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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores discourse functions of the two sentential endings in Korean: -(u)n/nun keya and ~ta, and discuss gender variation in use of these two endings in narrating gossips and experiences using naturally occurring spoken corpus produced by Sejong Project. Both -(u)n/nun keya and ~ta occur frequently in narratives, not just to make statements or inform noteworthiness of proposition(s)speaker wants to convey but more so to encode speaker's stance. Analytic frameworks are adapted from interactional sociolinguistics and pragmatics, and this dissertation argues that -(u)nun keya has discourse functions of mirativity, assumptivity, narrativity; ~ta has demonstrative and quotative meanings when it occurs in narrative frame.

Later part of the dissertation addresses gender variation in use of these two endings with the assumption that gender is socially generated and culturally diversified identity. In narrating one's experiences and/or episodes, men and women adopts different narrative strategies and many research on men's and women's narratives reports that men tend to seek separateness and engage in one-upmanship through talk, whereas women tend to seek connection and solidarity (Coates, 1996, 1997; Johnstone, 1993; Holmes, 1997). This dissertation observes the similar trends in Korean men's and women's narratives and discusses these narrative strategies in perspective of subjectivity and intersubjectivity.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>Conditional marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Declarative sentence-type suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDER</td>
<td>Ender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Indicative mood suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Intimate speech ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominalizer suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>Passive suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>Plain speech level suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Polite speech ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Interrogative sentence suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Quotative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>Propositive sentence-type suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>Promissive sentence-type suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Prospective modal suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>Relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Retrospective mood suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Subject honorific suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Topic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Vocative particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Just as a man is fulfilled through working out the intricate details of solving a problem, a woman is fulfilled through talking about the details of her problems.”

1.1 Overview

The idea that men and women are essentially different beings is a predominant view of gender, as shown by John Gray’s popular self-help book, *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* (1992), from which comes the epigram of this chapter. The quotation displays a popularly accepted opinion that—men work on finding solutions for problems whereas women talk about problems, and in so doing, both men and women realize their gendered selves—their gendered identity. Claims such as this lead us to perceive gender as essentially binary in nature: Men are workers, women are talkers; men are active pursuers, women are passive observers; men are reality facers, women are idealistic dreamers; men prefer to work for individual success, women like to work in groups. These assumptions about gender differences closely echo what Robin Lakoff (1975) describes as women’s communication style: hesitant, tentative, weak, trivializing, and hyper-polite. In her book, *Language and Women’s Place*, Lakoff explained that women’s sense of inferiority and insecurity because of their secondary status in society accounts for their propensity to use such “women’s language.”
1.2 Theoretical background

Many writers have criticized both Lakoff’s analysis and Gray’s generalizations, and it is still debatable whether there are true “gender” differences in reality. From the standpoint of sociolinguistics, social science, and ethnography, scholars such as Bergvall & Bing (1996), Brown (1998), Gal (1995), Holmes (1986, 1989, 1997a, 1998), Ochs (1992, 1995), and Schiffrin (1992) claim that “gender” is a culture-specific norm cultivated and practiced through social activities. Keenan (1989) found that women in the Malagasy village where she did fieldwork are considered to be less polite than men. They often employed confrontational and direct speech in addressing men despite strong indications of men’s superior status. In the Mayan community studied by Penelope Brown (1998), women seemed to abide by what could be generalized as the tenets of women’s language: these Tenejapan women were highly deferential to men but extremely warm and supportive to other women. Brown, however, explains that such language traits are not so much correlated with women’s social status but rather to “social networks,” and “social motivation,” which govern their linguistic choices and communicative strategies to achieve social goals. According to Tannen (1990, 1998) men and women belong to different “sub-cultures” and it is because they have been socialized in different ways since childhood, that they have distinct communicative styles.

From the post-structuralist view-point, “gender” is not a concrete reality but an imagined construct, and what appear to be “gender” differences in conversation are, in effect, social constructs produced by the dynamic nature and multiple factors of an interaction (Cameron, 1995; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2004; McElhinny, 2002). It is not that speech itself can be classified in a particular category, but that gendered constructs are performed or utilized by speakers as they see fit. In other words,
“...a model of gender that assumes that all individuals will be perceived as female or male is overly simple because gender is not only the attribute of individuals, or even constituted by the activities of individuals, but is also part of institutional definitions, structures, and tasks.” (McElhinny, 1995, p. 238).

In spite of differences in perspectives on gender and its performativity in discourse, most scholars, if not all, seem to agree that “gender” is a social variable that impacts language construction in context-specific as well as general practice. In accordance with this theoretical standpoint, the research presented in this dissertation investigates how “gender” as a social identity is constructed and negotiated subjectively and intersubjectively using two specific sentence endings in Korean: declarative ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya. Declarative ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya are the objects of this study in part because they are understudied in spite of the frequency of their usages in face-to-face interaction to convey affective and epistemic nuances. In addition, they occur frequently in narrative. Based on its analysis of the pragmatics of men’s and women’s utterances of these two sentence-ending forms and their contextual environments in these interactions, this study claims that Korean men and women show variation in stance-taking strategies in the unfolding development of action and in narrating their past experiences.

Narrative offers a pivotal interactional activity for this study because it allows observation of how speakers position themselves subjectively and negotiate their stances intersubjectively. Narrative involves “reporting” of a story or series of episodes that have been directly or indirectly experienced. The recounting of one’s past experience is generally
performed in a certain structure\(^1\) in which various specific speech acts are performed. Using diverse linguistic resources, narrative displays how speakers reinterpret their experiences, conceptualize “past” in relation to “present,” and perceive their own position in the stories they tell. This dissertation is concerned with this process of transforming personal experience into verbal performance as a resource for the display of self and identity. Previous research on oral narrative suggests that narrative language contributes to the construction and display of speakers’ sense of who they are. When people recount their past experiences, the speakers situate the experiences socio-culturally by drawing on cultural knowledge and social expectations about how to construct a story in recurrent situations and how to make relevant in the text, which includes their audience, interactional concerns, and interpersonal issues (Bamberg & Marchman, 1991; Jefferson, 1978, 1988; Kerby, 1997). Hence, narrative is a discursive activity that is interwoven with how speakers situate their ‘experiences’ in light of prescriptive norms that are culturally specific and often contextually conditioned. It thus becomes a site in which speakers display, negotiate, and construct their stances contextually and culturally. Studying the linguistic traits of a particular social group by observing their narratives reveals how the speakers understand their social identity as a whole. According to Schiffrin (1996), narrative language shows a process of subjectivization as it discloses speakers’ implicit meanings, provides multiple perspectives, and allows subjectification\(^2\). Therefore, by studying men and women in interaction we can learn about how men and

---

\(^1\)Labov (1972) identified narratives as discourse units consisting of an abstract, an orientation, a complicating action, an evaluation, and a coda in sequence. Narrative is prefaced by an abstract, which is a statement of the general theme of the story. This is followed by an orientation, giving background information on the when, where, and who of the story. A complicating action describes “what happened” in temporal order, and evaluation refers to the significance of the events to the speaker. A coda is an optional sequence of narrative, which provides a temporal and topical transition from the world of the story to the interaction in which it is told.

\(^2\)The term “subjectification” refers to the development of subjective meaning in language through time, focusing on the speaker’s role in meaning change. It describes a decrease in semantic value or content, but an increase in abstraction and nonreferentiality (Tabor & Traugott, 1998, p. 265).
women position themselves in relation to discourse contexts by asking questions such as:
What are their contextual motivations? What are the linguistic strategies they employ? And how do they accomplish their motivation in the context?

1.3 Goals of the study

The purpose of the current research is twofold. On one hand, the research presented in this dissertation seeks to explore the discourse functions and meanings of ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya using the participant-oriented, action-based micro-approach of discourse analysis (DA). On the other hand, this study seeks to contribute to studies on language and gender by exploring previously uninvestigated language-specific phenomena (i.e., gender variation in stance-taking strategies), while at the same time showing how talk-in-interaction in a non-western language can display the same striking systematicity observed in many western languages.

1.4 Organization of the study

The structure of the dissertation is as follows. In chapter 2, previous studies on language and gender are addressed. Since Robin Lakoff’s (1975) work, gender and its role in language construction has been studied in light of her rather rigorous perspective in conjunction with anthropology, social sciences, psychology, and linguistics. Such studies often generalize linguistic characteristics into binary categories of women’s or men’s speech styles and define them as concrete evidence of gender nature perse. With the rising popularity of discourse analysis and recognition of the significance of discourse context in language use, the relation between language and gender is perceived more locally and studied
by investigating the intricate matrix of interaction and speakers’ stance taking. Several studies have found that features of what has been considered exclusively gendered language—masculine speech versus feminine speech—are used by speakers of both genders depending on various contexts and contextual settings. For instance, female police officers employ so-called “masculine” speech, using blunt, referential, factual language on the worksite (McElhinny, 1995, 1998) whereas male caretakers in preschools use speech that is inferential, tender, and soft, which is considered “feminine” speech. In this chapter, I explore how gender and its prescriptive norms and expectations are defined differently in different cultures and how the ways that gender is marked, represented, and negotiated vary from context to context.

In chapter 3, the semantic and discourse functions of ~{(u)n/nun keya} are addressed and explored. Syntactically, ~{(u)n/nun keya} is derived from ~{(u)n/nun kesiya} with ~{i} deletion. In this form, ~{(u)n} and ~{nun} are adnominal suffixes that modify the noun kes, and thus ~{(u)n/nun kes} appears to form an NP in this ~{(u)n/nun kes} + {ita} construction. Studies that have investigated the function of kes explain that it appears to function sometimes as a nominalizer and sometimes as a marker of a cleft construction (Kang, 2006; Kim & Sells, 2007). Kim and Sells (2007) claim that the copular ~{ita} has predicative and equative functions, and kes constructions follow the pattern of simple copular clauses, with predicative and equative interpretations. Yet, kes + {ita} have no predicative function because kes cannot descriptively update an existing referent. Therefore, for instance, {ku chayk-un nay-ka ilk-nun kes-iya} (that book is the one that I am reading) is appropriate but {ku salam-un nay-ka man-nan kes-iya} (that person is the one that I met) is not because of the lack of informativity of kes in the latter example, leading to a clash in animacy.
The current research argues that ~keya has a strong predicative function in a narrative frame. Kes loses its property as a noun, and by combining with the sentence ender iya, it functions as a sentence ender and takes on a predicative property as shown in the examples below.

(1) A: *i chayk-un mwe-ya?*  
this book-NM what-INT  
“What is this book (for)?”

B: *yocum nay-ka ilk-nun ka-ya*  
these days I-TM read-RL ke-INT  
“(It is a) book that I’m reading these days”

(2) A: *mwusun il-i-ya?*  
what thing-is-INT  
“What is it?”

B: *ce chinkwu-ka kapcaki ca-taka ilena-se chayk-ul ilk-nun ka-ya.*  
that friend-NM suddenly sleep-while awake-and book-AC read-RL ke-INT  
“That friend woke up suddenly from sleep and read a book!”

In (1), ke in B’s utterance refers to a topic introduced by A, which is a book, and is replaceable with the referent, book. In (2), however, ke in B’s utterance presents new information relative to a topic that is already given in the context: something that both speakers witnessed. The ~(u)n/nun keya phrase also expresses the speaker’s surprise or a sense of unexpectedness.

Using spoken discourse corpus data from the Sejong Project\(^3\), I investigated usages of ~(u)n/nun keya among Korean speakers in interactions between friends in their twenties. I analyzed its discourse functions, and compared its usage and meaning in the speech of men

\(^3\)Sejong Corpora consist of raw corpora of modern written and spoken Korean, North Korean dialect, old Korean, and oral folklore literature. It is compiled by 21st Century Sejoing Project to provide Korean language resources for academia, education and industry.
and the speech of women. I claim that \( (u)n/nun\ keya \) functions as a stance marker to denote the speaker’s (i) mirativity, (ii) evidentiality, and (iii) assumption. Comparing men’s and women’s utterances, women tend to employ a higher number of \( (u)n/nun\ keya \) phrases than men within the same word count. Furthermore, men tend to position their individual subjectivity by negotiating, competing, and confirming their stance with other conversational participants and contextually emerging social notions, such as what is expected of a military dischargee, norms of filial piety, and so forth. On the other hand, women tend to position themselves in alignment with their co-participants in regard to the issues, topics, and themes that emerge in the context, and their subjectivity is often formed contextually and locally.

In chapter 4, semantic and discourse functions of the declarative sentence ender \( ~ta \) are discussed. Semantically, \( ~ta \) declares the speaker’s proposition. For example, \textit{na kan-ta} (I’m going) declares the speaker’s intention to leave at the current moment and announces it to an audience. Previous studies on \( ~ta \) agree that it marks the speaker’s modality: informing the audience of seemingly noteworthy information (H. S. Lee, 1994), expressing the speaker’s cognitive process (Noh, 2008), and signaling the audience on what to expect of the speaker (K. H. Kim, 2004). Building on the previous studies, this dissertation claims that \( ~ta \) has both narrative and non-narrative functions. In recounting the speaker’s personal experience, \( ~ta \) emerges at the beginning of a story, or the “orientation” William Labov’s narrative structure, and it signals a change of topic or anticipation of the upcoming story. It also emerges in evaluative activity within the discourse and marks the speaker’s epistemic and affective stance. Furthermore, in the narrative frame, the ending, \( ~ta \) occurs in reported speech constructions and marks the authenticity of the narratives that the speaker recounts.
Chapter 5 discusses gender variation in the use of \textit{\~(u)n/nun keya} and \textit{\~ta}. This study claims that both men and women employ \textit{\~(u)n/nun keya} and \textit{\~ta} to mark their stance subjectively and intersubjectively, but in the context of recounting of the speaker’s past experience, the frequency of \textit{\~(u)n/nun keya} and \textit{\~ta} is higher in women’s utterances than in men’s. It is argued in this chapter that this difference emerges because Korean women display their subjectivity locally by recounting details of an event or action of their past experience, whereas Korean men mark their stance globally by checking and negotiating their views of the world with their co-participants in the context. In addition, the sentence ender \textit{\~ta} often occurs in an adjacency pair with \textit{\~(u)n/nun keya} in evaluative actions within assessment and narrative activities. The chapter discusses how \textit{\~(u)n/nun keya} functions along with \textit{\~ta} in the two speech acts of assessment and narration, and what it denotes in regard to women’s and men’s stance-taking strategies. Then brief summary of the content of the dissertation and further discussion on gender variation in stance-taking in Korean are provided as conclusion in the chapter. Both Korean men and women employ narrative as a linguistic device to take and maintain the floor in interaction, but gender variation emerges in how men and women situate their past experiences and position themselves in the interaction. That is, Korean women situate their experiences contextually and employ these two endings to index the speaker’s stance whereas men situate their experiences socially and seek to negotiate, confirm, and sometimes compete for their view. Both Korean men and women continuously shift, negotiate, and construct their stances intersubjectively, and their “identities as social beings emerge as [they] construct [their] own individual experiences as a way to position [themselves] in relation to social and cultural expectations” (Schiffrin, 1996, p. 170).
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Studies on language and gender

In the social sciences, “(social) identity” refers to individuals’ labeling of themselves as members of particular groups or in terms of certain categories, such as race, ethnicity, class, and gender. This brief definition of social identity implies two interconnected notions: social versus individual and structural versus contextual. Identity is social because categorization is a social process defined and maintained by social structures and systems like ideologies, norms, and conventions. At the same time, identity is an individual construct because “a community, its rules, and its language only exist insofar as its members perceive them to exist” (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985, p. 16). That is, our social identity exists within the larger social structures as we conceive of them in our own perceptions, whether we see ourselves in accord with those structures or not. Therefore, identity is not just a representation of a social structure or a conceptualization of an individual’s social reality, but the practice of a complex set of social systems (Cameron, 2005). Within this notion of social reality/structures as emergent and constructed out of personal, situated interaction, identity construction is inevitably situational and interactional, for identity is constructed and negotiated with and by contextually shared knowledge that is inferred in conversational interpersonal involvement (Schiffrin, 1994). In this sense, language functions not just as a means to express an individual’s identity, but as a site in which they (or we) negotiate and construct a social identity, affected by larger social structures (Cameron, 2005; Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, 2004; Wetherell, 2000). The
study of gender, as a social identity, has been strongly influenced by this notion of identity. Politically, the feminist social movement that brought widespread attention to gender emerged as its proponents sought to strengthen the position of women, whom they perceived as a politically oppressed group, by improving their sense of confidence and value, as well as by familiarizing society with women as a social group.

In the following pages, I will argue that the simplistic traditional conception of sociolinguistic variation as a reflection of social identity is not realistic, with a focus on gender as a social identity. My arguments will be based on three key points. First, gender as a social entity is not a real but an imagined construct; thus it has no ontological status to be linguistically reflected, and there is no normativity of gender to which variation could be compared as a way to reflect its social reality (Cameron, 1998, 2005). Second, drawing on Judith Butler’s (1990) “gender performativity,” I consider gender as a social act and a practice rather than a conceptual construct; this view entails that gender is organized and realized differently in different contexts as it interacts with various social factors. Hence, gender is not a single representation of social identity but a complicated set of social relations (Pavlenko & Piller, 2001) and cannot be monolithically generalized. Third, gender as a social structure is culturally specific; thus its definition, values, societal stances, and relations are different and diverse across cultures and times (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, 2004; Gal, 1995).

2.2 Theoretical background: the concept of gender and theoretical approaches

The study of language and gender can be traced back to the 1970s when the feminist political movement brought a controversy-stirring approach to inequitable power relations
between men and women. Scholars of language and gender began to examine the speech of
women and men in relation to larger questions about female and male “culture.” The
dominant, essentializing perspective emphasized the difference between sex, as a biological
trait, and gender, as a social construct that elaborates upon biological sex
differences(Bergvall, Bing, & Freed, 1996; Cameron & Kulick, 2003; Eckert & McConnell-
Ginet, 2004). Within this context, the role of language in gender inequalities was debated,
focusing both on language used “about women,” such as the asymmetries between seemingly
parallel terms like master and mistress (Sutton, 1995), and language used “by women,”
which some argue places women in a double bind between being appropriately “feminine”
and being fully human, a view best exemplified by Robin Lakoff’s (1975) book ‘Language
and Women’s Place.’

Lakoff’s work has been criticized as based on a “dominance framework” and for her
unsupported, monolithic generalizations. She characterized so-called women’s language as
powerless language—uncertain, weak, and hyper-polite—in which linguistic features such as
hedges, tag questions, intensifiers, emphatic stress, and hypercorrect grammar all indicate
women’s lack of power. The underlying assumption of Lakoff’s description was the power
relation of women’s subordination and men’s dominance. In this perspective, or dominance
framework, the emphasis was on how gender inequality affects language use in constructing
gendered identity in the presupposed heterogeneous social structure in which men’s speech is
perceived as the norm against which women’s speech is measured and found to be as
aberrant and in need of being explained. Robin Lakoff’s generalization of women’s language
as powerless language sparked controversy and accelerated studies of language and gender.
Many subsequent studies in English (Bergvall, Bing, & Freed, 1996; Bucholtz & Hall,
and in Korean (Kim & Seo, 1996; Lim, 1993; Min, 1997; Chae & Park, 1999; Song, 1996) investigated how the effects of gender inequality were manifested and (re)produced in “gender-differentiated linguistic behaviors” (Cameron, 2005). Although the significance and effect of Lakoff’s work on the study of language and gender is unquestionable, many critics raised questions about her generalizations, including questions about gender ontology: Are there really women and men? What composes, constitutes, and identifies gender as a realistic identity?

Lakoff’s depiction of women’s language as powerless was mostly criticized for its lack of empirical basis and reliance on her own intuition. In effect, the very ideas of women’s language and powerless language are ideological constructs. For one thing, women’s language is not an exclusive property of women but is available to both gender groups, and power is not a unilateral dominance but a relational as well as situational force. For instance, Okamoto (1995) analyzed Japanese sentence-final forms used in the dyadic pad talks of Japanese female college students and observed that they had the tendency to employ less feminine forms, and more masculine and neutral forms. Similarly, Miyazaki’s (2004) study of Japanese junior high school students’ use of pronouns shows that it is not just gender but rather complicated contextual and relational power relations that affected their choice of pronouns. Miyazaki argues that gender is not an essentialist trait that exists as a binary opposition, but a continuum. In another study, Hall (1995) interviewed and observed female fantasy phone line workers, who constructed certain feminine personae using “powerless” linguistic traits. However, Hall contended that these women’s use of language gained them economic (i.e., capital gain) and social power (i.e., social freedom, control in selecting calls), rather than making them as subordinate to men’s dominance. All these studies reveal
that gender-differentiated linguistic traits, so-called women’s language, and related concepts of femininity and masculinity are imagined and ideological constructs that are not practiced consistently in reality. Clearly, the subjects of these studies were not playing their expected and imagined social roles as submissive, powerless women, at least linguistically and discursively.

By the early 1980s, a "difference framework "associated with Deborah Tannen emerged as an alternative to the dominance framework. Tannen (1999) argues that linguistic gender differences were produced not by the subordination of women, but “by the social arrangements which separate the genders in the formative period of childhood and adolescence” (p. 243). Tannen suggests that girls and boys are socialized into different ways of relating to one another in their predominately same-sex interactions and, thus, acquire different communicative styles. According to this model, the same event can appear differently to different perceivers, giving rise to a variety of interpretations of the same action (Tannen, 1990). In the difference framework, miscommunication occurs between interactants due to their distinct perceptions of the same event and consequent misinterpretations of each other’s social roles. A significant contribution of the difference framework is its proposal of the relativity of linguistic styles. That is, each subculture of gender, women and men, is equally inclusive and divergent, and thus, the same linguistic means can be used for different purposes and can have different effects in different contexts. Thus, “a strategy that seems, or is, intended to dominate may in another context or in the mouth of another speaker be intended or used to established connection” (Tannen, 2004, 152).

Gender, from the traditional variations approach to sociolinguistics, is believed to be a pivotal social variable (Holmes, 1997a) that causes linguistic differences between men and
women. And in turn, gender identity in this view is entailed and marked by the discursive as well as linguistic variations that characterize gender identity as a conformed social identity. For instance, Bradley (1988) found gender-exclusive differences in Yanyuwa, in which the gender of the speaker is marked by the choice of case-marking suffixes, and use of forms inappropriate to a speaker's gender was strongly condemned and rebuked, clearly marking a distinction in expected gender roles and domains in Yanyuwa society. In Trudgill’s (1974) research on social class and gender differences in phonetic variations in Norwich (e.g., /ng/ as in walking and talking), women and middle class speakers tended to use the more standard speech form, [ɨn], whereas men and working class speakers tended to use a nonstandard form, [ı̞n]. This pattern assumes an association of masculinity with the rough and unpolished speech of the lower classes, and femininity with standard speech as more refined and delicate. Other, subsequent studies on gendered structures and language use, which focused on gender differences in mixed conversation (Holmes, 1998; Lakoff, 1975; Tannen, 1996; West & Zimmerman, 1987) and same-sex interaction (Cameron, 1998; Coates, 1998) suggested that women are empathic, indirect, solidarity oriented, referential, polite, and hypercorrect, whereas men are more competitive, direct, and hierarchy oriented. Such studies have reported that linguistic displays of hegemony in terms of gender order and relations are manifested and maintained in social interaction, for example, by interruption and overlapping, and by denigrating women.

Although the contributions of these studies are significant to inquiries into the relationship between language and society with a focus on gender effects, they are problematic as attempts to document linguistic reflections of social identities—being a woman and/or a man. They do not address and discuss gender identity but larger gender
discourses, such as gender ideologies, hegemony, power, and division of labor. The focus of these studies was on the binary differences between men and women and how and why such gender variations exist, in either or both the dominance paradigm and the cultural difference paradigm. They approached gender variation as a set of social systems and relations that categorize, rather than identify, according to dominant social ideologies.

In recent years, more and more scholars from across disciplines, including but not limited to second language studies (SLS), language education, linguistics, discourse analysis, anthropology, sociology, and discursive psychology, have expressed some skepticism and concerns regarding the traditional perspective that language reflects society or social identities, especially in the study of language and gender/sexuality (Cameron, 1990, 2005; Cameron & Kulick, 2003; Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, 2004; Pavlenko & Piller, 2001). These scholars recognize the need for a qualitative paradigm that looks into the more detailed process of linguistic behaviors in context and culture-specific local sites, and they emphasize the need for explication of the notion of social identity as well as re-conceptualization of social identity as a diversified and jointly produced construct.

To understand the relation of language to identity as a part of a larger social structure, it is necessary to understand first the way in which people construct and negotiate their identities under what contexts and relations and with what governing social systems, such as norms, values, beliefs, and ideologies. Ironically, the dominant social systems by which we define and conceive the normativity of a society and thus reflect (and create) our own social identities—whether as mother, father, blue collar worker, student, black, white, oriental, American, etc.,—are in effect produced and realized through language use. In other words,
identity construction is an abstract notion, for its very ontological stance is questionable, and at the same time, it is a concrete construct, for it is practiced, negotiated, and constructed in everyday lives. For instance, my social information of being a Korean, a female, a graduate student, a teacher, a mother, a sister, a daughter, and a church-goer is concrete, as these percepts express my status, gender, beliefs, race, ethnicity, and relations. However, I do not consistently reflect, express, and negotiate my identity as being a Korean female graduate student, teacher, and mother who have parents, siblings, and a daughter as family and Christianity as a religion. My linguistic behaviors may share some commonalities with others who have similar social information, but we definitely will not be identical in the ways in which we construct and negotiate our social identities in our talk. One must question, then, the ontological reality of social identity: Is there a fixed, global, and monolithic social identity? It is necessary to explain linguistic variations as social phenomena before further elaborating the Discourse/discourse\(^4\) based upon them, as well as to consider how to relate social identities as part of larger social systems to linguistic phenomena (Cameron, 1990; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992).

Although gender researchers and theorists (e.g., Cameron, 1990; Coates, 1998; Freed, 1995; Holmes, 1998; McElhinny, 1998) acknowledge the earlier contributions of language and gender studies, they have recently argued that gender behaviors are neither predictable nor universal. Cameron (2005) argues that the dominance and cultural difference approaches have much in common, as they both treat gender with essentialist assumptions. They look for differences between men and women of monolingual, homogeneous groups and regard

\(^4\)“Discourse,” capitalized, refers to large concepts constitutive of social systems and structures such as ideologies, gender ideologies, and various social conventions that impose social order. So-called “small” discourse refers to practices of social conventions such as portraying “women’s language” as powerless language.
linguistic differences as the product of early socialization; both approaches concentrate on a mainstream prototype of femininity or masculinity in practice—white, straight, middle class, and monolingual. Such essentialist assumptions present men and women as undifferentiated groups, and both dominance and difference paradigms attempt to explain differences between women’s and men’s language through a generalized view of gender identities or relations (Pavlenko & Piller, 2001).

It is commonly recognized by most feminist theorists and researchers that the difference and dominance models are problematic, as in some cases they damage emancipatory practices. In recent years, studies have begun to shift from viewing gender as an individual and generalizable trait to viewing it as a social construction within specific cultural and situational contexts. For example, regarding gendered agency, in Miyazaki’s (2004) ethnographic study of Japanese junior high school students, her examination of language use led her to challenge the ideology of gender dichotomy. She conducted three years of ethnographic research on 7th-grade students in the Tokyo area and found that girls can perform alternate femininities using ore and boku (both means ‘I’), both traditionally considered masculine first-person pronouns in mainstream language ideologies, without being treated as “being boys.” However, these linguistic behaviors are associated with anti-school behaviors and sexually free attitudes. On the other hand, boys can alter their masculinities by drawing on various pronouns to create relationships based on power/hierarchy. In short, neither boys nor girls have complete agency in which pronouns they use or how they are interpreted, and gender is performed not as a dichotomy, but rather, as a continuum. Cameron (1998) analyzed an informal conversation among five young white American men, which involved discussion of "wine, women, and sports" as well as gossip
about other men, specifically men whom the speakers identified as “gay.” She argues that although the conversation did involve masculine topics, it also involved gossip about other men, which does not fit into the conversational framework of men’s language. Through the gossip, the speakers are distancing themselves from the men they talk about, and they affirm their identities as heterosexual males.

Some studies, like those by Hall and O’Donovan (1997) and Leap (1998), address speech patterns/forms observed in the speech of homosexuals or transsexuals. In Hall and O’Donovan’s study, hijras were interviewed in four communities in Banaras, India, and the speech forms and patterns of their language were studied. Previous studies on hijras claimed that they use masculine and feminine forms indiscriminately. However, Hall and O’Donovan argue that masculine and feminine forms are used by hijras to indicate solidarity and power/distance, respectively. As for Leap’s study, he analyzed casual conversation among fifteen gay men, arguing that gay English is a form of cooperative discourse, showing characteristics of intentionality, coherence, turn-taking, employment of descriptive imagery and metaphor, and inference strategies.

All these studies talk about “doing” and “performing” gender as well as the varied ways that gender is jointly constructed in particular communities of practice. They examine the ways that gendered identities are constructed, altered, and defended through discursive practices in local contexts by specific actors. Miyazaki (2004) and Cameron (1998) discuss agency and structuration. Speaking like a male or a female is a structuration due to historical and social forces. But while people are socialized to conform to the gender norms of their particular societies, they also have the agency to resist these norms. Men and women can

---

5 In India, hijras are known as “the third sex,” neither man nor woman. Most hijras are physically male but usually refer to themselves as female in their language use and dress as women.
choose how they represent themselves as more or less “male” or “female” than the structure dictates. Hall and O’Donovan (1997) and Leap (1998) similarly discuss alterations to the gendered notion of “women’s language” and related concepts of femininity and masculinity: Women’s language is not exclusive to women/femininity, but has varied social functions and cultural meanings. To investigate how speakers’ identities emerge from discourse, previous studies in this line of research use various methods, including discourse analysis, to pursue questions regarding the situated construction of gendered identities in specific local contexts.

The notion of social reality (including identity construction) as situated interaction is a core concern of discourse analysis (Cameron, 1990). The term “discourse” has different definitions, ranging from the simplistic—“utterances above sentence level”; “language in use”; “meaning-making”—to the more complex notion of “to ‘do’ social life” (Schiffrin, 1994). Wetherell, a leading discourse analyst and discursive psychologist, and her colleagues concisely describe discourse analysis as “new methods and techniques…in meaning-making…[and] a theory of language and communication, a perspective on social interaction and an approach to knowledge construction across history, societies and cultures” (Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2004, p. 1). In studies of language and gender, particularly gender identity construction, discourse analysis has been significantly influential, for it provides methods as well as a theoretical framework of investigation. In effect, it is under this methodological and theoretical notion of discourse/discourse analysis as the study of meaning-making (meanings that certain events and experiences hold for individual social actors) that a deeper understanding has emerged of gender as social actions and/or social activities realized locally, that is, in context. For example, traditional quantitative, correlational sociolinguistic research has shown that women, by and large, speak differently than men in regard to
standard and nonstandard speech. These studies, in spite of the significant contributions they have made to the study of language and gender, have underemphasized the effect of speakers’ agency in their linguistic production. Qualitative research that closely looks at the context and analyzes naturally occurring discourse has provided much deeper insight into how we as individuals choose to speak to represent ourselves as more or less male or female in contrast to how we are trained and/or structured to speak like males or females.

As briefly introduced on the previous page, gender ideology and identity are produced and reinforced linguistically and discursively. Interaction is, therefore, a local site in which the diversity and variability of individuals interact in context to construct context-based identity. Recent literature provides empirical methods, such as discourse analysis, to investigate the way participants orient and organize their identity/subjectivity, and a theoretical template with which the question of what constitutes gender can be addressed. Many gender and language studies that have focused on analyses of discursive and linguistic practices support the perspective that diversity and localization of identity are specific to certain communicative events and contexts (Bergvall &Bing, 1996; Cameron, 2005; Eckert & McConell-Ginet, 1992, 2004; Ohara & Saft, 2003). What constitutes gender is no longer perceived to be a static biological dichotomy but an ongoing, dynamic, and diversified mixture of various sociocultural products. There is no absolute gender identity inherited or acquired at an early stage, but localized practices through which participants each build their own identity relevant to the context, situation, and their social relation to other participants (Cameron, 1990, 1995, 2001, 2005; Hall, 1995; McNay, 2000; Ochs, 1992; Okamoto, 1995).

In spite of the locality of identity construction, the influence of larger social structures (ideologies)in identity construction cannot be disregarded. If gender is not something that we
acquire at an early age but something we perform, and if through our discursive practices we orient ourselves to relevant local contexts, then gender cannot be assumed to be prescriptive in its unscripted diversity and variability. Yet the notion of gender and how one identifies one’s own gender accordingly cannot be assumed to be independent of ideology. Van Dijk (1989, 1990, 1995) perceives ideology as an “interpretation framework” that categorizes sets of attitudes about other elements of modern society and provides the “cognitive foundation” for the attitudes of various groups in societies. Similarly, Eckert and McConell-Ginet (2004) describe ideology as the “system of beliefs” by which people account for and evaluate themselves as well as others, and gender ideology as “the set of beliefs that govern people’s participation in the gender order, and by which they explain and justify that participation” (p. 35). Thus how one constructs one’s gender reflects particular sociocultural systems of ideas, beliefs, values, and attitudes; at the same time, how one orients one’s identity through discursive practices and strategies shapes and produces particular ideologies of the society that person belongs to, his/her social status, and his/her relation to the community of practice. Therefore, whether it is prescriptive concepts and ideology that train a person to be a particular gender or whether it is a person’s linguistic practices that categorize and construct that person’s gender identity, both gender identity and gender ideology function together and reciprocally as they affect and contribute to each other. Thus, language could never appear by itself but as a system of linguistic term and, this system of linguistic term themselves are expressive of and organized by a specific ideology(Kress, 1990).Therefore, what we perceive and keep in our minds is framed and shaped by cultural predispositions that determine how and what to perceive. Cognition and language, then, are affected by social and cultural forces: The way we behave and express ourselves in relation to a linguistic code and the
underlying categories of the code itself are open to external influence (Schiffrin, 1999). In short, gender as a “complicated set of social relations and discursive practices” (Pavlenko & Pillar, 2001) is constructed, negotiated, defined, inferred, and perceived in local sites.

Such post-structuralist perspectives on gender underlie the discourse analysis of naturally occurring talk as empirical data to observe how people actually “do” their identities. One important concept crucial to understanding how individuals’ identities are realized as situated interaction is that of contextualization cues. A contextualization cue refers to “aspects of language and behavior (verbal and nonverbal signs) that relate what is said to the contextual knowledge…that contributes to the presuppositions necessary to the accurate inferencing of what is meant” (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 105). For example, nonverbal communication (e.g., gaze), turn-taking rules, prosody, politeness, code-switching, style-switching, and gendered language can be contextualization cues.

Contextualization cues were first introduced by Gumperz (1982) as an analytical construct that integrates our social and cultural knowledge into a “single overall framework of concepts and procedure” (cited in Schiffrin, 1994, p. 99). Gumperz viewed language and language use as representations of society and social structures. How we “use” and “do” language is, in this view, socioculturally relative, and we make sense of communicative events using our own social and cultural knowledge. We bring socioculturally determined (or at least affected) presuppositions to interaction to infer situated meanings that surface in the given context. In short, contextualization cues serve to activate and retrieve the necessary background knowledge so that a contextually appropriate process of inference can take place. At the same time, contextualization cues enable interplay between socioculturally determined and prescribed gender presuppositions that the speaker would employ in the context and what
individuals practice and experience in this process of interaction. This interplay-in-talk constructs individuals’ identity as situated meanings. For instance, Schiffrin (1994) discussed cross-gender interactions among four people including herself (the other three participants were neighbors, two of whom were a couple, and one of whom was her best friend) and noted that one female neighbor consistently spoke for the other female neighbor when Schiffrin directed questions to that younger female participant. Schiffrin explained that this behavior was situated in the context not just as a discourse strategy but also as a contextualization cue by which the participants’ relationship of solidarity and their gender identity was inferred. She argued that it was context that provided a situated inference about the meaning of their interactional moves as solidarity rather than dominance. She continued that the two female participants’ pursuit of “diet” as a topic emerged as a contextualization cue to display their gender identity through the structuring of a participation framework.

For another example, Taylor’s (2006) study of interculturality addressed jointly constructed miscommunication that occurs when participants with different cultural backgrounds fail to infer contextualization cues appropriately. She observed a tutoring session between a Korean male graduate student tutor who had been in the US over two years and an American female undergraduate student. Their topic was computer programming of bowling. After the session ended, when Taylor interviewed the tutor and the student, the student described the tutor as “playing games with her head” and the tutor described the student as “rude and disrespectful.” During the tutoring session, the Korean tutor used hedges like “approximately” and “maybe,” and Taylor illustrates that the use of such hedges emerged as a contextualization cue for displaying his modesty, which, for him, was culturally perceived as a polite act. On the contrary, the student inferred this as an indication of lack of
confidence in his knowledge and expertise. The tutor explained in the interview that it might be embarrassing for a foreigner to openly say he knows more about a game from the student’s own culture than she did. Because the tutor already believed that he had asserted his expertise, he did not feel required to respond to the student’s disclosure that she had bowled with an account of his own bowling experience. At the same time, the tutor inferred the student’s soliciting clarification as “rude and disrespectful” behavior challenging his authority as a teacher. On the other hand, the student took this as an indication that the tutor had no bowling experience, and because the student had bowled, she concluded that she was likely to have more knowledge than the tutor concerning how the scoring works. Hence, while the tutor was constructing his role and identity as a teacher upon his cultural template in the course of interaction, the student was acting upon her American cultural template to infer meanings different from those of the tutor. The contextual presuppositions that the tutor and the student used during the inferencing process were culturally relative (and thus, externally constructed) and imposed external constraints on the ways in which they understood meanings: modesty versus lack of confidence; a modest teacher versus a teacher with no expertise.

2.3 Studies on Korean language and gender

The study of gender effects in Korean language is a recent development (Min, 1997). Gender has been recognized as an important variable since the 1990s. Studies have addressed gendered differences including but not limited to the use of gendered terms such as the second-person pronoun caki (Chae & Park, 1999) and address terms (Yoo, 2001), syntactic and grammatical features (Min, 1997), discourse functions of lexical items (Lim, 1993),
conversational strategies such as disagreement strategies (Wang, 1999), conflict management strategies (Song, 1995, 1996), and assessment and understanding check strategies (Kim & Seo, 1996). Similar to the trend in western literature, most of these studies address gender from an essentialist perspective, focusing on a binary dichotomy of gender. The underlying assumption is that the relative social status of women and men in Korean society does not encourage women to be expressive or outspoken, despite recent, rapid social changes. Hence, these studies assume that women would engage in interactions in different ways than men would; they thus share characteristics of both the dominance and difference models in the English-language literature in that they assume women to be more indirect, less assertive/aggressive, and more polite than men in many speech act behaviors.

For instance, Song (1996) compares gendered differences of argumentative conversational strategies in English and Korean and illustrates that while both female and male English speakers engage in direct and indirect strategies in expressing disagreement, Korean men are involved in more direct and intense arguments than Korean women, and Korean women engage in more mitigating and less confrontational strategies to avoid conflict. Song argues that Korean women engage in these less-face-threatening argumentative strategies in the effort to save their “face” by behaving according to social demands and expectations of Korean women, according to which they should maintain harmonious and respectful interpersonal relationships. In Kim and Seo’s (1996) study of gendered difference in “assessment” and “understanding check” sequences in Korean, the women oriented toward giving empathic assessments and supportive agreement with others’ assessments and focused on maintaining solidarity, and the men oriented toward displaying their own assessments and showing their knowledge. In addition, the men tended to do
understanding checks more frequently than women, not to “check” interlocutors’ understanding but to display their own understanding or knowledge on the topics being checked. Both these studies illustrate findings similar to generally assumed binary gender differences—men’s speech is direct, instrumental, competitive, and assertive whereas women’s speech is tentative, empathic, and referential, to name a few.

In contrast, Wang’s (1999) quantitative study of gendered differences in disagreement strategies using discourse completion tasks (DCT) found no gender differences: Both Korean men and women engaged in similar politeness strategies (although the women appeared to use more positive politeness strategies than the men, the difference was minor); they similarly used both direct and indirect disagreement modes depending on the type of speech act; they both frequently expressed their own perspective using first person pronouns rather than distancing themselves from the subject in dispute. Wang refers to changes in Korea in women’s social status and the consequent narrowing of the gap between men and women as a possible cause for the observed findings. Although these studies address various aspects of the effects of gender in the context of Korean language, they do not address gender as a social identity and its construction in the discourse context, which are understudied in Korean. To understand the effects of gender in language and how these are realized in linguistic features, it is necessary to study how individuals orient to and construct their gender identity together with the role of social structures in shaping notions of gender. To clarify this point, I will analyze one Korean example, which I extracted and transcribed from a Korean TV forum called *Achim Matang* “Morning forum”.

*Achim Matang* is a daily hour-long program that airs in the morning. The program is hosted by one male and one female MC who lead the general flow of discussion by directing
questions to a group of guest panelists made up of four females and four males. The rows of male and female guests are seated across from each other and surrounded by the live audience who sit behind them in a semicircle. Each gender group is seated in order of age. After being given a topic, which varies each week, and initial probing by the hosts, the panelists talk freely without much control or direction from the hosts to allocate turns. The participants are from various professions, and in this particular speech event, the male guests are a lawyer, a psychiatrist, an actor, and a voice performer, and the female guests are a freelance reporter, a comedian, an anchor, and a business CEO. The audience is almost exclusively women, in particular housewives, which is not surprising given the timeslot of the program and the predominant expectation in Korean society that women stay at home to take care of the household while men go out to work. For this particular episode, the topic is women's vanity in relation to so-called toyncangnye, a newly coined term for a group of young women who are seen as vain, extravagant, and selfish.

(Excerpt 1)

10. Kang:  
**Seysangey, ku ke-y kal-li-nun ke-n kwaychanh-untey**  
"My goodness, that thing is okay with grinding but,"

11.  
**komwu phakhing-i ppacy-ess-eyo**  
its rubber band slipped off’

(lines omitted)

16.  
**kulayse sil @@ @ silul ilehkey haykacko ceckalakulo.**  
‘so I use string with a chopstick like this.’

(lines omitted)

18.  
**Sswusye nehe kacko ilehkhey hayse haysseyo.**  
‘I press like this and use it.’
(lines omitted)

25. Im:  
Ani, kuntey sasil ceto tutko ponikka ku kyelhonhal ttay san kasuleyinciyeeyyo.  
‘You see, but, the fact is, I too, as I listen to [the story], [it’s about] a gas oven  
that I bought when I got married.’

26. Kuntey ikey enu swunkan cemhwahanuntey mwunceyka sayngkyesseyo  
‘But this thing had a problem with ignition at some point’

(lines omitted)

28. kulaykacko icey laithalul kactatayya pwuli pwuthnun keyeyyo.  
‘so it only ignited when [I] put the lighter to it.’

(lines omitted)

36. kkuthkkaci incey icey catongulo pwul pwuthinun kes sasscanhayo.  
‘Yes, to the end. Now, for now, I bought a thing that automatically ignites.’

(lines omitted)

39. Pae:  
wuli cipunyo, seythakki isipchilnyen ssessmunteyyo, iccokeyse ppalakaciko  
‘As for my home, I used laundry machine for 27 years, [I] wash and’

40. illo cipeneheyo. cal tolakayo, thalswuka.  
‘put into this side. It spins well.’

Just as Schiffrin (1994) argues in her analysis, in this excerpt, gender is realized and  
constructed through the structuring participation framework. Before this segment, three  
females were talking about frugality in contrast to the modern concept of being an  
“extravagant girl or toyncangnye.” Kang (female) started talking about her long term use of a  
blender. Kang’s story about the blender is structured in three stages: (i) how long it has been  
used, (ii) types of problems that have risen from using it such a long time, and (iii) her efforts  
to resolve the problems. Upon hearing Kang’s story, Im (female)tells of an episode with a  
gas oven. She builds her story following an almost identical pattern to Kang’s episode: She  
has used it since she got married (line 25), it has problems with ignition (lines 26, 28), she
endeavors to resolve the problems first by getting it repaired (line 29) and finally by purchasing an automatic ignition device (line 36). Almost immediately after Im’s episode, Pae (female) takes the floor and describes her use of the same laundry machine for 27 years (lines 39–40). She does not clearly identify what the problem is with the machine, but it can be assumed from line 40 that it does not wash but can dry spin, and she resolves the problem by using two laundry machines: one for washing and the other for drying. Note that Pae occasionally engages in supportive talk with both Kang and Im before she tells her story. This recursive pattern of storytelling emerges with salient contextualization cues from which the participants infer a situational meaning of gender, and through structuring their participation framework in this way, they are engaging in two things: constructing their gender identity differently from the general topic they’ve been given (a group of vain young women) and performing their gender identity as middle-class, frugal housewives with their own professions who put effort into being frugal in domestic matters and taking care of their households. Within this frame, they orient to their gender identity as a group different from toyncangnye, a term that evokes extravagance, idiocy, vanity, and trend-seeking young contemporary women. They view toyncangnye as consumers while they position themselves as preservers who are not fashion-oriented but domestic and care-giving housewives by evoking frugality and wisdom.

2.4 Summary

The studies discussed in this chapter have documented that there is no absolute, universal generalization about gender that encompasses all cultures, societies, and history. What distinguishes women and men is based on biological sex, but sex itself is not concrete
and essential but an ambiguous notion. Based on gender ideology, which is related to power, gender is created as a social construct and is constantly produced and reproduced through the performance of gendered behaviors.

However, what constitutes femininity and masculinity is imagined and politically based, and linguistic modes of feminine speech and masculine speech are not thoroughly observed, practiced, and/or followed in reality. So-called “women’s language” is in effect inclusively used by both genders, and gender is a continuum, as speakers shift language use and negotiate new referential terms without being strictly limited by gender. Females use “male terms” and males use “female terms” depending on the context and participants, setting, and purpose of interaction (Miyazaki, 2004; Okamoto, 1995).

Furthermore, the characteristics that are often considered part of women's language are not really expressions of powerlessness, as was first theorized (Hall, 1995), and are inclusively used by both genders (Miyazaki, 2004; Okamoto, 1995) and by homosexuals/transgender individuals for varied social functions (Hall & O’Donovan, 1997; Leap, 1998; Hall, 1995). If linguistic variation reflects social identity, how would these people be categorized or identified? Similarly, studies show men’s “gay language” shares similar linguistic features with women’s language: high intonation, use of tag questions, emphatic stress, and more. How, then, would the speakers be categorized when they are biologically men yet use what is known as women’s language features? Do their linguistic variations reflect their identity, or socially created and mediated notion of gender?

Hence, identity is not an essentialist but a diversified notion. Gender as a social identity has been created and imposed by gender ideologies as a way to impose social order. In reality, gender is not a prescribed concept but rather an ongoing process of accomplishing
social relations. Gender can be defined differently and categorized differently, and thus practiced differently cross-culturally.

Identity construction is integral to the study of interaction and language, for all linguistic, communicative, interactional events or acts are inevitably social activities of creating a “self” as it interacts and intersects with other variables and factors. Deborah Cameron (2005) points out that wherever and whenever the matter has been investigated, men and women face normative expectations about the appropriate mode of speech for their gender. In particular, women’s verbal conduct is seen as important in many cultures, and women have been instructed in the proper ways of talking just as they have been instructed in the proper ways of dressing, in the use of cosmetics, and in other “feminine” kinds of behaviors. Paying attention to the gendered practice of identity construction in local sites helps us to deconstruct symbolic attempts to impose order on the social world and reconstruct identity in a more dynamic sense.
CHAPTER THREE

DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS OF ~(U)N/NUN KEYA

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the discourse functions of ~(u)n/nun keya are investigated using the Sejong Project’s spoken discourse data collected and compiled in 2003 and 2004. A total of 18 women’s interactions and 23 men’s interactions between close friends in the same age group (mid-20s) were chosen for analysis. The majority of the participants are identified as college students, while a few are identified as full-time workers. About 61% of the corpus participants indicated Seoul as their hometown. The total word count for female interactions is 107,998 and the total word count for men’s interactions is 108,616. Out of this data, six sentence-final suffixes or enders that index the speaker’s modality were selected and their occurrences counted, as shown below in figure 1.

![Figure 1. Six particles: % out total word count](image_url)

**Figure 1.** Six particles: % out total word count
As illustrated in the figure, Korean men and women apparently show no great difference in the use of ~ney and ~kwuna but men show higher usage of ~canha and ~ci whereas women show higher usage of ~(u)n/nun keya and ~ta. This is an interesting contrast when these six sentence enders are grouped into three subcategories of modality: ~ney and ~kwuna as evidential, ~canha and ~ci as epistemic, and ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya as narrative. While each suffix has a unique meaning and characteristics of its own, the subcategories have some commonalities in their basic meaning and usage in discourse. However, it is not the current research’s focus to compare and contrast these sentence enders in detail, except for the objects of the study, ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya; therefore, in the following, they will be described only briefly in reference to gender variation emerging from the spoken discourse.

Sentence enders ~ney and ~kwuna are characterized as displaying the speaker’s source of newly perceived information. H.S. Lee (1993) states that while both ~ney and ~kwuna express newly perceived information, ~ney marks definitive information based on the speaker’s factual knowledge whereas ~kwuna marks unassimilated information based on the speaker’s inference. Susan Strauss (2005) claims that ~ney and ~kwuna are cognitive realization markers, and that ~ney signals a discovery at the moment of speech based on the speaker’s realization of having just drawn a particular conclusion, but ~kwuna signals the speaker’s immediate and instantaneous discovery at the moment of speech.

Whereas ~ney and ~kwuna are concerned with how the speaker processes newly perceived information cognitively and denotes his/her realization as a result of cognitive inference or instantaneous discovery, ~canha and ~ci are concerned with the speaker’s certainty toward his/her personal judgment, assessment, or belief about the proposition presented in the discourse and toward the hearer’s acknowledgment. Studies on ~canha and
~ci confirm that they are used for information that the speaker and hearer are both aware of and involve both the speaker’s and the recipient’s personal judgment or belief on the commonly shared information; hence, they display the speaker’s certainty about the recipient’s agreement and they seek or negotiate a response from the interlocutor. H. J. Lee and J. H. Lee (2002) define ~ci as a suffix that affirms a truth or fact that the hearer is aware of; Kawanishi and Sohn (1993) characterize ~ci as expressing a lower degree of certainty and ~canh(a)- as expressing a higher degree of certainty about the interlocutor’s agreement. H.S Lee (1999) addresses ~ci and ~canh(a)- from the conversation analytic perspective and proposes that both ~ci and ~canh(a)- as committal markers make explicit reference to and thus emphasize the speaker’s belief about the conveyed message (1999, p. 272).

As for the sentential endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya, they too often occur when the speaker perceives new information (J.B. Kim & Sells, 2007;K.H. Kim, 2004;H.S. Lee, 1993;Noh, 2008; S.H. Rhee, 2010). H. S. Lee (1993) states that in certain contexts, the sentential ending ~ta marks newly perceived information in such a way that it expresses information that requires the interlocutor’s immediate attention. Extending this claim of Lee’s, K.H. Kim (2004) addresses ~ta from a conversation analytic view and investigates sequential features associated with its use. He suggests that ~ta provides a basis for a perlocutionary act because of its marking of “noteworthiness.” He asserts that the referent or event that the speaker has just noted using ~ta furnishes the speaker with a basis on which he/she can initiate a move, and orients the hearer to take a relevant next action.

As for ~(u)n/nun keya, which can be translated as ‘the fact is…, the thing is…’, it indexes the speaker’s objectivity. J.B. Kim and Sells (2007) state that kes may present new information relative to a topic that is already given in the context (p. 480). S.H. Rhee (2010)
in his discussion of Korean nominalization and how Korean nominalizers mark stances briefly states that ~nkei- as in 'kuttay ku-ka o-nkei-a (it was that time when he came)' has emphatic meaning with the nuance of mirativity (p. 10): information that is perceived to be surprising, unexpected, and new. Many other studies address kes in the Korean cleft construction, in which it carries emphatic meaning.

These previous studies on the sentential endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya are insightful in understanding the discourse functionality of these two endings, and the current research is greatly indebted to them. Building on these studies, the current research investigates the functionality of ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya in narrative activity. Previous studies on ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya investigate these endings from various perspectives: H.S. Lee (1993) addresses the suffix through cognitive analysis; K.H. Kim (2004) offers an interactional account of ~ta; and Noh (2008) explains the discourse function of ~ta with a usage-based analysis. However, these studies analyze the functionality of ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya in nonnarrative frames, overlooking their high occurrence in the recounting of past experience. Considering narrative as a social activity that provides a site in which the speaker’s identity unfolds, the speaker’s stance that is conveyed in the course of narrating past experiences and the interactional motivation of recounting past experiences are closely related and shaped by the speaker’s perception of self, as well as interpersonal relationships between interlocutors. Therefore, stances taken up in retelling the speaker’s past experiences emerge subjectively and at the same time, they emerge intersubjectively within the discourse context. Based on the framework of DA and interactional sociolinguistics, this study investigates the usage of ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya in the activity of narrative, the stances that emerge from the use of

6Many studies on -ta, not discussed here, include phonological analysis and consider the functionality of boundary tones. Chapter 4 provides further discussion on -ta.
these endings, how their usage varies by gender, and what the variation implies about
genderlects.

A brief description of the sentence-enders in Korean is presented here to emphasize
the modalities they encode in reference to stance-taking strategies and gender. Although
these endings are not exclusively used by one gender over the other, a higher occurrence rate
of a specific linguistic device by one gender suggests the existence of interactional stance-
including variation by gender. The first pair of evidential marker endings (~ney and ~kwuna)
denotes the source of the speaker’s discovery or a realization that he/she perceives as new
information, and the second pair of epistemic stance markers (~ci and ~canha) indexes the
degree of the speaker’s certainty of his/her belief or judgment about the referent/event
presented in the course of interaction and the agreement of the interlocutor. This dissertation
begins with the assumption, which it aims to demonstrate, that the last pair of sentential
endings, ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya, have a narrative function derived from their semantic
meaning of emphasis and objectivity. The differences in usage presented in figure 1 seem to
indicates three aspects of gender variation in stancetaking: (i) Korean men and women show
little difference in marking newly perceived information; (ii) men seem to take an epistemic
stance of certainty when the information is shared and known prior to the interaction or
realized in the course of interaction more often than women do; (iii) women more frequently
seem to use narrative as a communicative device than men do. If these traits are found to be
true, then it may be an indication of men’s tendency toward idea positioning in interaction
through the content of what they say and women’s tendency toward subject positioning
through relationship with others, that is, storytelling.
However, idea positioning is not accomplished in isolation, and idea positioning and subject positioning are closely interrelated because the way that speakers present their ideas relates to how they present themselves to others in social interaction. Therefore, positioning needs to be analyzed from an interactional perspective to examine how these stances emerge and what linguistic devices and interactional management strategies the participants use in these social interactions.

In this chapter, the discourse functions of ~&(u)n/nun keya and ~ta are addressed using Sejong Corpus data to observe if men and women show any variation in stancetaking through the use of these sentential endings, which will be discussed in the following chapter. The chapter is organized as follows.

Section 3.2 describes the semantic meaning of ~&(u)n/nun keya, and section 3.3 explains its discourse functions in narrative activity. I argue that ~&(u)n/nun keya has the interactional functions of mirativity, denoting unexpectedness on the part of the speaker; evidentiality, indexing the source of the information presented by the speaker; and assumption, encoding the speaker’s perception, opinion, and/or subjectivity. A brief summary of the chapter is given in section 3.4.

### 3.2 Basic meaning of ~&(u)n/nun keya

The syntactic structure of ~&(u)n/nun keya is as shown below.

\[
[\{&(u)n/nun \kes\}\NP + [i + \_a]V]VP
\]

- adnominalizer
- noun ‘thing’
- copular intimate sentence ender
*Kes* is a defective noun and thus it requires an adnominalizer or a relative suffix to precede it (Sohn, 1999). The types of adnominalizers are given in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Adnominalizers (Sohn, 1999, p. 310)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an adnominalizer preceding *kes*, it functions as a nominalizer, as in *mek-nun kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) eat’, *mek-ten kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) used to eat’, *mek-ul kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) will eat’ for the nonpast verb form; *mek-un kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) ate’, *mek-ess-ten kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) had used to eat’, and *mek-ess-ul kes* ‘thing that (I/he/she/they) could have eaten’ for the past verb form. In this study, the prospective ~*(u)l-kes-i-a* will not be discussed since it undergoes different cognitive processing from the indicative and retrospective *kes-i-a*. That is, ~*(u)l* conveys the speaker’s proposition in relation to the temporal notion of futurity. Therefore, in the interactional activity of narrative or retelling of past experiences, ~*(u)l-kes-i-a* hardly occurs.

The semantic meaning of ~*(u)n/nun kes-i-a* or its variant form ~*(u)n/nun keya* is largely derived from the noun *kes* ‘fact, thing’, and often *kes* is understood as a cleft construction.

(1) a. ecey mek-un kes-un pipimpap-i-ya
    yesterday eat-RL kes-TC bibimbap-is-INT
    ‘What (I) ate yesterday is bibimbap.’

    b. pipimpap-i ecey mek-un ke-ya
    bibimbap-NM yesterday eat-RL ke-INT
    ‘Bibimbap is the one that (I) ate yesterday.’
Example (1a) is a predicational cleft construction in which *kes* refers to missing information, which is *bibimbap-iya*; (1b) is an identification cleft in which the subject *bibimbap* is identified with *ke* in the predicate, and (1c) is an eventual cleft, describing the activity of an event. These examples apparently have similar meanings as English cleft constructions as indicated by the emphasis expressed in translations such as ‘the thing is…’. These sentences also have different information structure properties. (1a) marks new information relative to the given information that the speaker ate something, namely that it was *bibimbap*. (1b) takes *bibimbap* as the topic and equates it with the object from the *kes*-phrase, something that the speaker ate. This information structure property can be seen more clearly with a question meaning ‘What was it that we ate yesterday?’ as shown in example (2).

(2) A:  
\[ \text{ecey} \quad \text{wuli-ka} \quad \text{mek-un} \quad \text{kes-i} \quad \text{pokkumpap-i-ess-e?} \]  
yesterday \quad we-NM \quad eat-RL \quad kes-NM \quad fried rice-is-PST-INT  
‘Was it fried rice that we ate yesterday?’

B:  
\[ \text{pokkumpap-un} \quad \text{eskucey} \quad \text{mek-un} \quad \text{ke-ya.} \]  
fried rice-TC \quad day before yesterday \quad eat-RL \quad ke-INT  
‘Fried rice is what we ate the day before yesterday.’

\[ \text{pipimpap-i} \quad \text{ecey} \quad \text{mek-un} \quad \text{ke-ya} \]  
bibimbap-NM \quad yesterday \quad eat-RL \quad ke-INT  
‘Bibimbap is what we ate yesterday.’

Speaker A asks B about the food item that they ate together. The information about what they ate yesterday is not new information, yet A is not sure of it, assumes that it was fried rice,
and checks this information with B. Then B clarifies that fried rice is what they ate the day before yesterday, and that bibimbap is what they ate yesterday. This information is new to A but related to the given information about the food item they ate yesterday. Here, ~(u)n/nun keya has an equative function as ke is equated with the subject of the sentence. These predicational and identificational clefts inherit properties from the corresponding copular constructions as shown in examples (3) and (4).

(3)  
\[ \text{chelswu-nun sensayngnim-i-ta} \]
\[ \text{clews-TC teacher-is-DC} \]
\[ \text{Celswu is a teacher.'} \]
\[ \text{b. chelswu-nun kaluchi-nun salam-i-ta} \]
\[ \text{Celswu-TC teach-IND person-is-DC} \]
\[ \text{Celswu is the one who teaches.'} \]

(4)  
\[ \text{i chayk-un sensayngnim ke-ta} \]
\[ \text{this book-TC teacher-Ø-ke-DC} \]
\[ \text{‘This book is the teacher’s book. / This book belongs to the teacher.’} \]
\[ \text{b. i chayk-un sensayngnim-i po-si-nun ke-ta} \]
\[ \text{this book-TC teacher-NM see-SH-RL ke-DC} \]
\[ \text{‘This book is what the teacher read.’} \]

Example (3a) is a predicational sentence: The property expressed by the predicate noun phrase sensayngnimita ‘(it is) a teacher’ is the predicate Celswu. (3b) is an equative construction: It asserts that the referent of the expression Celswu and the referent of the expression kaluchinun salamita ‘person who teaches’ are identical. The examples in (4) show that the ~(u)n/nun keya construction follows the same pattern of copular construction of predication and equation. On the other hand, (1c) apparently shows no direct subject of the referent that could coindex with the predicate keya. In fact, the entire clause is headed by
keya, and the subject can be linked to a temporal point or anything that can cause the event denoted by the cleft clause. Because it describes an event or action, ~(u)n/nun keya in an eventual cleft construction often co-occurs with elements that can provide a background setting or increase the emphatic meaning conveyed by ~(u)n/nun keya.

(5) a. [pwul-ul kku-camaca] [isangha-n soli-ka tulli-nun ke-ya]
   light-AC off-as soon as strange-IND sound-NM heard-RL ke-INT
   ‘The fact is, as soon as I turned off the light, I heard a strange noise.’

b. [keki-ey] [con-i nathana-ss-ten ke-ya]
   there-at John-NM appear-PST-RL ke-INT
   ‘The fact is, John had showed up there.’

c. [ne-ka amwu pyenmyeng-ul an-ha-nikka] [ohay-ka sayngki-n ke-ya]
   you-NM any excuse-AC not-do-since misunderstanding-NM arise-RL ke-INT
   ‘It is because you did not explain yourself, that (they) misunderstood (you).’

The adverbial clauses in the examples in (5) provide supporting information that accentuate key information conveyed by the ~(u)n/nun keya phrase. In (5a), the adverbial clause of pwul-ul kku-camaca ‘as soon as (I) turn off the light’ provides a time frame for the event of hearing a strange noise. In (5b), keki-ey ‘at there’ provides a place for the event of the appearance of John; and ne-ka amwu pyenmyeng-ul anhanikka ‘because you are not defending’ in (5c) offers the cause of having a misunderstanding.

### 3.3 Discourse functions of ~(u)n/nun keya

The previous section described that ~(u)n/nun keya has emphasis as its basic meaning derived from its objectivity, denoted by the defective noun kes, and the syntactic structure of the cleft construction. Cleft constructions typically put a particular constituent into focus. In this section, the discourse function of ~(u)n/nun keya is discussed in relation to stancetaking,
especially the functions that emerge in narrating one’s past experience, and how this sentential ending gives a “dramatic "voice to a story and is often used to accentuate what the speaker perceives to be noteworthy or pivotal in the unfolding of the story. First, the mirative meaning of ~(u)n/nun keya will be addressed, and then the evidential function and the assumptive function. Stance variation by gender will be discussed in the last section.

3.3.1 Mirative meaning of ~(u)n/nun keya

A mirative linguistic form is used to encode an assessment of the knowledge background of the speaker. Mirative meanings reflect “the status of the proposition with respect to the speaker’s overall knowledge structure” (DeLancey, 1997, p. 33) or “expectation of knowledge” (Hyslop, 2011, p. 625). When what is known to the speaker turns out to be truthful unexpectedly, the speaker asserts the reality of an unexpected truth and the process that brought it about. The surprise or counterexpectation expressed by the mirative forms arises from the discrepancy between what is expected and what things really are and as such encodes the transition of the speaker from a state of nonknowledge to a state of knowledge. By using mirative forms, the speaker expresses an assertion, an inference, and/or a conclusion, which is surprising even to him/herself.

Studies on mirativity show that the range of mirative meanings subsumes “sudden discovery, revelation, realization, unprepared mind and new information with its basic meaning of surprise and counterexpectation” (Aikhenvald, 2012, p. 208). In Korean, ~(u)n/nun keya carries mirative marking within this range of meanings. This ending emerges at points in the discourse where the speaker has just directly perceived something for which
he/she had no premonitory consciousness and concomitantly produces a cognitive realization.

(Excerpt 2: Sudden realization)

1. Lee: *cangki-lul twu-nunkey, il tay il-lo twu-nunkey anila cangki-AC play-while one versus one-by play-RL ke-NM not ‘We were playing *cangki*, and it was not a one t one game.’*

2. *Ni-ney sey myeng wuli sey myenghay kacikwu you-team three people our three people do with ‘With three people on your team, three on our team and’*

3. *swunpencey-lo tolaka-nun ke-nte, celtay yaykihay cwu-myen antw-ay turn system-by operate-RL ke-but never tell for-if not-INT ‘we played by taking turns, but you could never say anything’*

4. *cangkwun-ul chye-ss-nunkey, ku-ttay na chalyey-yess-ketun checkmate-AC play-PST-but that time I turn-PST-you see ‘I checkmated and, that time it was my turn you see’*

5. *ilehkey chi-myen mak-nunkey like this play-if block-but ‘(I could) block if I played like this’*

6. *i salam-tul-i yayki-lul mosha-taka this people-PL-NM talk-AC cannot-while ‘they could not tell me about that but’*

7. → *nay-ka engtwunghakey mengkwun-ul ha-n ke-ya I-NM unexpectedly counter-checkmate-AC do-RL ke-INT ‘I did a counter-checkmate unexpectedly.’*

8. *cye-ss-canha kulayse Lose-PST- you know so ‘(They) lost, you know, because (of that).’*

Three speakers from the same college are talking about college social culture. Prior to this excerpt, the speaker Lee describes the type of games or activities that he used to play with his society members when he was a freshman. He talks about how they used to play kick ball
and Korean chess occasionally, then he begins to unfold one of his past episodes with the specific proposition of cangkilul twununtey ‘we were playing cangki’. After he provides the proposition and the setting in line 1, he further explains the specific rules of this game until line 3. Here, the speaker explains a unique characteristic of this game: It is played not on a one-to-one basis but on a three-to-three basis, each member taking his/her turn. This information is a necessary frame to explain what happens in the game and what the speaker wants to accentuate by using the ending ~(u)n/nun keya.

After Lee provides the setting and necessary information about the situation he is about to unfold, he gathers the interlocutors’ attention in line 4 using ~ketun and providing information that only he has access to. The episode that the speaker narrates provides enough information about his situation: (i) it was his turn to play, (ii) his team members were not allowed to inform him about the current situation of the game, (iii) his team was checkmated, (iv) he made a defensive checkmate that caused the other team to lose the game. To accentuate the resultative state of the other team’s loss, the speaker uses ~(u)n/nun keya. This is clearly an eventual cleft, and it brings out the effect of focus or emphasis. It also marks the speaker’s sudden realization and surprise, denoted by the adverbial engttwunghakey ‘unexpectedly’. This describes the fact that his defensive checkmate (meng-kwun) was not what he expected. This engttwunghakey is developed through the sequential turns of his narration. In line 4, the speaker provides information that only he has access to and believes that his interlocutors are not aware of using ~ketun: that it was his turn when his team was checkmated. Then through lines 5 to 6, he elaborates on details of the circumstance using ~nuntey and ~taka, both of which denote the unexpectedness of an event. These clauses take only contrastive clausal, as seen in the examples in (6).
(6) a. \[ilehkey \text{ chi-myen mak-} \text{nuntey} \text{mos mak-ass-ta}\]
   like this play-COND block-but cannot block-PST-DC
   ‘(One) could block if (one) plays like this but I failed to block (it)’

b. \[ilehkey \text{ chi-myen mak-} \text{nuntey} \text{ makassta}\]
   like this play-COND block-but block-PST-DC
   ‘(One) could block if (one) plays like this but succeeds’

c. \[i \text{ salam-tul-i yayki-lul mos-ha-taka kyelkwuk malhayss-ta}\]
   this people-PL-NM talk-AC cannot do-but eventually say-PST-DC
   ‘These people could not say but eventually told (the story)’

d. \[i \text{ salam-tul-i yayki-lul mos-ha-taka kyelkwuk mos-hay-ss-ta}\]
   this people-PL-NM talk-AC cannot do-but eventually not do-PST-DC
   ‘These people couldn't not say but eventually couldn't say it’

The speaker in excerpt 2 is setting up a frame where the addressees could expect some sort of twist on the background information he has provided using \(\text{~nuntey}\) (in line 5 ‘(I could) block if I played like this’) and \(\text{~taka}\) (in line 6 ‘they could not tell me about that but’). In other words, the speaker sequentially lays out the settings of (i) his turn, (ii) his other teammates being unable to help him out, (iii) and the fact that this move out of checkmate (\text{cangkwun}) was an unexpected and even surprising move marked by the adverbial \text{engtzwungakey} and the ending \(\text{~(u)n/nun keya}\).

The sentential ending \(\text{~(u)n/nun keya}\) occurs in the process of the speaker re-organizing the story line. The interactional time frame shifts to the past and the state of knowledge also shifts to a dislocated frame. The fact that the speaker did the checkmate is not new information since he has lived through the experience already. However, the realization of his checkmate is perceived as a sudden and unexpected discovery to the speaker as well as to the interlocutors. It is possible to interpret from the excerpt that the speaker was not aware of what he was doing, and his defensive checkmate move (\text{mengkwun})
must have been an unplanned move, something he had done without realizing. Only after the move did he come to realize that he had just gotten out of the checkmate and turned the victory of the game around to his team. Therefore, what is perceived as new information is this realization rather than the information itself. A mirative statement conveys “the information is new and unexpected and is as much about this surprising newness as it is about the information itself…the mirative marker conveys surprise at what is newly acquired and unintegrated” (DeLancey, 1997, p. 25).

The use of ~canha and ~ketun before and after the ~(u)n/nun keya clause indicates the speaker’s cognitive process in the narrative. Both ~canha and ~ketun are used when the speaker is making a judgment about the interlocutor’s awareness of the current information that s/he is about to impart. When the speaker thinks that the interlocutor is aware of the information, ~canha is used, whereas if the information that the speaker is about to convey is something that only the speaker has access to, ~ketun is used (Park, 1998). Following the use of sentence enders in this excerpt, the narrative sequences involving the~(u)n/nun keya clause are organized as follows:

Introducing information only the speaker has access to:

kuttay na chalyeyessketun (that time it was my turn you see)

Presenting a sudden realization in the moment of the episode:

mengkwunul han keya (I did a counter-checkmate unexpectedly)

Concluding the episode with the inductive understanding:

cyesscanha kulayse ((They) lost you know because (of that))
The sentential ending form of ~\(un{nun\ keya}\) in its event cleft construction functions as a mirative marker to depict this “surprising newness” in the narrative. Just as seen in excerpt 2, excerpt 3 depicts how the mirative function of ~\(un{nun\ keya}\) is performed in a narrative setting.

(Excerpt 3: Unprepared mind)

1. Baek:  \textit{unkunhi aphu-ci anha, ke}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
  somewhat pain-NEG that thing  \\
  ‘Isn’t it painful somewhat? That thing?’
\end{tabular}

2. \textit{pal-ey mac-nun cwusa?}  
foot-on inject-IND shot  
‘A shot injected in the foot?’

3. Kim: \textit{cepen-ey hanpen}  
that time-at one time  
‘Once last time’

4. Baek: \textit{ung}  
yeah  
‘Yeah.’

5. Kim: \textit{kathun kanhosa-ka kyeysok nwu, ike noh-taka}  
same nurse-NM continuously shot this one inject-but  
‘the same nurse kept giving me shots continuously but’

6. Baek: \textit{ung}  
yeah  
‘Yeah.’

7. Kim: \textit{e ye, yella aphu-n ke-ya @ @}  
eh very very pain-IND ke-INT  
‘the fact is that (it is) very painful.’

8. \textit{cangnan-i aniess-e, cincca, wa}  
joke-NM not-PST-INT really wow  
‘(It was) not a joke, really, wow.’

9. \textit{aphukey noh-umyen kulehkey-kkaci aphul swu iss-kwuna}  
painfully inject-COND like that-till painful-possible-kwuna
‘(If one) injects it painfully, it can be as painful as that.’

10. *kulen* *sayngkak-i* *tul-ess-ta-nikka*
such that thought-NM arise-PST-PLN-you see
‘Such thoughts came (to my mind), you see.’

Before excerpt 3, speaker Kim was talking about the removal of his stitches and how he hates getting injections. His coparticipant Baek then asks him if it is painful getting an injection in the foot. He proffers his opinion or assessment that it must be painful, and he invites Kim to coparticipate in his assessment. Kim then proffers his assessment not immediately after, but provides a character and a situation: the nurse who gave shots to him repeatedly. After providing an episodic situation of getting a shot in his foot, he then gives his assessment using the ~(u)n/nun keya pattern in line 7. Used in this event cleft construction, *yella aphun keya* ‘the fact is that (it is) very painful’ depicts the speaker’s emotional experience in the situation that Kim is describing and in so doing, he agrees with Baek’s assessment about such shots being very painful. The discourse function of ~(u)n/nun keya here is narrative and mirative as well. Kim found that the shot was very painful, but the degree of the pain was seemingly not expected. To depict the unexpectedness of the pain even to the extent of surprising realization as described in lines 8 to 10, speaker Kim sets up an episodic frame. This realization of pain needs a setting for the hearer to understand how the speaker came to that realization. Both Kim and Baek already knew that Kim got hurt and had stitches. With the already given information, Kim provides a situational setting and proffers his unexpected realization of the pain in line 7 with the form ~(u)n/nun keya. This extreme pain is not expected and thus not prepared for by the speaker even though the speaker had already experienced getting shots from the same nurse as he described in lines 3, 5, and 9. Although the type of injury and degree of severity is not clearly mentioned in the conversation, it is
reasonable to assume that he has been treated for this injury more than once. Both cepeney han pen ‘once last time’ in line 3 and kathun kanhosaka kyeysok ike nohtaka ‘the same nurse kept giving me shots continuously but’ in line 5 imply that he has been treated by the same nurse several times and he knew what to expect of the shot. It is that ‘one time’ that he describes in line 3 that the shot is extremely painful and the intensity of the pain is surprising and unexpected, as depicted by the event cleft construction of ~(u)n/nun keya. He elaborates on his experience and the intensity of the pain in line 8 with the intensifier cincca ‘really’ and the exclamation wa ‘wow’. Note how the conceptualization of this newness takes place in lines 7 through 10. In line 7, the speaker uses the present tense in delivering his assessment yella aphun keya ‘the fact is that (it is) very painful’, indicating that his assessment is an unintegrated sudden realization that the speaker realized during the process of the experience. Then in line 8, the speaker evaluates his unintegrated information of ‘the shot is extremely painful’ in the past tense form cangnani aniesse, cincca, wa ‘it was not a joke, really, wow’. The information is no longer raw and unintegrated, and in lines 9 and 10, it is cognitively processed and conceptualized in self-quoted speech that the speaker assesses not in terms of the degree of pain but his realization of the pain.

Another example of the mirative function of the event cleft construction of ~(u)n/nun keya is depicted in excerpt 4, given below. Previously, the three participants had talked about an incident involving one female junior from the same university who tried to purchase a bag of tea with no success.

(Excerpt 4: Sudden discovery)

1. Jin: ayu, kyay-n cincca kwiyp-te::, oh that person-TC really cute-you see:: ‘Oh, she was really cute, you see,’
2. Joh:  *kwiyep-ci:*
  cute-right
  ‘(She’s) cute, you are right.’

3. Jin:  *cayu sikan ka-se, incey o-
  free time go-and, now come
  ‘now, during the break, now (she) came…’

4. Joh:  *cayu sikan?*
  free time
  ‘Free time?’

5. Jin:  *e, cayu sikan ka-se*
  eh free time go-and
  ‘Yes, during the break.’

6. Joh:  *ecey?*
  yesterday
  ‘Yesterday?’

7. Jin:  *ai, ani,*
  oh no
  ‘Oh, no,’

8. Joh:  *kucey?*
  day before yesterday
  ‘Day before yesterday?’

  day before yesterday-or DM cry-and
  ‘(Not sure if it was) the day before yesterday (or not but, she) was crying
  hard’

10. Joh:  *wu-n-ta-ko?*
  cry-IN-DC-QT
  ‘She cried?’

11. Jin:  *e::*
  uh
  ‘Yeah.’

12. Joh:  *way wul-e?*
  why cry-INT
  ‘Why (did she) cry?’
13. Jin: 
\[ a::wu \text{ way } kuli kwyep\text{-}tun-\text{ci}, \]
\[ oh:: \text{ why such cute-ci} \]
‘Oh, how she was so cute’

14. 
\[ ku:: mwe:: \text{ chinkwu-ka } \text{ palammachye kac-ko} \]
\[ that:: \text{ DM}-\text{ friend-NM stand-and} \]
‘That is, (her) friend stood her up’

15. Lee: \[ \rightarrow \text{ tangyenhi wul-ci. } na-lato wul-keyss-ta \]
of course cry-you see I-even cry-guess-ta
‘Of course (she would) cry. Even I would cry too.’

19. Lee: 
\[ ani \text{ kukey aniko::} \]
no that not::
‘No, that’s not it.’

20. \[ achim-pwuthe:: \text{ chinkwu ttaymey cha sa-l-lako::} \]
\[ morning-since \text{ friend because } \text{ tea buy-PRS-intend::} \]
‘From morning, (she) tried to buy tea for her friend’

21. \[ kyey::sokna swuep-intey kyey::sok \text{ mwunca-lul wa-ss-e::} \]
\[ continuously I \text{ class-but continuously text-AC come-PST-INT} \]
‘I was in the class but continuously she sent (me) texts’

22. Joh: 
\[ cha tal-lako? \]
tea give-\text{ QT} ‘To ask for tea?’

23. Lee: 
\[ a:: \text{ cha etise sa, } \text{ kyey::sok mwunca wa kaciko} \]
\[ ah:: \text{ tea where buy } \text{ continuously text come and} \]
‘Oh, (she) sent texts continuously asking where to buy tea’

24. Jin: \[ \rightarrow \text{ nokcha, nokcha} \]
green tea green tea
‘Green tea, green tea’

25. Lee: 
\[ yay-ka \]
this person-NM
‘She is’

26. Joh: 
\[ ku-ke \text{ amwuteysena phal-canha nokcha::?} \]
\[ that thing anywhere sell-you see green tea \]
‘That thing, green tea, is sold anywhere, isn’t it?’
27. Jin: → **kunikka ay::ka?  ku-k-el  moll-a.**

So this person-NM that thing-AC don’t know-INT

*paykhwacem ka-lako::*

department store go-QT

‘She does not know about that. (I told her) to go to a department store.’

((12 lines omitted))

40. Joh: **eti paykhwacem-ul  ka-ss-nuntey,**

where department store-AC go-PST-ENDER

‘Which department stores did she go to?’

41. Lee: **ta ka-ss-e::,**

all go-PST-INT

‘(She) went to all (of them).’

42. Jin: → **ta, ta, kuntey ta mwun-ul tat-un ke-ya**

all all but all door-AC close-RL-keya

‘The fact is that every place was closed.’

43. Lee: **welyoil nal cengki hyuep-i-canha::**

Monday day regular holiday-is-you see

‘Monday is the regular holiday, you see.’

Jin opens up with his assessment on the female junior in line 1, saying that she is cute, and reveals how he came to feel that way through lines 3 to 14. Then the topic of conversation shifts from Jin’s assessment of her being cute to an episode of her desperate search for a bag of tea. Lee seems to have prior knowledge about this episode as indicated in line 15. His use of the enders ~ci and ~ta in line 15 depicts his certainty of his claim and the adverb *tangyenhi* (naturally) accentuates his strong conviction that the incident is worth crying for and that he would have cried if he were in her shoes. With this conviction, Lee changes his footing from listener to storyteller and unfolds this episode of a tea search from line 19. Jin, who originally brought the referent into the conversation, assumes the role of assistant and supplements Lee’s story with what he considers important information in lines 24, 27, and 42. This
episode is constructed and delivered in collaboration. Joh assumes the role of an active audience member who asks questions for clarification, and Lee and Jin take part in answering and providing missing or crucial information to Joh. In line 24, Jin provides supplemental information, the type of tea, which Lee had not provided in his previous utterance. Jin also takes up where Lee leaves off in line 25 due to the interruption of Joh in line 26. Lee and Jin’s collaborative construction of the episode continues, and in line 41, to Joh’s question, Lee provides the background that the referent (the female junior) went to all the department stores nearby, and Jin supplements this with the core of the episode, that all the department stores she went to were closed, using ~(u)n/nun keya in line 42. Lee and Jin construct how desperately the referent of this episode searched for a bag of tea, which would seem to be a common commodity and thus easy to purchase. However, the referent of the story faces an unexpected challenge: All the department stores are closed. The use of ~(u)n/nun keya here depicts this counter-expectedness—green tea is a common commodity and thus expected to be easy to find. When this general expectation is not met, the information becomes surprising and thus noteworthy. After Jin shares the counter-expected and surprising information, Lee takes the floor to provide the reason for the surprising turn of events in line 43. His use of ~canha indicates that the information that Monday is a regular holiday for department stores is not surprising for the participants.

As depicted in previous excerpts, the mirative function of ~(u)n/nun keya displays four constructional traits. First, it occurs in an event cleft construction; second, it is used in a narrative frame; third, clauses with ~nunty or ~taka precede ~(u)n/nun keya clauses and function to provide background information for the ~(u)n/nun keya clause; and fourth, because it occurs in narrative frame, the realization of mirativity is situational. It brings the
narrative perspective into the current frame, allowing the audience to conceptualize the situation in the given time frame.

### 3.3.2 Assumptive meaning of \(\sim(u)n/nun\ keya\)

Another discourse meaning of \(\sim(u)n/nun\ keya\) is that it marks the speaker’s assumption or presupposition. Presupposition is a type of information that is already shared by a speaker and a hearer at the time of the utterance (Lambrecht, 1994). In a normal conversation, if a speaker utters a linguistic expression that has a certain presuppositional structure, it is usually assumed that the discourse situation associated with the presuppositional structure is shared by the speaker and the addressee. See excerpt 5 below.

(Excerpt 5: Assumption)

1. Koh: \(a, ce so cinaka-n-ta\)
   oh that cow pass-IND-ta
   ‘Oh, those cows are passing!’

2.   \(so! kKaypppang wuski-ta\)
    cow really funny-DC
    ‘Cows! (They look) really funny!’

3. Choi: → \(cyayney se-se ka-nun keya? kuLeMyen?\)
   they stand-and go-RL keya then
   ‘Are they being transported standing up then?’

4. Koh: \(e, cyayney tali aphu-l ke kath-ay.\)
   oh they leg painful-RL ke seem-INT
   ‘Oh, they seem to be hurting their legs.’

5. Choi: \(pWulssangha-y\)
   pitiful-INT
   ‘How pitiful.’
The two participants in this conversation are watching TV news reporting the transportation of cows to North Korea. At the moment of the conversation, they together notice the trucks loaded with a large number of cows. Speaker Koh describes the scene spontaneously in line 1 and gives her assessment of the scene in line 2 that it appears very funny. Then speaker Choi asks a question to confirm what she has understood—that the cows are being transported in a standing posture. Even though they have not previously conversed about the event that they are watching on TV, both coparticipants already share the information at the time of their utterances via the visual and auditory resource of the TV news and possibly through information available to them beforehand. Thus, speaker Choi assumes that the referent (cows) and the information about the referent (that these cows are being transported in a standing posture) are taken for granted by hearer Koh. In the form of a question, ~(u)n/nun keya functions to ask for clarification and confirmation of the assumption that the speaker and the hearer share in the context/situation/discourse. In the narrative frame, ~(u)n/nun keya functions as a mirative marker and projects a condition, a mental status, and/or a situation that the speaker realized or discovered through the experience or processing of recounting the experience. However, in its assumptive function, ~(u)n/nun keya projects an assumed proposition that the speaker shares with the interlocutor or assumes to be known to the interlocutor (Kang, 2006). This is shown to be true by the sequential organization of the talk, since the replies following the questions either clarify or confirm the matter of the questions. Excerpt 6 below demonstrates how a series of confirmations/clarifications can be performed within a discourse based on shared assumptions.

(Excerpt 6)
1. Hong: ne myech cem pat-ass-nya?
you what score receive-PST-Q
‘What was your score?’

I check-AC not-do-try-PST-INT
‘I did not try to check (the score)’

3. kulayto han, pyello an thulysse-e
even though about not much not incorrect-PST-INT
‘but (I) didn’t get too many wrong.’

4. Hong: mwe phalsim-cem-imyen pwuth-nun-ta kulysse-na?
what eighty-point-COND pass-IND-DC say-PST-Q
‘Did you say that (one can) pass when (he/she) scores 80 points?’

seventy point
‘Seventy points’

6. Hong: chilsip cem?
seventy point
‘Seventy points?’

II-category-if  II-category-if seventy points
il-cong-imyen phalsip cem.
I-category-if eighty points

‘If it is category II, then eight points (is the passing score). If it is category I, then seventy points.’

8. Hong: → um, il-cong-i thulek-i-n-ka?
um I-category-NM truck-is-IN-Q
‘Um, category I is trucks?’

9. Kang: ani-n-ka?
not-IN-Q
‘Not?’

10. Hong: kang min kyung
kang min kyung
‘Kang Minkyung.’

11. Kang: na way ilehkey moll-a?
I don’t know why I like this. I don’t know why I like this.

12. hayethun na-nun chilsip cemi-ess-e.
    anyhow I-TC seventy points-is-PST-INT
    ‘Anyhow I got seventy points.’

13. Hong: → ya, ku-key il-cong-imyen thulek-i-ci?
    hey that I-category-COND truck-is-ci
    ‘Hey, if that’s category I, then it must be a truck, isn’t it?’

    uh truck
    ‘Yeah, truck’

15. Hong: → ne-nun i-cong otho-ha-n keya?
    you-TC II-category automatic do-RL keya
    ‘You tested on category II automatic (vehicle)?’

    II-category auto
    ‘Category II automatic.’

The speakers Hong and Kang are talking about getting their driver’s licenses. Kang took the test already, and Hong is planning to take it soon, and is trying to get as much information as possible from Kang. Hong asks about the passing score for the test in line 4, to which Kang responds by elaborating on different passing scores depending on the classification of the licenses in line 7. Hong wants to clarify the type of car that requires the “category I” license in line 8 and once again in line 13. In line 8, Hong utters her uncertain assumption—that a “truck” is “category I” using the ~(n)ka form. Kang fails to attend to Hong and wonders whether or not seventy points was the passing grade. Both Hong and Kang use the ~(n)ka pattern to express the uncertainty of their assumptions. However, in line 13, Hong expresses a higher degree of certainty by using the ender ~ci. It seems that the time interval before she utters the confirmation in line 13 allows her to recall information that she knew before about
the categories of cars for driver’s license types. What is interesting is that Hong could have used the ~ci ender in line 15 with all the given information confirmed in the discourse, but instead she uses ~(_u)n/nun keya. Kang has said that she scored seventy points on the driver’s license test, which is the passing point for the category I driver’s license, and the category II driver’s license includes trucks. With all this information, Hong could presuppose that Kang did not test for truck driving and, since she scored seventy points, was tested on the category II driver’s license. Hong could have a high degree of certainty on her assumption—that Kang was tested on category II automatic cars—and Hong could have expressed her strong assumption with the ender ~ci. Whereas the sentence ender ~ci “makes an explicit reference to and thus emphasizes the speaker’s belief about the conveyed message” (H.S. Lee, 1999, p. 272), ~(_u)n/nun keya denotes the speaker’s assumption about a proposition without expressing that the speaker believes or makes a commitment to it. In other words, Hong wants to check whether her belief/assumption/knowledge about the vehicle classification is true or false, in particular, whether trucks are included in the category I driver’s license in lines 8 to 13. Once the truth of her knowledge is confirmed, the speaker wants to check the truth of the assumed proposition itself regardless of her belief or certainty. Hong presents her assumption about Kang without associating her attitude or commitment to that assumption. Excerpt 7 is the continuation of excerpt 6.

(Excerpt 7)

but auto-NM convenient-canha drive-IND-key
‘But, the fact is, automatic (vehicles) are more convenient to drive’

24. kuntey, wuncen-ul com culki-nun salam-tul iss-canha.
but drive-AC somewhat enjoy-IND people-PL exist-canha
‘but there are some people who enjoy driving somewhat.’

    such people-PL-TC manual-NM more fun QT-tela
    ‘Such people said that manual driving is more fun’

26. Hong: *otho-nun camon-tay?*
    automatic-TC sleep-QT
    ‘(Do they say that) the automatic vehicle is too boring?’

27. Kang: *e, nemwu cikyep-tay.*
    eh very tedious-QT
    ‘Yeah, (they say it is) too tedious.’

28. *nemwu ha-nun key eps-unikka.*
    very do-IN-ke not exit-because
    ‘Because there is nothing to do.’

29. Hong: → *cincca kamaniss-nun keya? otho-nun?*
    really stay still-RL keya automatic (gear)-TC
    ‘Does the automatic really stay still?’

30. Kang: *otho-nun kunyang pal no-myen kunyang kutaylo ka-ko*
    automatic-TC just release foot-when as it is go-and
    ‘As for the automatic gear, it goes as it is when you release your foot’

31. *pal puleyikhu palmu-myen seiss-kwu,*
    foot brake step-COND stand-and
    ‘If you step brake, (car) stays stop (mode) and’

32. Hong: *kulayto ku-ke-l wumciki-ki-n wumciki-canha. son-ulo*
    but that that thing-AC move-NOM-RT move-canha hand-with
    ‘But you still move that thing with your hands’

    move-ci move-but automatic-NM convenient-INT
    ‘You can move it but automatic gear is convenient’

34. Hong: → *cheum sicakha-l tlay, ile-l tlay-man wumciki-nun keya?*
    first start-PRS moment this-PRS moment-only move-RL keya
    ‘The fact is, do you move it only when you start (the car)?’

Hong and Kang talk about automatic gear, and Hong seems to have no prior knowledge or experience with automatic vehicles and does not quite understand how automatic gear is
operated, whereas Kang presents some knowledge of it. In seeking and confirming information and clarification about the proposition (automatic gear), Hong repeatedly uses \(\sim \text{(u)n/nun keya}\) in line 29 and line 34 to present her assumptions, which she has conceptualized through the dialogue with Kang from lines 23–28. Hong assumes in line 29 that in automatic gear the driver does not shift at all, and her assumption is inferred from Kang’s utterances that it is boring and tedious as indicated by the indirect quotative ender \(\sim \text{tay}\). To Hong’s question, Kang elaborates on how to operate automatic vehicles in more detail (lines 30–31). Hong, however, seems to have some knowledge of manual geared vehicles and compares them to automatic gear. Even after Kang’s explanation, Hong wants to confirm her belief that the driver would shift even automatic gears with the hands (line 32), as indicated by the ender \(\sim \text{canha}\). Kang confirms Hong’s belief, then utters her assessment that automatic vehicles are convenient, using \(\sim \text{ci}\). While sentence enders such as \(\sim \text{canha}\) and \(\sim \text{ci}\) depict the speakers’ commitment or degree of certainty about their conveyed message, \(\sim \text{(u)n/nun keya}\) depicts the speaker’s assumption about her conveyed message with inference as the source of her assumption. That is, the speaker’s degree of certainty is not the main concern, and the pattern functions only to seek the truthfulness of the assumption, presented in factual form.

The sentences in examples (7) and (8) compare neutral \(\sim \text{e}\) and assumptive \(\sim \text{(u)n/nun keya}\) in pairs. Whereas (7a) and (8a) are descriptive and ask simple questions about automatic gear, (7b) and (8b) depict the speaker’s assumption on a proposition with the presupposition that the hearer would know or could confirm and/or clarify the speaker’s assumption.

(7) a. \(\text{o} \text{tho-nun} \text{cincca kaman iss-} \text{e}\)?
\(\text{automatic-TC} \text{really stay still-INT}\)
‘As for the automatic vehicle, does it really stay still?’
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The indicative mood or attributive suffix ~(u)n/nun is a “simple deictic tense and functions as an indirect evidential” (K.S. Chung, 2009, p. 2). Because ~(u)n/nun functions as a tense and aspect marker, it creates an evidential environment. Thus, the source of Hong’s assumption is inference from the previous conversation with Kang, and ~(u)n/nun ke- places “focus” on the inference that the speaker is drawing rather than on the description.

### 3.3.3 Narrative meaning of ~(u)n/nun keya

The sentence ending ~(u)n/nun keya frequently occurs in a narrative frame. A narrative is defined as one way of recounting past events, and the order of narrative clauses matches the order of events as they occurred (Labov, 2001, 2004, 2011). Example (9) shows this narrative organization.

(9)  
1. tongpangsinki-ka kyothongsako nal,  
   Tongbangsinki-NM car accident day  
   ‘On the day that Tongbangsinki got into a car accident’

2. wenthitu-hako pwusan-eyse kongyen-ul ha-ko  
   Wanted-and Pusan-at performance-AC do-and  
   ‘(They) did a performance at Pusan with Wanted’
3. *kakca kosokpesu tha-ko talun khonsethu-lo itonghako iss-ess-e*
   each express bus ride-and other concert-to move-in the middle of-PST-INT
   ‘They were moving to other concerts on the express bus separately’

4. *saypyek sey si-ey.*
   dawn three o’clock-at
   ‘At three a.m.’

5. *twu thim-i o pwun kankyek-ulo sakona kaciko*
   two team-NM five minute interval-by accident-and
   ‘The two teams got into accidents at a five-minute interval’

6. *wenthitueysenun han myeng-i cwuk-ess-tay*
   Wanted-in-TC one person-NM die-PST-QT
   ‘(They say) one person from Wanted was killed.’

According to Labov (2001, 2004, 2006), narrative structure is established by temporal
juncture between two independent clauses, and the temporal organization of narrative is as
follows: abstract>orientation>complicating action>evaluation>coda. *Abstract* refers to the
general purpose of telling the story; *orientation* refers to background information such as
who, what, when, and where; *complicating action* refers to the event that breaks “stasis” and
therefore initiates the plot of the story; *evaluation* means interpretation of the plot, the
narrative meaning; and finally, *coda* refers to returning the temporal setting to the present.
The sentence ending ~*(u)n/nun keya* frequently occurs in the sequences of complicating
actions and evaluations.

Narratives are more than a simple reporting of events. A variety of evaluative devices
is used to establish the evaluative point of the story (Polanyi, 1985). Narratives of personal
experience, which are basically an account of events that happened, frequently contain
irrealis clauses—negatives, conditionals, futures,—which refer to events that did not happen
or might have happened or have not yet happened (Labov, 2006). Irrealis clauses serve to
evaluate the events that actually did occur in the narrative by comparing them with an alternate stream of reality: potential events or outcomes that were not in fact realized. Excerpt 8 is a simple narrative of evaluation using the sentence ending ~(u)n/nun keya.

(Excerpt 8)

1. K: *kunkka selo uysikhay-se,*
   therefore each other aware-and
   ‘Therefore, when we are aware of each other and’

2. *ssawu-ci malaya keyss-ta hamyen an ssawu-n-ta*↑
   fight-NEG don’t PR-DC intend not fight-IND-DC
   ‘decide not to fight (intentionally), then we don’t fight’

3. *kuntey camsi pangsim-ul ha-myen*
   but for a moment carelessness-AC do-COND
   ‘but when we are careless for a moment’

4. → *ssawum-i sicak-i toy-nun keya*
   fight-NM beginning-NM become-RL keya
   ‘the fact is that we begin to fight.’

Here, ~(u)n/nun keya is used in an irrealis clause. The speaker is evaluating the situational conditions for when they (the speaker and her boyfriend) get into an argument and when they don’t. The speaker provides the premise in lines 1 and 2 that they do not get into arguments when they are conscious about it. An irrealis clause follows after the utterance in line 3 (*kuntey camsi pangsimul hamyen* ‘but when we are careless for a moment’). This suspends the action before a critical event and establishes that event as the point of the narrative: the speaker and her boyfriend getting into an argument. Thus, ~(u)n/nun keya is frequently deployed in the evaluation section of a narrative to obtain objectivity so that such an objective event can speak for itself, as shown in excerpt 9, which is the continuation of excerpt 8.
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20. Kang: na-to mwe::
I-too what::
‘Even I too, you see’

21. ewu, cincca mwe-ka mekko siphe ile-n ke-y ani-nikka:::
oh really what-NM eat want to this-IND fact-NM not-because
‘oh, (I’m) not doing this because I really want to eat something’

22. amwukena mek-ci, kuntey twul ta pay-nun kophu-ntey
anything eat-ci but two all stomach-TC hungry but
‘just eat anything, but both of us are hungry’

23. @@eti-l ka-l-ci-n moluko @@ @
where-AC go-PRS-AD-IND don’t know-and
‘we don’t know where to go.’

24. Cha: ung
‘Yes.’

25. Kang: → kveysok ppingkulpingkul tol-ki-man ha-nun keya
continuously round and round rotate-just do-RL keya
‘The fact is that we are just circling round and round.’

26. Cha: ung
‘Yes.’

27. kyelkwuk kunyang amwukena mek-ci
eventually just anything eat-ci
‘Eventually, you’ll just eat anything.’

yes anything eat-PST-ci
‘Yes, (we ended up) eating anything, you see.’

The utterance in lines 3 and 4 in excerpt 8 marks the point of the narrative, and then Kang
begins to talk about how she got into a fight or argument with her boyfriend in more detail.
The instance she elaborates on in excerpt 9 is about how their indecisiveness surfaced on a
date. The speaker’s evaluative comment is already uttered in line 22 with certainty,
amwukena mekci ‘just eat anything, but both of us are hungry’. Immediately after the speaker’s evaluation, the situational description is followed by two conditions—both of them were hungry and they did not know where to go. The situational event is depicted with an objective stance using ~(u)n/nun keya. This utterance is just an objective description of a situation or event (that they wandered around continuously) and marks the complicating action in the narrative structure. At the same time, it also serves as evaluation as the utterance speaks for itself without direct evaluative comments from the speaker. Without Kang’s further explanation or description of the situation, the interlocutor could infer the end of the story, as Cha does in line 27, and this inference of Cha is confirmed in line 28 when Kang repeats what Cha says. Thus, ~(u)n/nun keya denotes complicating action from an objective stance and leads to evaluation. Line 28 is a coda of the local narrative about the instance of the date of Kang and her boyfriend. Evaluation provides justification for the narrative’s claim on a greater portion of conversational time than most turns of talk, requiring an extended return of speakership to the narrator until it is finished (Sacks, 1987). Excerpt 10 is a continuation of Kang’s narrative topic in which extended speakership is again given to her.

(Excerpt 10)

30. Kang:  
*a, oppa-nun kyeyhoyk-ul seyw-e*  
oh boyfriend-TC plan-AC set-INT  
‘Oh, (my) boyfriend sets a plan’

31.  
*kuntey kulehkey antoy-myen @@ toykey ccacungna-y*  
but like that not-COND very irritated-INT  
‘but when (his) plan does not turn out as he planned, he gets irritated’

32. Cha:  
@@@a kulay  
ah, so
‘Oh, is that so.’

33. Kang:  
\[kuntey \ kyeyhoyk-taylo \ cal \ an-ha-canha::\]
‘But he does not follow his plan, you see’

34. Cha:  
\[kyeyhoyk-taylo \ an \ han-ta-may\]
‘You said he does not do as he plans’

35. Kang:  
\[kyeyhoyk-taylo \ an \ han-untey-twu\]
‘even if he does not follow his plan’

36.  
\[kyeyhoyk-taylo \ an \ hako\]
‘does not follow as he plans’

37.  
\[macimak-ey \ seywu-n \ kyeyhoyk-taylo \ an \ toy-myen\]
‘At the last moment, when his plan does not turn out as planned, he releases his irritation’

((19 lines omitted))

56. Kang:  
\[kulayse, \ ssawum-uy \ sicak-un,\]
‘So, a fight starts’

57.  
\[oppa-ka \ na-hanthey \ phincan-ul \ cwu-nun\]
‘It starts with my boyfriend’s scolding style of talking’

58.  
\[ne-nun \ way \ kulehkey \ mos-ha-nya? \ ihay-ka \ anka, \ cengmal.\]
‘Why can’t you understand like that? I don’t understand, really’

59.  
\[i \ yavki-lul \ tut-nun \ swunkan \ ttak \ kipwun-i \ nappaci-nun \ keya\]
this talk-AC hear-IND moment DM feeling-NM degenerate-RL keya
‘The fact is that the moment I hear this comment, I feel bad’

60. *ku ttay-pwuthe na-to moksoli-ka kheci-kwu::*
that time-from I too voice-NM loud-and
‘From that time, I raise my voice too and’

61. *ssawum-i sicaktoyn-ta?*
fight-NM begin-IND-DC
‘(We) start to fight’

62. *kulemyen-un oppa-nun, way ilehkey hwa-lul nay-nya-ko,*
then-TC boyfriend-TC why like this anger-AC release-Q-and
‘Then my boyfriend asks why I get mad like this’

63. *hwa-ka nass-nuntey:: hwa-lul nakey hay noh-ko,*
anger-NM arise-and anger-AC arise do CMP-and
‘(I am) angry, and (he) made me angry’

64. *ecey kuke kaciko twu sikan-ul pam-ey*
yesterday that thing with two hour-AC night-at
‘Yesterday, with that thing, for two hours at night’

65. → *neypeeynting sutholi-lo ssawu-n keya*
everending story-like fight-RL keya
‘The fact is that (we) fought like a neverending story’

66. *kulaykacko,*
so
‘so’

67. *nacwungey-n cincca wuli-ka an mac-nun-ka,*
later-TC really we-NM NEG fit-IND-Q

*mac-ci anh-nun-ka-lul twuko hancham yayki-lul ha-taka,*
fit-ci-not-IND-Q-AC regarding a while talk-AC do-and

‘Later, (we) talked about whether or not we really fit (each other) for a while’

68. *caca-ko ceypal. kuman com ca-ca-ko.*
sleep-RQ-QT please stop DM sleep-RQ-QT
‘(I asked) please let’s sleep. (I asked) let’s stop it and go to sleep’

69. Cha: @ @ @

70. Kang: *achim-ey tto cenhwahay-se mianha-tay::*
morning-in again call-and sorry-QT
‘(He) called in the morning and told (me) sorry’

71. Cha:  mianha-tay?
sorry-QT
‘(Did he say) sorry?’

oh don’t know-INT issue-INT we couple-to
‘Oh, I don’t know. (It’s) our couple’s issue’

Throughout excerpt 10, ~(u)n/nun keya is repeatedly used in lines 37, 59, and 65. These are the points of the narrative that speaker Kang is attempting to explain on a larger scale: the differences between her and her boyfriend and the resulting repeated arguments. In line 37, the speaker explains a situation when her boyfriend gets upset, and then she explains when she gets upset in line 59, and finally she describes how intensively they argued in line 65. For each of the three utterances, ~(u)n/nun keya marks the temporal juncture where complicating action overlaps with the evaluation section in the local context. That is, the utterances with ~(u)n/nun keya are depicting a behavioral state (line 37), an emotive state (line 59), and an eventful state (line 65), but these descriptions of states stand for themselves in evaluation. In other words, ~(u)n/nun keya describes situational and/or emotional states in an objective and general stance, but the description itself provides justification for the narrative’s claim and constructs evaluations for the claim. The fact that her boyfriend gets upset when his plan fails to pan out and the fact that she gets upset when she hears intimidating comments from her boyfriend provides justification for the narrative point of getting into a fierce argument. In the larger structure of K’s narrative, excerpt 10 is composed of a complicating action of that larger structure, but within its local site, the organization of this narrative can be broken down as follows.
Narrative structure of excerpt 10.

Abstract 1
30. oppa-nun kyeyhoyk-ul seyw-e.
   boyfriend-TC plan-AC set up-INT
   ‘(My) boyfriend sets a plan’

Complicating action / Evaluation 1
37. macimak-ey seywun kyeyhoyk-taylo an toy-myen toykey ccacung-ul nay-nun keya
   last-at setup-RT plan-as not turn-COND very irritation-AC release-RL keya
   ‘At the last moment, when his plan does not turn out as planned, he releases his irritation’

Abstract 2
56. ssawumuy sicakun,
   fight-GN start-TC
   ‘So a fight starts’

57. oppa-ka na-hanthey phincan-ul cwu-nun malthwu-eyse-pwuthe sicak-i toy-ketun
   boyfriend-NM I-to scolding-AC give-IND talking style-from-since begin-NM become-ketun
   ‘It starts with my boyfriend’s scolding style of talking’

Complicating action 2
58. ne-nun way kulehkey mos-hanya? Ihay-ka an ka, cengmal.
   you-TOP why like that cannot-do-Q understanding-NM not really
   ‘Why can’t you understand like that? I don’t understand, really’

Evaluation 2
59. ayi-lul tut-nun swunkan ttak kipwun-i nappaci-nun keya
   this talk-AC hear-IND moment DM feeling-NM degenerate-RL keya
   ‘The fact is that the moment I hear this comment, I feel bad’

Complicating action 3
64. ecey kuke kaciko twu sikan-ul pam-ey
   yesterday that thing with two hour-AC night-at
   ‘Yesterday, with that thing, for two hours at night’

65. neyeeunting sutholi-lo ssawun keya
   neverending story-like fight-RL keya
   ‘The fact is that (we) fought like a neverending story’

Coda 1
70. achimey cenhahayse mianhatay.
morning-in telephone-and sorry-QT
‘(He) called in the morning and told (me) sorry’

issue-is-INT we couple-to
‘(It’s) our couple’s issue’

Within the larger narrative theme, the speaker constructs a smaller narrative or episodic
narrative repeatedly in the structure of abstract>complication>evaluation until the coda is
reached in the greater organization of the narrative, as shown in lines 70 to 72. See excerpt
11 for further discussion of the ending form ~(*u)n/nun keya marking complicating action and
evaluation in narrative structure.

(Excerpt 11)

1. Kim: *na-nun elma han ken ani-ciman ettehkey kongpwuhay-ss-nun cwul ala?*
I-TC how long do-RT ke-TC not-but how study-PST-IND know-INT
‘I didn’t do it for long but do you know how I studied?’

2. *nay-ka kyohoy-lul ilcwuil-ey ney peninka, tases pen naka-ss-e.*
I-NM church-AC week-per four time-whether five time attend-PST-INT
‘I attended the church four or five times per week’

3. *wusen swuyoil-nal na-kass-kwu, kumyoil-nal na-kass-kwu,*
first Wednesday-day attend-PST-and Friday-day attend-PST-and
*mokyoil-nal milal moin.*
Thursday-day wheat seed fellowship

‘First of all, I attended Wednesday, Friday, and Thursday at the wheat seed
fellowship’

4. *ku tam thoyoilnal chengnyenpwu moin.*
that after Saturday-day youth group fellowship
‘After that, Saturday youth group fellowship’

5. *ilyoil-ey-nun mwe cwiulhakkyo-pwuthe-hayse*
Sunday-on-TC DM Sunday Bible school-from-with
‘on Sunday, including Sunday Bible school’
6. yeypay mwe ha-myen han tases pen naka-ss-e tases pen. service what do-COND somewhat five time attend-PST-INT five time ‘if (there were) some services, I attended five times, five times’

7. chelya yeypay-to iss-ko mwe, swuyo yeypay-to ka-ko. night service-also exist-and DM Wednesday service-also go-and ‘There is also night service, and I went for Wednesday service too’

8. tases pen-i-lan maliya. five time-is-QT-RT word-is-INT ‘I’m saying, (I attended) five times’

9. → kulemyen-un ilcwuil-i cincca wancenhi kyohoy-ey ta ssotapwus-nun keya then-TC week-NM really completely church-to all pour-RL keya
caki sikan-ul. own hour-AC

‘Then I’m pouring all of my own time into the church completely during the whole week’

10. ta kacta pwus-nun ke-ketun? all take pour-RL ke-ketun ‘I’m pouring all of it, you know’

11. Ile-n sikan-tul-ul ta ccal-lass-e, cincca. such-IND hour-IND PL-AC all cut-PST-INT really ‘I cut off all such hours, really’

12. kyohoy-eyse chengnyenpwu hoycangcik-ul hayss-ess-nuntey, church-at youth ministry president-position-AC do-PST-but ‘I was the president of the youth ministry at (our) church’

13. → hoycangcik-i kkuth-nacamaca palo ttak kumantwu-n keya. president position-NM finish-as soon as right away DM resign-RL keya ‘I resigned as soon as the term ended’

14. siweltal-ey hoycang-ul ppop-nun-ta-n mal-ya. October-month-at president-AC select-IND-DC-RL word-INT ‘(We) select the president in October’

15. siwel cwungswun-ey ttak kkuthna-se, kumantwu-ko, October middle-in DM finish-and resign-and ‘(My term) ended in the middle of October, I resigned and’
16. *kuttay-pwuthe kyohoy-nun cwuihnal, ttak yeypay hana-man ttak tuli-ko*
that time—since church-TC Sunday-day just service one-only DM give-and just

*kunyang tola-wass-e.*
return-PST-INT

‘From then on, I went to church only on Sunday service and came back’

17. *kuliko tulewa-se kongpwu-hay-ss-e.*
and enter—and study-PST-INT

‘and I came (home) and studied’

study—and sleep wake up—and again study-CNJ

‘studied, woke up in the middle of sleep, and studied again’

Two male college students are talking about an examination for special admission. Kim has passed the examination and transferred to his current college whereas Sung is preparing for the examination. In excerpt 11, Kim is narrating how he studied, which is the abstract of this narrative given in line 1. Line 2 provides the orientation, which is that the speaker attended services about four to five times a week. Complicating actions are depicted from line 3 to 8, in which the speaker specifies the exact days and nature of the meetings—small group ministry meeting called ‘wheat seed,’ young adult group meeting, Sunday Bible school, night worship, and so forth. Then the evaluation of the complicating actions follows in sequence, using the form ~(u)n/nun keya in line 9. The conjunction *kulemyenun* ‘then’ summarizes the actions that the speaker described in the previous lines and proposes what seems to be the resultative of *kulemyenun*. Although these complicating actions (that is, attending so many days of church affairs) are actions that the speaker has already completed, *kulemyenun* functions as an irrealis clause, as if they have not yet happened or been realized, and the predicate *ssotapwusta* ‘pour out’ is followed by present tense ~(u)n/nun keya. Therefore, the utterance constructs an irrealis statement, which means “under such a premise, one would be
in such a state” or “if one does such a thing, he/she will be or is in such a state.” In depicting complicating action in a narrative, ~keya frequently appears in present tense in spite of the narrative aspect of “past experience.” Narrating actions of a story in the present tense allows the speaker to dramatize the event by giving a real time perspective, and thus it functions to involve the participants in the story. The cleft construction with ~(u)n/nun keya also conveys “focus” on its statement. This pattern frequently occurs with right location of object or subject as seen in line 9, excerpt 11, and intensifies the “focus” given by this construction. The utterance in line 9 denotes focus on the “fact” that the speaker spends most of his time on church affairs, and this “fact” is emphasized again by right location of the object caki sikanul ‘one’s own time’. As the pattern places the focus on the conveyed message, it seemingly functions as a topic orientation marker, as proposed by Fraser (2009). That is, ~(u)n/nun keya signals a continuation of the narrator’s speakership on the discourse topic he/she is on.

Discourse topic is defined as “what the discourse is currently about, what the participants recognize they are talking about from what has been contributed to this point” (Fraser, 2009, p. 893). In line 9, the speaker evaluates the narrative topic, and this evaluation is re-asserted in line 10 using ~nun keketun. The cleft construction of ~nun ke is constructed and the speaker denotes his own stance using ~ketun to reaffirm his claim. In line 13, the speaker narrates his solution to the problem described in lines 9 to 10. He orients the interlocutors to how he comes to resolve the issue through various linguistic devices: (i) use of the ~(u)n keya ending, (ii) the attention marker ttak, and (iii) repeated elaboration in lines 14 and 15.

Besides marking complicating action and evaluation in narrative structure and signaling topic orientation as well as maintaining speakership, ~(u)n/nun keya is used to infer the generality of its encoding action and/or evaluation. It depicts the tellable moments of
narrative in a descriptive and objective fashion, and thus by using it the speaker is claiming the generality of his/her evaluation or the point he/she is attempting to establish in the discourse. See excerpt 12 for the discussion.

(Excerpt 12)

1. Choi: *mal cengmal an tul-e. kulay kacikwu, nemwu suthuleysu pat-kwu* word really not listen-INT so with that very stress receive-and ‘(He) does not listen (to me) really. So I get very stressed’

2. kongpwu-to cinca cicili @@an ha-n-ta,@@ study-even really completely NEG do-IND-DC ‘(He) does not really study at all’

((8 lines omitted))

10. Choi: *kulayse, ha-nuntey, kuke-lul, maynmal, kunikka,* so do-and that-AC everyday that is ‘So, (I tutor) and (give homework) everyday, that is’

11. → *han pen swukcey-lul naycwu-myne-nun* one time homework-AC assign-COND-TC

*mvech penssik kveysok vayki-lul hayya toy-nun keya.* several time continuously talk-AC must-RL keya

‘When I assign homework, I must remind him continuously several times’

The abstract of Choi’s narrative is given in lines 1 and 2. Previously, Kim asked Choi why she quit being a private tutor, and in response Choi gives an account of an experience with her private tutoring student. Mainly, she describes him as someone who (i) does not listen to her instruction and (ii) does not like to study. Choi’s narrative consists of an episode and her description of her mixed emotions about the student. At tellable points of the story, Choi uses the ~*keya* construction in present tense form as if the episode is playing out in real time. In
line 11, Choi describes how she has to remind the student frequently when she gives him an assignment. This utterance itself speaks for her narrative point, clarified in lines 1 and 2, that he does not follow her instructions and does not study. See excerpt 13, the continuation of excerpt 12.

(Excerpt 13)

12. *kunkka tto an hay o-ko tto an hay oko @ @ @ tto an hay oko.* so again not do- and again not do-and again not do-and ‘So, (he) didn’t do it again, didn’t do it again, and didn’t do it again’.

((6 lines omitted))

19. Choi: *nay-ka myech pen-ul malhay nohko kass-nuntey sok theci-canha::,* I-NM several time-AC talk-CMP go-PST-but frustrated-canha ‘I reminded him several times and went, it is frustrating, you see’

20. *kunikka ay-ka:: ccom ikhey sanghwang-ul caki mam-taylo::,* so child-NM DM DM situation-AC self heart-as ‘So, he (uses) the situation as he pleases’


*mak ha-l-lye-nun kes-twutoykeymanh-kwu,* DM do- PSR-intend-RL kes-also very many-and

‘like, like, he tries things like lies many times’

22. → *cepen-ey tomangka-ss-etwu nay-ka han sikan tongan kitalye-ss-nuntey,* last time-on escape-PST-even I-NM one hour during wait-PST-but

*ca**k**i-nun wa-ss-ess-ta-nun keya,** he-TC come-PST-PST-QT-RL-keya

‘Last time when he ran away (missed the lesson), I waited for one hour but he said that he came’

bell-AC no matter ring-even not exist-PST-and telephone-AC do-even not exist-PST-ketun
‘No matter how many times I rang the bell and called, he was not there’

24.  →  XX eps-ess-ko XX kulay-ss-nuntey-twu:: eps-ess-nuntey,
XX not exist-PST-and XXX such-PST-but-even:: not exist-PST-but

_kulaytwu caki-nun wa-ss-ess-ta-nun keya_
nevertheless he-TC come-PST-DC-RL keya

‘XX was not there XX did but (he was) not there but nonetheless he said he came.’

25.  wa-ss-ess-nuntye:: nay-ka XXX an wa-ss-ta-ko, XXX
come-PST-PST-but:: I-TC not come-PST-DC-QT
‘I came but (he said that) I didn’t come’

26.  →  XXX kunikka XXX na-hanthey ttochaykim-ul mwut-nun keya,
XXX so XXX I-to again responsibility-AC ask-RL keya
‘So he is holding me responsible again’

Following the narrative point she emphasizes in line 11, she elaborates on it again in line 12
to line 19. Then she extends her instances with the student from line 20. Note that Choi utters
her premise before her narrative instance in lines 22, 24, 26, 30, and 34. That is, Choi
describes the student’s character in lines 20 and 21 as one who will change the situation for
his own benefit, even using lies. After this evaluation, Choi gives an account of a specific
instance in line 22 and uses ~(u)n/nun keya in a quotative construction. In this fashion,
~(u)n/nun keya functions as an evidential for the speaker to claim her entitlement to tell the
story she is unfolding and to emphasize her experience of waiting for one hour against the
student’s claim. Then she elaborates more on the situation (her attempts to reach him) in line
23, and this utterance functions as a premise for the second ~(u)n/nun keya in reported
speech (line 24). Similarly, some words are inaudible, but the verb _epsta_ ‘not exist’ is used
repeatedly as in _epsessko_ and _epsessnuntey_, and it is possible to guess that she is trying to
defend her case by emphasizing her efforts to reach him, based on her use of this verb and the contextual situation. After the elaboration, she again uses ~(u)n/nun keya in quoting what her student said: wassesstanunkeya ‘he said that he come’. The fact that the speaker has past perceptual experience with this propositional content provides her more entitlement than other participants of the talk. Then, this indirect quotation leads to the next situation of him holding her responsible in line 26. Excerpt 14 is the continuation of excerpt 13.

(Excerpt 14)

27. ne::mwu hwangtangha-canha @@kabayse @@
very absurd-canha so
‘It was very absurd, so’

28. kabayse ay-lul ikhey tlay-li-l swuto eps-ci @@ kulehtakwu, @@
so child-AC DM hit-PSR possible-ci nonetheless
‘nonetheless I cannot hit him because of that’

29. kabayse, cvupyen-eyse-nun:: ha-l tlay-nun hay-ya
soother-from-TC do-PRS moment-TC do-must
ikhey tlay-lyeya toy-n-ta-ko mak ile-nuntey,
DM hit-must-IND-DC-QT DM say-but

‘so others told me that I had to discipline when needed’

30. → Na-n tlay-li-ki-nun silh-un keya,
I-TC hit-NOM-TC dislike-RL keya
‘The fact is, I don’t want to hit him’

31. kyay-ka::, emma-hanthey emma appa-hanthey toykey mac-nun ke kath-untey,
that child-NM mother-from mother father-from very hit-RL ke seem-and
‘he seems to get beating from his mom, his mom and day very often’

32. mal-ul an tule kacikwu, na-kkaci tlayleseya toy-keyss-nya,
word-AC not listen-with I-even hit-should must-BLNT
‘because (he does not) listen, even should I discipline him’

33. ilen sayngkak-to tul-ko na-n ttomaksang tlaylillye-myen-un
such thought-also occur-and I-TC also actually hit-when-TC
‘such thoughts arise, and when I actually intend to hit him, somehow I feel sorry for him too’

34. → *ccom maum-i yakhayci-nun keya.*
DM heart-NM weaken-RL keya
‘somehow I get soft’

Then the speaker moves on to the evaluation section of her narrative, in which she repeatedly expresses her attitude toward her student in lines 30 and 34. The use of ~(u)n/nun keya in lines 30 and 34 denotes the speaker’s emotion in an objective and descriptive fashion. This objectivity of her statement supports and strengthens her claim and thus functions to achieve her entitlement to the stance that she takes. The speaker is achieving entitlement to the claim she expresses by displaying that her claim is based on her past personal experience.

### 3.4 Summary

The discourse functions of ~(u)n/nun keya are addressed in terms of mirativity, assumption, and narrativity (in relation to evidentiality) in this section. In summary, ~(u)n/nun keya is used in both narrative and nonnarrative frames. In a nonnarrative frame, ~(u)n/nun keya is used to encode the speaker’s assumption and check his/her assumption with the coparticipants of the conversation. In a narrative frame, it has the function of marking mirativity and evidentiality. The mirative function encodes the speaker’s surprise or sudden realization of new or noteworthy information as the speaker reconstructs his/her past experiences. Evidentiality is marked in claiming the speaker’s entitlement and narrative points in his/her past experience. In sum, ~(u)n/nun keya has strong narrative and evidential
functions. The source of evidence is derived from direct past experiences, and these experiences are realized and made more concrete in the discourse through the speaker’s active reconstruction of the story, that is, the narrative construction. The sentential ending ~(u)n/nun keya is used frequently in narrative frames in describing or recounting the speaker’s past experience, and in this context the construction seems to have the function of evidentiality. Moreover, the functions of checking assumptions and encoding mirativity also fit within the broad spectrum of evidentiality. Evidentiality is a linguistic tool used in discourse for various interactional purposes. One interactional purpose of evidentiality is to mark the speaker’s stance, which will be explained in chapter 5.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS OF THE SENTENCE ENDER ~TA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores discourse functions of the Korean sentence ender ~ta in naturally occurring conversation data. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the literature on ~ta has primarily addressed its taxonomical distinction, syntactic relations, and grammaticalization. In recent years, with the increasing importance of naturally occurring data in linguistic studies and the development of discourse analysis, the scope of research on the sentence ender ~ta has expanded to examine its interactional functions from cognitive (H. S. Lee, 1993, 1994) and conversation analytic perspectives (K. H. Kim, 2004; Noh, 2008). These studies go beyond the typological definition to examine how ~ta is used in spoken discourse, what its discourse-pragmatic functions are in local contexts, and what motivates such practices. The common interpretation of ~ta in these studies is that ~ta marks the speaker’s stance by (i) marking the “noteworthiness” of new information (H. S. Lee, 1993), (ii) providing the ground for the next relevant action (K. H. Kim, 2004), and (iii) indexing the speaker’s cognitive process in the interaction (Noh, 2008). These studies offer insightful accounts and shed vital light on ~ta’s discourse function(s) in naturally occurring data, showing that the sentence ender ~ta is widely used in spoken discourse with various interactional functions besides marking sentence type and speech level.

Insightful as prior studies may be, other meanings of ~ta have not been fully explored. More importantly, the role of gender in defining a speaker’s “stance” in interaction has been overlooked completely. Individual speakers construct their stance in interaction through
strategic choices that are affected not only by local contextual factors but also by sociocultural variables such as gender. This chapter looks at the effects of gender in the marking of stance or speakership in interaction by analyzing the linguistic features chosen by speakers in actual conversation, as well as examining what motivates their choices and usages.

In this chapter, I will examine the interactional functions of the sentence ender ~ta from the discourse analytic perspective, using an interactional sociolinguistic framework. First, I review the literature on the sentence ender ~ta’s discourse-pragmatic functions, and then I present my own analysis of ~ta in terms of its demonstrative and narrative meanings.

4.2 Previous studies on ~ta

Many studies on sentence enders or sentence-final suffixes in Korean have been taxonomical analyses focusing on sentence types and speech levels, such as declarative, interrogative, imperative, and propositive. Typically, sentence enders are classified by the four main sentence types and six speech levels shown in table 2 (Sohn, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declaratives</th>
<th>Interrogatives</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>Propositives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-nya</td>
<td>-ela/ala</td>
<td>-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>-ney</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-key</td>
<td>-sey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>-(o)/so</td>
<td>-(o)/so</td>
<td>-(u)o</td>
<td>-(u)psita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-eyo/ayo</td>
<td>-eyo/ayo</td>
<td>-eyo/ayo</td>
<td>-eyo/ayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>-(su)pnitaa</td>
<td>-(su)pnikka</td>
<td>-(u)psio</td>
<td>-(u)psita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neutral)</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-(nu)nya</td>
<td>-(u)la</td>
<td>-ca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such literature has dealt with the sentence ender~7 ~ta only in terms of its function of

---

7 The terminology used to refer to ~ta varies across the literature reviewed here: It is called a “sentence-terminal
indicating a declarative sentence and considered it primarily as a feature of "written" discourse, paying little attention to its actual usage in informal speech. Recent studies based on naturally occurring conversations, however, reveal that the sentence ender ~ta is widely used in informal discourse to perform various discourse pragmatic functions (K. H. Kim, 2004; H. S. Lee, 1993, 1994; Noh, 2008). From the cognitive linguistic perspective, H. Lee (1993, 1994) approaches the sentence ender ~ta as an epistemic modality marker, and argues that ~ta expresses the “noteworthiness” of newly perceived information, requiring the hearer’s attention. He defines “noteworthiness” of information in three situations:

(i) the information conveyed is about the accomplishment of awaited events or states of affairs at the very moment of speaking, (ii) it is provoking or intriguing on the part of the speaker, or (iii) it bears on the addressee’s well-being, and thus needs to be conveyed or immediately attended to. (1994, p. 526).

Some of H. Lee’s (1994) examples are presented in (10).

(10)  

a. **al-ass-ta**  
know-PST-DC  
‘I’ve got it!’

b. **oppa chinkwu-la-nun salam, na mann-ass-ess-ta**  
big brother friend-INTROS-RL person I meet-PST-PST-DC  
‘I met your friend.’

c. (K and H are assembling a cot for K, and H noticing the size of cot, says) **kuntey antway-keyss-ta ne-nun.**  
by the way not become-PST-DC you-TC  
‘By the way, it seems that it wouldn’t fit you.’

suffix” (H. S. Lee, 1994); a “sentence-ending suffix” (K. Kim, 2004); and a “sentence final suffix” (J. Noh, 2008). I use the term “sentence ender” throughout the dissertation.
The examples in (10) are noteworthy information, as judged by the speaker, because (10a) is a spontaneous verbal reaction that signals the fulfillment of an intellectual pursuit, that is, understanding, which has been awaited by the speaker; (10b) carries information that the speaker wants the hearer’s attention for, that is, meeting the hearer’s friend; and (10c) expresses H’s realization that concerns K’s well-being. H. Lee’s analysis clearly emphasizes the authority of the primary speaker over the information being conveyed. He claims that if the speakers had judged that the information being conveyed lacked noteworthiness, they would have used the informal sentence ender ~e/a for the examples in (10), as in alass-e, mannasess-e, and kuntey antwaykeyss-e. H. Lee’s study on ~ta recognizes interactional functions of ~ta beyond its sentence type and is important given the fact that there was no comprehensive study on the sentence ender ~ta prior to his work. He believes Korean sentence enders carry modality meanings, and in this respect, ~ta expresses what the speaker perceives to be “noteworthy,” orienting the hearer to pay attention to it. It is not clearly explained, however, how we could know that the speaker puts value on selective information. The author names function—indicating that the information being conveyed is “noteworthy”—but leaves out the process. That is, he does not discuss how we might know that the speaker doesn’t point out the noteworthiness of information in ways other than the use of ~ta, or what discourse evidence we might have to draw this conclusion about the function of ~ta, instead relying on the author’s cognitive presumption(s) about the speaker’s mind.

In accordance with H. Lee’s study, K. H. Kim (2004) further elaborates on the speaker’s authority when he/she uses ~ta to mark “noteworthiness” of information from the
conversation analytic perspective. He sees ~ta as a stance marker\textsuperscript{8} “which the speaker uses and deploys as a resource for displaying his/her stance toward a newly perceived referent/event in the course of proffering a topic or taking up and aligning with the interlocutor’s interactional move” (p. 5). H. S. Lee (1993, 1994) too approaches the Korean ~ta as an epistemic stance marker, expressing the speaker’s stance toward the information being conveyed as noteworthy information. While he concentrates on cognitive processing (that is, how the information being conveyed is mentally conceptualized and realized in linguistic usage, i.e., the discourse meaning of the sentence ender ~ta is to index noteworthiness of information and the discourse function of ~ta is to express the speaker’s stance and orient hearers to pay attention), K. Kim focused on interactional sequences and contextual patterns in which ~ta occurs to see how its discourse function—indexing the speaker’s stance, orienting the hearer to pay attention—is carried out in its interactional context. More importantly, he also attempts to understand the hearer’s role in instantiating ~ta in discourse, in addition to the speaker’s role. Consider example (11) from K. H. Kim (2004, p. 26).

\begin{align*}
\text{(11) a.} & \quad \text{pion-ta.} \quad \text{tuleka-ca} \\
& \text{rain come-RL-DC} \quad \text{enter-PR} \\
& \text{‘(I’ve just noticed) It’s raining. Let’s go in.’} \\
\text{\quad b.} & \quad \text{cha on-ta.} \quad \text{cosimha-y} \\
& \text{car come-RL-DC} \quad \text{caution-INT} \\
& \text{‘(I’ve just noticed) A car is coming. Watch out.’} \\
\end{align*}

K. H. Kim points out that the events (i.e., raining and the coming of a car) that the speaker has noticed, which are indexed by the usage of ~ta, provide the ground for the next social

\textsuperscript{8} K. H. Kim (2004) and H. S. Lee (1993, 1994) both investigated the discourse pragmatic functions of three Korean sentence final suffixes, ~ney, ~kwun, and ~ta.
actions initiated by the speaker. In (11a) the speaker notices that it is beginning to rain and
suggests to the listener that they go inside. In (11b), the speaker notices the coming of a car
and gives a warning to be careful. In this respect, ~ta is contextually processed through the
two sequential actions: (i) the action of noticing new information which is “noteworthy,” and
(ii) the fulfillment of subsequent action following the “noticing.” Hence, in example (11), the
sentence ender -ta alerts the hearers to notice the “noteworthiness” of information so that
they can expect or prepare for the next relevant action (i.e., suggestion and warning) and
participate together with the speaker in the next move (i.e., going indoors and avoiding a car).

K. Kim addresses the authority of the speaker, explaining that it is his/her voice that sets the
ground using ~ta and initiates the next social action, and describing how such authority is
accomplished in the interaction with the hearer’s collaboration. In other words, as he explains,
“the recipient of ~ta is often placed in a position to attend to the import or ‘noteworthiness’
of the speaker’s observation so that he/she can collaboratively participate or react to the
speaker’s next action” (p. 28). He continues that this point is evidenced by the fact that often
the hearer withholds his/her turn and lets the speaker continue to talk as a way to orient
himself/herself to the speaker’s next action. In some contexts, the hearer initiates a repair, as
in example (12) (from K. H. Kim, 2004, p. 29).

(12)  
1. S:  
   ha-ki silh-ta-kwu sayngkak-ul an hayss-ci  
   do-NOM dislike-Qt thought-AC not do-PST-ci  
   ‘I didn’t think that was something I didn’t want to do’  

2.  
   tangyenhi hay-ya toyl kellwu sayngkakha-kwu  
   naturally do-must RL ke-ACC-as think-and  
   ‘I just thought of it as something that I should do.’

---

9 The information noticed in the examples in (12) is noteworthy because it concerns the hearers’ well-being.
3. H:  
\[ e \text{ enni-to } \text{ minho oppa-lang } \text{ tokkathi sayngkak-ul ha-sin-ta. } \]
DM old sister—also Minho old brother—with same thought-AC do-SH-IND-DC
‘Hey, you’ve got the same attitude as Minho’

4. S:  
mwe-lul.
what-AC
‘What.’

5. J:  
tangyenhi hay-ya tway
naturally do-must
‘That’s something that you should do.’

6. H:  
kukenun tangyenhi hayya toyl kkelakwu.
that is naturally do-must RL ke-QT
‘I mean, the idea that that’s something you should do.’

In (12), in line 3, H uses -ta to comment on S’s utterance. Upon hearing this, S initiates repair in line 4. K. Kim analyzes that such an act of the hearer allows the speaker who used -ta to continue to talk for further clarification. In other contexts, the hearer utters the “continuer ‘yes’” and has the speaker continue to talk as shown in example (13) (from K. Kim, 2004, p. 31).

(13)
1. J:  
\[ \text{ theysuthu cachey-lul } \text{ kulehkey nay-twu kwaynchanh-keyss-ta. } \]
test itself-AC like that make-and all right-PR-DC
‘We could make the test itself like that.’

2. W:  
ney ney
yes yes
‘Yes, yes’

3. J:  
\[ \text{ kulenikka cenhye (.) molu-nun mwuncang-ul } \text{ kacta-nay-kwu... } \]
I mean totally not:know-RL sentence-AC take-give-and
‘I mean, we give a totally unfamiliar sentence and…’

In short, K. H. Kim argues that the hearer orients himself/herself to the speaker’s next action/move based on the sequential evidence (i.e., silencing, repairing, and use of discourse
continuer ‘yes’) he found in naturally occurring data.

Similar to H. S. Lee’s analysis, however, K. H. Kim also does not give any account of what motivates such functions of ~ta in a given context. What K. H. Kim describes as conversational evidence that demonstrates the hearer being oriented to the speaker’s next action by the utterance of ~ta may have different underlying motivations, such as politeness strategies. In example (13), it is presumable from the utterance of ney, ney ‘yes, yes’, which is in the polite speech style, that speaker W may be subordinate to J, either in age or social position or both, or that W does not feel enough intimacy with J to address him/her in the plain or informal speech style. In this respect, W’s utterance of ney, ney may be a politeness strategy to let J know that W is listening, which is indeed a sign of the hearer being oriented to the speaker, but may not be so much a sign of attending to the speaker’s next move as a conversational strategy to maintain face. In a similar vein, example (13) may not be an instance of repair since there is no indication of a misunderstanding to repair. Instead, it could be a simple request for clarification. Without prior knowledge of Minho’s attitude, opinion, thoughts, or actual verbal comments, S may not be aware of what H’s comparison of S to Minho in line 3 refers to even though it was a response to S’s utterance in lines 1 and 2. Therefore, S may be asking for clarification in line 4, upon which both J and H elaborate in line 5 and line 6, respectively. In addition, as J. Noh (2008) points out, these studies have concentrated only on the primary speakers’ use of ~ta and overlooked non-primary speakers’ responsive use of ~ta such as mac-ta ‘right’, cohkeyss-ta ‘good’, michkeyss-ta ‘drive (me) crazy’, ani-ta ‘not’, and so forth. The usage of these types of ~ta in interaction cannot be

10 Face is a politeness concept developed by Brown and Levinson (1997). Positive face refers to the desire to be liked and negative face refers to the desire not to be imposed on by others. Any act that might threaten face is face-threatening. Refer to Brown and Levinson for further discussion.
sufficiently explained as indexing “noteworthiness” of information or laying the ground for the speaker’s next relevant action.

More detailed analysis on the sentence ender ~ta is offered by Noh (2008). Using naturally occurring conversation data, she analyzes the distribution of the sentence ender ~ta in contexts of (i) spontaneous sentences and (ii) nonspontaneous sentences. Within the context of spontaneous sentences, Noh analyzes the sentence ender ~ta as marking “a speaker’s mental activity such as conjecture, prompt realization, or one’s understanding of the on-going situation” (p. 207) and categorizes the functions of ~ta as “reactive token, attention-getter, self-repair, and stance marker”. In regard to the function of ~ta as a “reactive token,” Noh claims that it frequently collocates with the “conjecture marker” ~keyyss, which implies that ~ta indexes the speaker’s stance. Consider example (14) from Noh (2008, p. 207).

(14)

1. P1: nay-ka wuli kwukekwa salam-tul cwung-eyse
   I-NM our Korean department people-PLS among-at
   ‘I, among our Korean department people’

2. wuli kwukekwa salam-tul aniko
   our Korean department people-PL not-CNJ
   ‘not our Korean department people’

3. sam-haknyen kwukekwa-eyse nay-ka ceyil eli-ta?
   …three-school year Korean department-in I-NM most young-ta
   ‘I am the youngest among the juniors in the Korean department’

4. (0.3)

Noh (2008, p. 206) follows Iwasaki and Ono’s (2002) definition of the two sentence types:
(1) “The spontaneous sentence directly expresses a speaker’s emotion, sensation, thought, and other internal experiences as they occur in his mind. These experiences may arise as a response to various immediate stimuli such as the physical surroundings, the content of the utterance, or the flow of conversation.”
(2) “The nonspontaneous sentence develops over a time period as the speaker engages in various complex cognitive activities while speaking, such as retrieving information from memory and judging an addressee’s understanding.”
Here, Noh argues that -keys-ta is employed by the nonprimary participant 2 as a “floor supporting strategy.” Participant 2 is not attempting to claim the floor but rather supporting participant 1’s keeping the floor by giving a brief assessment of the previous utterance (that he/she envies participant 1 being the youngest in her department). Noh continues that because -keyss-ta expresses the speaker’s assessment of the discourse context, it functions as a “reactive assessment” and has undergone a meaning change, as seen in cohkeysssta in line 5. The literal meaning of cohkeysssta is “(it) must be good (for you),” indexing the speaker’s conjecture about the hearer’s stance, but it has changed to the discourse meaning of “I envy you” and now marks the speaker’s affective stance instead.

Noh also describes instances of ~ta employed for expressing a speaker’s sudden and instant realization, as illustrated in example (15) from Noh (2008, p. 210; slightly adapted).

(15)

1. S:  
   kulayse kuke ilkko isse.
   so that thing read-COMP-INT
   ‘So I’m reading that book’

2.  
   a mac-ta
   oh be right-ta
   ‘Oh, right’

3.  
   kimonyengthay ku chayk-eyse incey ta cohunty
   Kim youngtae that book-in DM all good-but
   ‘All is good in Kim Youngtae’s book’

   Han-kaci kwungkumha-n kes-un
   one-thing curious-RL-kes-TC
   ‘one thing (I’m) curious about is’
In line 2, the speaker expresses something she just realized using ~ta and invokes the interlocutor’s attention. With the attention given, speaker S then shifts the topic back to the book written by Kim Youngtae.

Based upon these analyses, J. Noh attempts to account for the underlying motivation of the illustrated discourse functions of ~ta. She conceptualizes three mental points at which people may verbalize their thoughts: (i) upon the perception of stimuli, (ii) while processing the stimuli, and (iii) after the stimuli is processed as internalized knowledge. Within this mental configuration of verbalization of the stimuli, Noh insightfully suggests that the “suffix ~ta presents the speaker’s cognitive processing in the primitive form of internalized knowledge” (p. 218). In spontaneous sentences, she claims, the suffix ~ta marks the speaker’s ongoing cognitive process and thus tends to be instantaneous and short, which she describes as interactional features of ~ta realized in spontaneous sentence types. In nonspontaneous sentences, ~ta indexes interactional processes by controlling interactions among interactional participants. In short, “the basic meaning of the suffix ~ta indexes ‘process’ either in the speaker’s cognition or in the on-going interaction” (p. 220).

4.3 Discourse functions of the sentence ender ~ta

Though the literature includes some accounts of the discourse-pragmatic functions of the Korean sentence ender ~ta from various analytic perspectives, the existing studies apparently share the view that ~ta indexes the speaker’s epistemic stance in interaction, in particular speakership. The current research extends the discussion of ~ta by investigating
discourse activities in which \( \sim ta \) occurs most frequently, that is, speech acts of assessment and narration, and also considers how the previous findings on the discourse functions of \( \sim ta \) as a marker of noteworthy information and an attention-getter are intertwined in its discourse activities to mark the speaker’s stance.

The term *stance*\(^{12}\) has been used in different ways in discourse and linguistic writings. In linguistics, it has been addressed as a matter of the expression of internal psychological states of an individual speaker (Kärkkäinen, 2006). Biber and Finegan (1989) define *stance* as the linguistic expression of a speaker’s attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitments about the propositional content of messages. According to Ochs (1990, 1996), stance is “a socially recognized disposition” of which epistemic stance is “a socially recognized way of knowing a proposition” whereas affective stance is “a socially recognized feeling, attitude, mood, or degree of emotional intensity” (p. 2). Taking Ochs’s definition, this dissertation addresses and discusses how the sentence ender \( \sim ta \) marks not only epistemic stance but also affective stance subjectively and intersubjectively. In the following section, I explore the stance marking function of \( \sim ta \) as a demonstrative and in narrative.

### 4.3.1 Demonstrative meaning of \( \sim ta \)

One of the most frequently used indirect quotative structures in Korean is the \( \sim ta(ko) ha- \) form. This is a biclausal construction in which the embedded clause ends in the \( \sim ta \) form and is followed by the main verb *ha-, which means ‘say’* (Sohn & Park, 2002). Often this \( \sim ta(ko) ha- \) form is considered to function as a genuine indirect quotative to deliver what

\(^{12}\)Definitions and conceptions of stance are very diverse and broad, but it can be noted that stance represents the social and pragmatic nature of language and how it is used by actual speakers in the real world (Englebretson, 2007). Therefore, the term is closely associated with *subjectivity*, *evaluation*, and *identity*, and most of the literature on stance makes explicit reference to one or more of these categories.
others have actually said. See the examples in (16) below.

(16)
a.  *onul ilki yeypo-eysenayil pi-ka on-ta(ko) hayss-ta.*
today weather forecast-from tomorrow rain-NM come-IND-QT say-PST-DC
‘Today’s weather forecast predicted that it will rain tomorrow.’

Jane-NM Korea go-IND airplane ticket-AC buy-PST-QT say-PST-POL
‘Jane said that she bought an airplane ticket to go to Korea.’

Both examples depict the truthfulness of the “quoted message” by indicating the sources (i.e., the weather forecast and Jane). In these constructions, the quotative particle ~ko can be omitted without meaning change. However, if the listener attempts to confirm the quoted message, the quotative particle ~ko cannot be omitted, but the main verb ha-can. See the examples in (17), (18), and (19).

(17)
a.  *nayil pi-ka on-ta?*
tomorrow rain-NM come-IND-QT
‘(Are you saying that) it will rain tomorrow?’

b.  *ceyin-i pihayngkiphyo-lul sass-ta?*
Jane-NM airplane ticket-AC buy-PST-QT
‘(Are you saying that) Jane bought an airplane ticket?’

(18)
a.  *nayil pi-ka on-tay?*
tomorrow rain-NM come-IND-QT
‘(Are you saying that) it will rain tomorrow?’

b.  *ceyin-i pihayngkiphyo-lul sass-tay?*
Jane-NM airplane ticket-AC buy-PST-QT
‘(Are you saying that) Jane bought an airplane ticket?’

(19)
a.  *nayil pi-ka on-ta?*
tomorrow rain-NM come-IND-ta
‘It will rain tomorrow?’
b.  

*ceyin-i pihayngkiphyo-lul sass-ta?*

Jane-NM airplane ticket-AC buy-PST-ta

‘Jane bought an airplane ticket?’

In the context of confirming the quoted message, the examples in (17) share a similar meaning with the examples in (19). In effect, ∼*tay* is considered a short form of the ∼*ta(ko)* *ha-* construction, as the embedded ending ∼*ta* and the main verb *ha-* combine into the quotative ending ∼*tay*. Sohn and Park (2002) elucidated that the hearsay ∼*tay*, though a short form of ∼*ta(ko)* *ha-* marks more assimilated knowledge of the information. Thus in reconfirming the context of the examples in (18), the speaker is confirming the assimilated knowledge—whether the one who delivered the quoted message actually heard the information and whether that information is truthful. On the other hand, ∼*ta(ko)* *ha-* depicts a lesser degree of integration of knowledge in contrast to ∼*tay* (Sohn & Park, 2002), and the examples in (17) negotiate confirmation of the factuality of the quoted information without implying the speaker’s personal interpretation.

The examples in (19), however, have different meanings than the examples in (17). With the omission of the quotative particle ∼*ko*, what was an embedded clause now becomes a monoclause, and the embedded ending ∼*ta* functions as a sentence ending ∼*ta*. Even without the quotative particle ∼*ko*, however, the example sentences in (19) still carry quotative meaning to a somewhat low degree. The ending ∼*ta* in these examples marks the speakers’ cognitive recognition or realization of the (reported) information (Noh, 2008) and displays an annotation of the quotative construction. Excerpt 15 provides a more detailed illustration.
1. Koh: *kunkka kwun saynghwal-ul hal manhay*
   so military life-AC do-PRS-possible
   ‘So military life is doable’

2. *ccampap eps-ul ttay ceychoki tollinun ke paywess-taka*
   experience not have-PRS time weeder operate-RL ke learn-PST-and
   ‘When I was low rank, I learned how to operate a weeder’

3. *ku hwu-pwuthen mwe:: @@ wuncen-to an-ha-ko, ceychopyeng XX @@*
   that after-since-TC DM @@ drive-even not-do-and weeding solider XX@@
   ‘After then, I don’t even drive, and weeding solider XXX @@’

4. Yeo: *ceychopyeng-un cincca phyenhay*
   weeding solider-TC really comfortable-INT
   ‘(being) a weeding solider is really comfortable’

5. Koh: *kuntey mak:: ppaksi-canha.*
   but DM:: hard-canha
   ‘But it’s hard, you know’

   hot and DM:: hard-and get hurt-and
   ‘(It’s) hot and, hard, and you get hurt’

7. Kim: *sahoy-wa kwuntay-uy kacang khun chaicem*
   society and military-of most big-IND difference point
   ‘The biggest difference between society and the military’

8. → *kwuntay-eyse-nun amwu kes-to an-ha-myen, a, onul ttayngcap-ass-ta,*
   military-in-TC any thing-even not-do-then oh today get lucky-PST-ta
   ‘If (I) do nothing in the military, (I would say) oh, I got lucky’

9. → *kuntey sahoy-eyse-nun conna simsimha-ta*
   but society-in-TC very bored-ta
   ‘but in society (I would say) it’s very boring’

10. *pichamha-n ke-ci*
    miserable-RL ke-ci
    ‘The thing is that it is miserable, you see’

Previously, the three male participants had been talking about their military experiences. One participant, Koh, talked about positive aspects of military experience in reference to
leadership, saying that the military trains men for leadership whether they like it or not because the military forces draftees to be in certain positions to manage others or to survive, and even to search for duties on their own when they are of low rank. To prove his point, he talks about how he served by weeding when he was a private first class, but later, once he became a specialist, he didn’t have to do anything except to manage privates first class (lines 1 to 3). Koh clearly indicates his point of view that military service is doable in line 1 and provides evidence for his point of view in lines 2 to 3. The military slang ccampap literally means military rice or meal and is often used in reference to military rank since draftees are promoted to higher ranks (e.g., private first class > private > specialist) by year. Although Koh did not clearly indicate his rank ku hwu pwuthen (afterward) in line 3, it can be assumed based on the following line that it was after he gained in rank.

Upon hearing this utterance, Yeo comments on weeding soldiers having an easy life in line 4. Immediately after Yeo’s comment, Koh claims in lines 5 and 6 that weeding is indeed hard work. To this, Kim contrasts the social sphere and the military sphere and how they perceive the concept of “lack of duty” or “nothing to do.” The sentence ending ~ta in lines 8 and 9 clearly functions to mark indirect quotations, as the same utterances can be said with the ~ko ha~ construction without much meaning change, as example (20) demonstrates.

(20)
kwuntay-eyse-nun amwu kes-to an-ha-myen, a, onul ttaungcap-ass-tako ha-nuntey 
military-in-TC anything-even not-do-then oh today get lucky-PST-QT-say-but 
‘If (I) do nothing in the military, (I would say) oh, I got lucky’

sahoy-eyse-nun conna simsimha-tako ha-n-ta 
but society-in-TC very bored-QT say-INT-DC 
‘But in society (I would say) it’s very boring’
This quotation is apparently constructed in reportive style but the authenticity or truthfulness of this “report” is not considered to be important. Neither the source nor the authenticity of the report is revealed, but rather it is assumed and understood by all the participants. In other words, it is a “constructed report,” not actual utterances, denoting the stance of the speaker himself and others with whom the speaker positions himself, that is, those who have experienced military service. In line 8, Kim’s reported utterance of a, onul ttayngcapassta ‘oh, I got lucky’ is constructed in response to Koh’s previous statements on how he didn’t have to do anything when he was promoted to specialist and the difficulty of being weeding soldiers. Koh does not comment directly that he felt lucky, but his laughter and his use and elongation of the discourse marker mwe in line 3 seem to denote his perspective. Hence, Kim’s constructed quotation a, onul ttayngcapassta ‘oh, I got lucky’ is the stance that has emerged intersubjectively among the three participants. This is the stance reflected by Yeo’s comment that weeding soldiers have easy posts, which can also be interpreted as ttayngcapassta, to be lucky by being assigned to weed. It is also the stance that is reflected by Koh’s claim that weeding is hard work; hence, if one has nothing to do in the military, he is lucky. Kim’s utterance conna simsimhata ‘it's very boring’ in line 9 is also a constructed quotation. The speaker assumes that the others would share the same stance, and even though none of the participants has previously compared their military experience with their social experience, it seems to be a shared realization among the participants rather than just the speaker’s own thought. Such annotation of a reported message is a characteristic of the demonstrative (Pennesi, 2003), and this annotative feature is marked by the sentence ender ~ta in the constructed quotative frame: What others have said is quoted or reported along with the speaker’s interpretation, assumption, and/or bias expressed with the ending ~ta. H. J.
Lee and J. H. Lee (1999) suggest that the sentence ender ~ta in spoken talk indicates self-asking and/or recalling information one has heard or realized. The sentence ender ~ta in excerpt 13 provides the speaker’s interpretation of the contextual stance that has emerged in the course of their discourse as he positions himself in alignment with the other participants. While the sentence ender ~ta marks the speaker’s involvement in marking his/her stance, it also can be used to mark the speaker’s detachment in positioning his/her stance in the discourse context, as explained in light of excerpt 16.

(Excerpt 16)

1. Kim: ne-n mwe-ka himtu-l-tako sayngkakhay? tongali ha-myense?
you-TG what-NM hard-PSR-QT think-INT school club do-as?
‘What is the difficulty with the school club?’

2. Park: a:: ce-nun ku ttay::, seki ha-nulakwu:: ikhey cek-ki-man ha-nula::;
ah:: I-TG that time:: secretary do-because:: DM write-NOM-only do-since::
‘Oh, I was a secretary at that time, and because I was only writing down’

3. mal-ul ceytaylo XXX mos hay-ss-nuntey XXX
speak-AC properly XXX cannot do-PST-but
‘I couldn’t participate actively (I couldn’t speak of my opinion properly)’

worst-GN condition-is-you see this man
‘You have the worst condition, you man’

5. Park: talun salam-tul ha-nun mal tule po-nikka mwe::;
other people-PL speak-RL talk hear try-as DM::
‘As I listen to what others say’

6. kunyang, caki kath-un tongki-tul-i icey ta cippwu-lo nemekako
just oneself like-IN classmate-PL-NM now all executive branch-to move
‘those classmates in the same school year are now in the executive position’

7. kongi hakpen-man nam-un ke canha-yo::;
02 school number-only remain-RL ke you know-POL
‘Only (those who are) class year of 02 remained, you know’

8. kongil hakpen-un icey yakkan somttey-nun kulen ke-ko
01 school number-TC now little off hand-RL such-RL ke-and
‘(those who are in) the class of 01 are somewhat not taking the lead’

9. kuntey::, tongki-tul-i mak::;
   but:: classmates-PL-NM DM::
   ‘But the classmates (are saying that)’

10. kayin saceng kath-un ke-l::, iyu-lo hay kaciko::;
    personal circumstance like-RL ke-PSR reason-as taking-with
    ‘Taking something like personal circumstances as reasons’

11. → cal chamye-lul an havcwu-n-ta,
    well participation-AC not do-IN-ta
    ‘(they are) not participating well’

12. mak ilen yayki, manhun i-tul-i XXX.
    DM such talk many people-PL-NM
    ‘Many talk like this’

    classmate-PL-NM personal participation personal life take care-because

    chamye-lul an ha-n-tako?
    participation-AC not do-IN-QT

    ‘Are you saying that the classmates are not participating because they are busy
    with their own personal lives?’

In this excerpt, Kim and Park talk about their school society, in which both participate. Kim is senior to Park and previously had been speaking about his role in the school society and the difference in the attitudes of his juniors. While he and his classmates who entered school the same year (i.e., those who have the same *hakben*) dedicated their time and effort to the school society, the juniors or new freshman members seem less dedicated and enthusiastic about the club than he and his classmates used to be. In particular, Kim served in the army and recently returned to school. He asks Park how he feels about the club and what is the most challenging for him in line 1. Responding to this question, Park detaches himself from the discussed group in three steps: (i) revealing his position; (ii) providing background
information; (iii) identifying the source of a report or quotation. As shown in lines 2 to 3, Park reveals his position as a secretary, which provides an excuse for him not participating in the discussion. Then, in line 5, Park creates second detachment by identifying the source of the complaint that he is about to quote, talun salamtul ‘other people’. Kim identifies these ‘others’ in line 9 as tongkitul ‘classmates’ and later he speaks of them again in line 12 as manhun itul ‘many people’. Thus, Park categorizes those who spoke up in the meeting as ‘others’, ‘many’, and ‘the class of the same year or classmates’. In so doing, Park is establishing a boundary between him and ‘others’. In lines 6–7, Park provides the background information of the current status of the college society. Note that he uses ~canhayo in explaining the background, an indication that Park assumes that the hearer, Kim, is aware of this information. Then in lines 10–11, the speaker reports talk by whom he has identified as talun salamtul, tongkitul, and manhun itul, ending with ~ta. Here, ~ta functions to indicate an indirect quotation and thus marks a lesser degree of speaker commitment to the truthfulness of the information. Although Park clearly said in lines 2–3 that he acquired the information auditorily when he acted as a secretary at the society meeting, his concern is "reporting" the general voice that arose in the meeting. Therefore, here ~ta functions as a demonstrative of stance that denotes others’ stance instead of the speaker’s. In contrast, in line 13, Kim confirms his understanding of Park’s statement using the quotative ~tako, and thus the stance (the complaint of tongkitul who are not participating) shifts from ‘others’ to Park. In short, the sentence ender ~ta in indirect quotative/reported constructions functions to demonstrate stance formed out of attitudes, values, beliefs, and experiences.

4.3.2 Narrative meaning of the sentence ender ~ta

The sentence ender ~ta is frequently used in a narrative frame. The ending ~ta is a
declarative sentence ender, and in a nonnarrative context, it usually occurs with falling or level intonation unless it is a self-addressed question, as in example (20) in the previous section. However, in narrative, ~ta is frequently uttered with rising intonation. Interestingly, ~ta often occurs in conjunction with ~(u)n/nun keya as if they were an adjacency pair in the narrative frame. Whereas ~(u)n/nun keya in a narrative frame occurs only in falling intonation, ~ta occurs with falling and rising intonation for different meanings and in different places. With rising intonation in the narrative frame, ~ta occurs in the orientation segment of the narrative structure, while ~ta with falling intonation tends to occur in complicating action in the form of an indirect quotation, or in a coda.

Intonation in spoken discourse often marks the status of the information the speaker is relaying. Falling or level intonation on a statement marks the proposition contained in that statement as something the speaker believes the hearer will be able to treat as “given.” On the other hand, rising intonation marks a proposition as something the speaker considers important “new” information for the hearer (Cameron, 2001). With the intonation functioning as a contextualization cue that signals the status of the information presented by speakers and the kind of attention hearers are expected to give it, the sentence ender ~ta claims speakership in the narrative. A detailed discussion of this phenomena follows excerpt 17.

(Excerpt 17)

1. Kim: kuney nay-ka kucekkey-Ø-n-ka?
   but I-NM day after yesterday-is-IN-Q
   ‘But I, was it day after yesterday?’

2.  → encey kyav-hanthey polpheyn-ul pillye-ss-ta↑
   sometime ago her-from ballpoint pen-AC borrow-PST-ta
   ‘Some time ago, I borrowed a ballpoint pen from her'
In excerpt 17, the two participants talk about a girl named Kunyeng who lives next door to Kim. Previously, Kim talked about an incident with Kunyeng who is the roommate of a girl named Kalam, a mutual friend of both Kim and Suh. In this excerpt, Kim unfolds an episode about Kunyeng with basic background information: when and what. This is the orientation of the episode that Kim is about to unfold and she prepares the hearer for this new and important information by using ~ta in rising intonation, and thus takes the floor, continuing her speakership. The Suh comprehends the contextual cue provided by ~ta in rising intonation and anticipates the upcoming story by showing her interest in the story as seen in
line 3. They have been talking about this girl previously, and it is very obvious in the given conversational context that Kim is talking about the same girl. Yet Suh confirms it by asking whether it is Kunyeng that Kim borrowed the pen from in line 3. This is not to interrupt or challenge Kim in taking the floor but simply to signal that Suh is listening. Kim continues to tell the story and Suh again provides a minimal response in line 7, not as an agreement ung but as an “I’m listening ung.” Kim uses direct quotations in lines 6, 8, and 9, which comprise the complicating actions in this narrative. In doing so, the speaker is engaging the listener through role-playing and dramatization at important points in the narrative (Labov, 1972; Tannen, 1986). Then she utters the evaluation of the narrative in line 9 using the form ~(u)n/nun keya: nemwu ippun keya ‘she is so pretty’. The speaker is depicting that she was not aware of the beauty of the character (Kunyeng) prior to the incident, and it was a new and surprising realization, as indicated by the mirative ~(u)n/nun keya. This evaluation of Kunyeng continues to be delivered and confirmed in the following sequence of the conversation, which is shown in excerpt 18.

(Excerpt 18)

10. Suh:  

   api? pretty  
   ‘Is she pretty?’

11. Kim:  

   e. kamanhi po-nikka, nay ku cen-ey pwa-ss-ul ttay-nun mak, yeah carefully look-since I that before-at look-PST-PRS time-TC DM  
   ‘Yes, (she is pretty) since I looked (at her) carefully. When I saw (her) before’

   ((1 line omitted))

13  

   kongpuha-l ttay-la meli pwusisiha-ko mak ankyeng kki-kwu, study-PRS time-since hair messy-and DM eyeglass wear-and  
   ‘(it was) study period, so (her) hair was messy and (she) wore glasses’
14. ikhey mak kkwucilkkwucilha-kwu iss-ess-ta
   DM DM messy-and such-PST-ta
   ‘(she) was in a state of being messy’

15. kuntey sihem po-le naka-nuney.
   but test take-in order to leave-and
   ‘but (she was) leaving to take a test’

   ((2 lines omitted))

18. mak khayp tancenhakey hako ka-nikka, leyncu kki-ko,
   DM very neatly do-and leave-since lenses wear-and
   ‘She wore lenses and left in very neat shape’

19. kulenikka mos ala pwa-ss-canha.
   so cannot recognize-PST-you know
   ‘so I couldn’t recognize her, you know’

20. tikey ippu-tela
    very pretty-RT
    ‘She was very pretty’

Excerpt 18 followed immediately after excerpt 15. After the initial evaluation of Kunyeng as
pretty by Kim in line 9 of excerpt 17, Suh reconfirms it in line 10. This has a similar
discourse function as the minimal response observed in line 3 of excerpt 15, where Suh
reconfirms the dominant character of the story. Suh is signaling to Kim that she is listening
with interest, encouraging Kim to take the floor. Kim continues with her speakership by
telling about a brief moment of her previous encounter of Kunyeng as background
information for her surprise at Kunyeng’s beauty. In this second part of the narrative,
introducing a different encounter with Kunyeng, Kim provides a second set of orientation
information: when (during a study period for a test) in line 13 and what (Kunyeng’s messy
appearance) in lines 13–14, using the form ~ta. This is the new and important information
that the speaker wants the hearer to pay close attention to because this provides the reason for
her surprise at Kunyeng’s pretty appearance, which is in effect the core point of her narrative.
Kim’s previous encounter with Kunyeng left an impression of messiness and is described with words such as *pwusisihata* ‘messy’ and *kkwucilkkwucilhata* ‘messy’. Then, in line 19 she describe show, when she encounters Kunyeng again, now neatly dressed and with contact lenses, the change is so great that she does not recognize her. Here, there is clear denotation of the participant’s unprepared mind and sudden realization depicted by *nemwu ippun keya* ‘so pretty’ in line 9 of excerpt 17. Since her surprise was already expressed in line 9, she reconfirms it in line 21 using ~*tela*, which functions as an evidential for the speaker’s claim and realization. The two participants’ talk about Kunyeng continues in excerpt 19.

(Excerpt 19)

24. Suh:  
   *na-nun kyay pwa-ss-ul ttay, cepen-ey hanpen*  
   I-TC her see-PST-PRS time last time-at once  
   ‘As for me, when I saw her, once last time’

25. Kim:  
   *e*  
   yes  
   ‘Yes.’

26. Suh:  
   *yekise hanpen can cek iss-ess-canha*  
   here once sleep-RT time exist-PST-you know  
   ‘I slept here once, you know’

27. Kim:  
   *e, e*  
   yes yes  
   ‘Yes, yes.’

28. Suh:  
   *ku ttay pwa-ss-nuntey*  
   that time see-PST-and  
   ‘I saw her at that time and,’

29. Kim:  
   *e. kkwucilkkwucilha-ci…*  
   yeah messy-ci  
   ‘Yes, (she looked) grubby, right?’

30. Suh:  
   *e. a, kas ilena-ss-ul ttay pwa-ss-e*  
   yeah oh just wake-PST-PRS moment see-PST-INT  
   ‘yes, oh, (I) saw her when (she) just woke up’
31. Kim:  
\[ e, \text{ pwusisiha-ko mak} \]
yeah messy-and DM
‘Yes, (she looked) messy and just’

32. Suh:  
\[ e, \text{ cangnanani-ta, mak...} \]
yeah no kidding-ta DM
‘Yes, (she was) no kidding’

33. Kim:  
\[ e \]
yes
‘yes.’

34. Suh:  
\[ celen ay iss-ess-na, wuli hakkyo-ey, mak kulay-ss-nuntey. \]
such child exist-PST-wonder our school-in DM say-PST-you see
‘I wondered and said, do we have such a student in our school?, you see’

35. Kim:  
\[ na-to kakkum, kakkum ka kackwu, maynnal twismosup-man pok \]
I-too seldom seldom go-and everyday back shape-only see-and
‘I too went to (her room) seldom and only saw her from the back’

36.  
\[ kyay-ka ikhey pang-ey nwukwu o-nun ke silhehan-tay \]
she-NM DM room-to someone come-RL ke dislike-RL-QT
‘I heard that she dislikes people coming to her room’

37. Suh:  
\[ e, e \]
yes yes
‘Yes, yes.’

38.  
\[ na-to cosimsulewe kac-kwu, \]
I-too cautious with-and
‘I too am cautious (of her)’

39.  
\[ cal ikhey, kunyang, ikhey, insa-man hakwu kulay-ss-ketun. \]
well like just like greeting-only do-and such-you see
‘Well like, I just only greet her, you see.’

40. Kim:  
\[ um \]
um
‘um.’

41. Suh:  
\[ kuntey myechilcen-ey-nun, incey kathi pap-ul sikhye-se mek-ess-e kathi. \]
a few days before-in-TC now together meal-AC order-and eat-PST-INT together
‘A few days before, now we ordered a meal and ate together’
In excerpt 19, Suh takes the floor and shares her encounter with Kunyeng. She follows a similar structure as Kim by providing the essential elements of information: when, where, whom, and how. Suh saw the girl next door (whom) last time (when) when she slept over (how) in Kim’s room (where). In immediate sequence, Kim confirms that Suh’s experience is similar to her own encounter in line 29, confirming Kunyeng’s looking messy. Suh confirms Kim’s claim and provides a more specific setting, explaining that she met her when she just woke up. Then in the following sequence, both Kim and Suh position themselves in alignment in line 31 and 32, each taking a turn to describe Kunyeng as someone who looks messy. Note that their utterances supplement each other as if they were one utterance, and they share the same structure, beginning with ‘uh’ followed by a description of Kunyeng (pwusishako cangnan anita ‘messy and it is no joke’) and ending with a discourse marker mak. The discourse marker mak has a variety of contextual meanings, but in lines 31 and 32, it functions as an emphasis or intensifier to mean ‘very’. The ending ~ta in line 32 denotes...
the speaker’s evaluation of Kunyeng’s appearance in self-quoted voice. As indicated in line 33 where the quotative pattern ~la/ta(ko)kulayssnutey occurs, the utterance of changnan
anita (it’s no joke) is a self-quoted utterance followed by celen ayka issessna, wuli hakkyoey
(is there a girl like her in our school?), another self-quotiation. Suh uses ~ta to represent what
she thought of her when she first saw her in the morning. The ending ~ta as a monologic
representation marks the initial thought of the speaker. This contextual occurrence of ~ta to
represent a self-quote of the speaker's prior speech or thought seemingly demonstrates what
Noh (2008) claimed: The ending ~ta denotes the speaker’s cognitive processing before the
information or stimuli is assimilated into internalized knowledge. It is initial, raw thought
that is processed in the mind of the speaker before it is assimilated as realization,
confirmation, surprise, or anything else. Therefore, it occurs here as a self-quote, to represent
the initial status of the speaker’s mind. This characteristic of ~ta will be addressed again in
analyzing excerpt 20.

After Suh’s story, Kim takes over the floor and continues with the same proposition.
In the following sequences, however, Kim shifts the focus of the story from her surprising
realization of Kunyeng’s beauty to how she got to be close with her. In line 45, the speaker
concludes her narrative about Kunyeng with chinhaycyessta ‘become close’. This is the
current status of her relationship with Kunyeng as indicated by line 46 in which the speaker
mentions the current time, kulay cikum ‘like that now’, and an example of her intimacy,
malto nohko kulay ‘lower our speech level’. In other words, this is the coda section of the
narrative, and ~ta here occurs with no rising intonation, for this information is shared
knowledge that the hearer can expect and figure out from the context. With this wrapping up
of the narrative about Kunyeng, Kim shifts her conversational topic to food, which is another
indication of lines 45 and 46 being the coda of the narrative about the girl next door.

Because both ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya occur in narrative frequently, they occur together as an adjacency pair quite often in the context of quotative constructions. Consider the following excerpt as an example of ~ta in self-quotation and how it occurs with ~(u)n/nun keya as an adjacency pair in narrative.

(Excerpt 20)

1. Lee:  
@@colla himtul-e cincca. Himtul-ki-n conna himtul-e @@  
@@very hard-INT really hard-NOM-IN very hard-INT  
‘(It’s) very hard, really. It’s very hard.’

2. onul-twu mak:: o-nulako sayngssyo-hay-ss-canha::  
today-too DM come-in order to lives how-do-PST-you know  
‘Even today, I to come (on time), I acted silly’

3. onul mak onul mak o-nuntey::  
today DM today DM come-and  
‘today, you see today, I was coming’

4. wuli pothong maynnal ahopsi-kkaci ha-nikka ay-tul nuc-e kacikwu::  
we normally everyday nine o’clock-until do-since student-PL late-being  
‘Because we normally start at 9 o’clock every day, students are late’

5. ahopsi sipopwun-kkaci o, ola kulayss-ketun.  
nine o’clock fifteen minute-until come-QT say-PST-ketun  
‘(Professor) said to come by 9:15, you see’

6.  
kuntey na-n mak ka-ss-tuni sipchil pwun-i-ya:: ewussi manghay-ss-ta.  
but I-TC DM go-PST-when 17 minute-is-INT no trouble-PST-ta  
‘But I rushed and it was 9:17. Oh no, I’m in trouble’

7. kulayse, mak:: ttwi-e kacikwu:: kanguysil ttak tuleka-nuntey  
so DM run-being classroom just enter-and then  
‘So I ran to the classroom and about to enter the room, and then’

8.  
aph-ey kyoswunim-i o-si-nun keya. awu tahayngi-ta,  
front-in professor-NM come-SH-RL keya oh relief-ta  
‘The professor is coming in front (of me). Oh, what a relief’

The speaker, Lee, has been talking about midterms and classes with the other participant, Jin. While Jin expresses his concern about the midterms, Lee expresses his concern about his tardies and absences in classes. In the previous turn, Jin commented that he had never been absent that semester and Lee responded that Jin has only afternoon classes whereas Lee himself has only morning classes. Lee then states the fact that he was absent three times and tardy twice. To defend his absences and tardies and to express his efforts not to be absent or tardy, he begins his narrative by marking his stance clearly in line 1—it is very hard to be on time in a morning class. After providing the abstract of the narrative in line 1, Lee gives the orientation in line 2: introducing what he is about to narrate. With the brief but essential background information to this episode provided in lines 3 to 5 (that he and his classmates have 15 minutes of grace period), he narrates the complicating actions of being late by two minutes after the grace period (line 6): running to the class (line 7), encountering the professor (line 8), and finding out that nobody has come yet (line 9). In unfolding these complicating actions, Lee continuously uses the endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya in adjacency. In line 6, given the condition of the grace period, Lee realizes that he is late for class by two minutes, and upon this realization, Lee utters an immediate response to this realization with a ~ta form, manghayssta ‘I'm in trouble’ (line 6). This is a statement of his thoughts, not an actual verbal utterance that he said at the moment of his narrated event. After the initial processing of the stimulus (realization of being late), Lee runs to the classroom, and in line 8, when he is about to enter the classroom, he comes across the professor, which is an
unexpected surprise since he had thought he was late for the class. He marks this event by ~(u)n/nun keya to denote the unexpectedness and his surprise. In adjacency, Lee again spontaneously responds tahayngita ‘what a relief’ upon the presentation of the stimulus—encountering the professor. In line 9, his following action is to greet the professor and enter the classroom only to find nobody else there yet. The unexpectedness of this situation is expressed by ~(u)n/nun keya.

(Excerpt 21)

1. Lee: *hata po-nikka enni-hanthey sikan mwulepwa-ss-canha. nay-ka...* do try-as sister-to time ask-PST-you know I-NM
   ‘As I try to do (it), I asked you the time’

2. *pelsse, e, e, eme isip pwun pakkey an nam-ass-ney,*
   already oh oh no twenty minute only not remain-PST-ney
   ‘Already, oh, oh no, only twenty minutes remaining, you see’

3. → *isip pwun-to an nam-un keya.*
   twenty minute-even not remain-RL keya
   ‘The fact is that there are not even twenty minutes left’

4. *samsipo pwun i-laymay.*
   thirty five minute is-QT
   ‘You said (it’s) 35 minutes’

5. → *khulna-ss-ta, ike...*
   big trouble-PST-ta this
   ‘This is big trouble / I’m in trouble for this’

Two participants, Lee and Kim, talk about the test that they took together for a class. It seems that they took an essay test in which they had to write a certain amount of pages in a given time. Lee recapitulates the moment when she realized that she was running out of time. In line 2, she realizes that she only has twenty minutes left after hearing the response she gets from Kim, whom she asked the time, indicated in line 1. Upon this initial realization of the
remaining time, denoted by the ending ~ney, the second realization takes place, denoted with the ending form ~(u)n/nun keya. Whereas the initial realization in line 2 takes place immediately upon the given stimulus (informing of the time by Kim), the second realization in line 3 takes place after the initial realization. The speaker is informed of the time and upon that response, she immediately perceives the estimated remaining minutes, and as she utters the narrated moment of this realization, she seems to realize that there are not even twenty minutes left to finish her essay. The tense in lines 2 and 3 attests to this cognitive process: ~ney uttered in past tense depicts the resultative state of the realization while ~nun keya uttered in present tense denotes her reprocessing of the initial realization at the moment of the utterance. After the realization has been processed cognitively, the speaker self-quotes her thought, khulnass-ta ‘I’m in trouble’ (line 5). The process of this discourse function of the ending ta is schematized as followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Schema] Self-quotative/self-reported construction of ~ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational/ contextual events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 18
Recognition of being late manghaiyssta running to the class
Encounter with the professor tahangita greeting the professor

Excerpt 19
Running out of time khulnassta finishing the writing

Figure 2. Schema of self-quotative of ~ta
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The utterances that employ ~ta in excerpts 18 and 19 are, in effect, constructed dialogue. These self-quoted utterances are constructed by the speaker spontaneously at the time of talking, not at the time of the narrated situation (Pennesi, 2007; Tannen, 1989). The motivation of such constructed dialogue in the form of reported or quotative speech could be to dramatize the story (Mayes, 1990; Maynard, 1996), to create “involvement” of both speakers and listeners (Tannen, 1986), or to create “distance” whereby speakers present themselves as actors in a scene, as seen in excerpts 18 and 1, or to allow speakers to manipulate a broader range of expressiveness and voices of others in the interaction, as seen in excerpts 13 and 14.

4.4 Summary

The functions of the ending ~ta are explored in this chapter in terms of demonstrativity and narrativity. The ending ~ta functions demonstratively because it denotes an annotative meaning, which acts as a discourse deictic. The voices of others (public or general opinions, sentiments, ideas, etc.), interlocutors, and/or interactional participants are denoted by the ending ~ta in quasi-quotative constructions. The ending ~ta as a demonstrative does not quote what others say directly or indirectly, but it expresses the speaker’s annotation of the stances of others. Annotation is a core element of demonstrativity, and unlike the direct quotative construction of ~ta( ko) ha-, the ending ~ta in a nonnarrative frame expresses what are considered to be agreeable, shareable, and assumable stances between interactional participants within the conversational context.

The sentence ender ~ta in a narrative frame frequently occurs in the orientation and complicating action of the story with rising intonation, and in the coda with falling intonation,
with different discourse functions in these distinct contexts. In the orientation of the narrative, ~*ta* denotes noteworthy information that the speaker wants to unfold as he/she begins the story; in the complicating action of the narrative, ~*ta* occurs in (self) reported constructions and/or constructed dialogue to accentuate the episode: It dramatizes the story by recreating the narrated event and time as if it were a real-time situation. Such discourse functions of ~*ta* emerge as stance-taking strategies in the interactional contexts, which will be addressed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE
GENDER VARIATION IN THE USE OF ~(U)N/NUN KEYA AND ~TA IN A NARRATIVE FRAME

5.1 Narratives as stance-taking devices

Previous research on men’s and women’s narratives reports that men tend to seek separateness and engage in one-upmanship through talk, whereas women tend to seek connection and solidarity (Coates, 1996, 1998). According to such research, men like to recount their personal successes and achievements and women like to tell stories about social norms (Johnstone, 1993); men are likely to focus on work and hobbies, while women are likely to focus on relationships with other people and document small successes, minor mishaps, and embarrassing moments (Holmes, 1997). Studies also report that the narrative styles of men and women differ, following what is called “female speech style”—cooperative, facilitative, and supportive—or “male speech style”—competitive, referential, and assertive. Thus, according to such research the way women tell their narratives is by being cooperative, using epistemic modal forms when sensitive topics are discussed, and judiciously offering minimal responses, while when men tell their narratives, they tend to employ interruption as a discourse strategy to compete and maintain the conversational floor. Furthermore, both men and women engage in story-chaining: A story on a particular topic suggests a story on a related topic to another speaker. For women, however, such story-chaining is supportive, as they do it to show support for the previous speaker by sharing a similar experience; for men, it is done competitively to attempt to top the previous narrator’s story (Romaine, 1999).

However, one must be cautious in applying generalizing labels like “cooperative” and
“competitive” to conversational styles used by women and men. Studies by Cameron (1998) and Lee (1992) attest that men do use “collaborative” and “cooperative” styles in conversation between male friends, and studies by Okamoto (1995) and McElhinny (1995) show that women do use “competitive,” “assertive,” and “blunt” conversational styles when talking among female friends. Therefore, although a large body of evidence indicates variation of conversational behavior by gender, it is necessary to be cautious about interpreting the results of this research. In other words, analysis of the complex interaction between form and context in the production of meaning is necessary.

Table 3 shows men’s and women’s use of ~(u)n/nun keya and ~ta in the 41 conversations this study analyzed. As the table shows, Korean men employ ~(u)n/nun keya and ~ta in nonnarrative frames more, and Korean women employ ~(u)n/nun keya and -ta in narrative frames at higher frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Nonnarrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~(u)n/nun keya</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in the table suggests that the way Korean men and women express their stances in same-gender group discourse differs. In other words, while Korean women employ episodes or “tales” in discourse and build up a sense of solidarity and identity by sharing these “tales,” Korean men tend to encode direct stances in nonepisodic fashion. In so doing, Korean women tend to mark their stance through the “telling” and position themselves “intersubjectively” while Korean men tend to mark their stance through the “tale” and focus on positioning themselves “subjectivity.” This chapter explores how interactional
stancetaking is performed by gender and how discourse stancetaking is implicated in the representation of self- and other-positioning through the use of the Korean sentential endings ~\((u)n/nun keya\) and ~\(ta\).

### 5.2 Subjective positioning by Korean men

Narratives told by Korean men show characteristics reported for men’s speech styles in previous studies. They tend to recount their successes and achievements and focus on work (most of the speakers in the corpus data were college students, so their “work” is studying) and leisure activities, such as computer games, gathering for drinking, traveling, and so forth. Through the act of telling tales about their mundane experiences, Korean men build up both individual and group identity. They form group identities through co-constructing narratives with those who share similar or the same experiences and understandings; their subjectivity emerges from taking stances throughout the discourse. Stance is frequently marked when male speakers perform subject positioning. Subject positioning is the discursive practice of how speakers position themselves in relation to meaningful content that others first express (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). In so doing, they mark their stances regarding the propositions in the discourse, and in this way their subjectivity emerges and is negotiated.

#### 5.2.1 Positioning through negotiation of meaning

Excerpt 20 depicts how Korean men, in recounting their successes and accomplishments, engage in “subject positioning” both competitively and cooperatively. The three male speakers chat about computer games. Prior to the excerpt, Lee mentioned that he indulges in shooting games in a PC room and has mastered almost every computer shooting
game. He has won first place for most of the shooting games, and his name appears in the computer record. He was recognized by the owner of the PC room he regularly visits, and the owner asked him about his skills and experience with shooting games. This is important background for understanding what excerpt 22 depicts. That is, after Lee elaborates on his accomplishments and successes in computer shooting games, his game skill is challenged by the other speaker, Sung.

(Excerpt 22)

1. Lee:  
   *yocum-ey:*  
   na-lang min-i hyeng-i-lang  
   these days-in I and Min-VOC brother-VOC-and  
   eyelo phaithe-lul hay polla kulay-ss-ketun↑  
   Aero Fighter-AC do try intend-PST-you see  
   ‘These days, Min and I tried to play Aero Fighter.’

2.  
   *ku yeysnal-ey*  
   that old days-in  
   ‘A long time ago,’

3. Sung:  
   *yeysnal ke-ntey*  
   old day thing-ENDER  
   ‘(It’s) an old game.’

Lee secures his speakership using ~ketun in line 1, introducing information that the interlocutors are not aware of. The rising intonation of ~ketun also indicates that there is more to follow and Lee intends to maintain the floor with this story as he provides a time frame in line 2. Lee’s possession of the floor, however, is seemingly challenged by Sung in line 3. In line 2, Lee utters yeysnal ‘along time ago’, which sets the narrative frame for the continuation of his game accomplishment narrative. Before he can complete his utterance, however, Sung interrupts and proffers his assessment on the game being an old one (yeysnal
kentey), implying that the game is outdated. Due to the lack of paralinguistic data on this corpus excerpt, some crucial information, such as whether or not Lee and Sung overlap in lines 2 and 3 or whether or not the ending intonation in line 3 is high or low, is not accessible. Yet with the given transcribed data, it is reasonably arguable that Lee is aware of the “oldness” of the game Aero Fighter, as he utters yeysnaley ‘long ago’ again in line 6 as he picks up the conversational floor again in excerpt 23. The excerpt begins with a rather long pause in the conversation.

(Excerpt 23)

5. (2.2)

old days-in Aero Fighter-NM famous-ci
‘Aero Fighter was a famous (game) long ago, you know’

7. nanito-to kulehkey elyep-ci anh-ko
level of difficulty-also that difficult-NEG-and
‘the level of difficulty was not that hard too’

8. Sung: kumanhayto kulehkey swiwu-n nanito-n ani-ci
even with it that easy-IN level of difficulty-TC NEG-ci
‘Even then, it was not that easy’

9. Lee: um:: suthulaikhe XXX ilkwusao XXX ka::
um:: Striker XXX 1945 XXX-NM
‘Um…Striker 1945’

10. Sung: → wen-un com swiw-ess-nuntey, thwu-nun-XXX
one-TC a bit easy-PST-but two-TC XXX
‘(Aero Fighter Version) I was a bit easy but II is…’

11. Lee: wen-un swip-nya?
one-TC easy-Q
‘Is (Version) I easy?’
Lee reclaims his speakership after the 2.2 second pause in line 5. Pauses in spoken discourse function as interactive signals for turntaking, emphasis, or dramatic effect, providing time for cognitive refocusing and for building up tension before a climax (Chafe, 1985). At least two interpretations of the pause before this extract are possible. It can be analyzed as a signal for turntaking, Lee waiting for Sung to go on after his initial statement in line 3, yeysnalkentey ‘(It’s) an old game’, since the clausal ending ~ntey suggests that the statement is background information that may be followed by other relevant information. Or it might be that Lee pauses to build up tension in his story again after Sung’s interruption. When Sung shows no sign of continuing his remark, Lee resumes in line 6 where he left off in line 2, with yeysnaley ‘a long time ago’. Lee proffers an assessment on Aero Fighter: It’s popular and has a relatively low level of difficulty. He seems to be certain of his perception of the game, using the committal ~ci in line 6 and adding his evaluation on its difficulty in line 7. In proffering a positive assessment, Lee invites the recipients to be coparticipants in assessing the game and to agree with him by proffering a subsequent assessment. But his speakership and assessment is challenged by Sung again in line 8, when Sung disagrees with Lee’s strong assertion. This is followed in line 9 with a filled pause with elongation, um:::, similar to the long pause in line 5. Both pauses and filled pauses, such as um, oh, and well, function as discourse markers in spontaneous conversation and have a transitional function (Schiffrin, 1987). They can mitigate the tension of potentially face-threatening acts such as topic shifts, realizations requiring dispreferred responses, and situations when interlocutors compete in
turntaking (Schiffrin, 1987). *Oh* can also be described as a mental change-of-state marker (Heritage, 1989), indicating a change in the speaker’s thinking that necessitates a shift in the discourse.

Such disfluencies are not found in other sequences of this narrative about Aero Fighter, but only in lines 5 and 9. The 2.2 second pause and the filled pause *um:* occur only after Lee has been challenged by Sung’s interruptions, and the long pause in line 5 seems to function as a turn-taking signal, while the filled pause in line 9 marks the speaker’s mental change-of-state. The pause and *um:* occur when the speaker is challenged by a topic shift, which is a dispreferred response. The long pause of 2.2 seconds in line 5 indicates Lee’s anticipation of a following utterance from Sung. Although the clausal connective ~*(u)nuntey* in yeysnalkentey’*(it’s) an old version*’ often occurs in sentence-final position, it implies the potential of a clause to follow. That is, Lee may have anticipated Sung would take the floor to elaborate on his remark, and when this anticipation was not met, Lee continued from where he was interrupted. However, the filled pause *um:* in line 9 seems to have a different motivation. After the elongated *um:*, the topic shifts from Aero Fighter to a different game named Striker 1945, evidence of a change in the speaker’s thoughts.

Lee does not give a counter-assessment to Sung’s disagreement and tries to move on to a new topic in line 9. Sung, however, seems to want to carry on the topic of Aero Fighter as indicated in his continued assessment in line 10. After Lee’s speakership has been challenged three times, Lee openly invites Sung to give his assessment by asking him a question in line 11. Lee and Sung start off from different positions, as shown in excerpts 20 and 21: Lee has positioned himself as a gamer who is good with computer shooting games and wants to maintain this position in the discourse context. Sung challenges Lee’s identity.
as a gamer who is good with shooting games. By challenging Lee in terms of game version and level of difficulty, he has threatened Lee’s face and revealed his identity as a gamer, too, a better one than Lee. Although no active face-saving negotiation is observed in this interaction, Lee attempts to maintain his subject position as a gamer and to avoid letting Sung take a position as a better gamer. Excerpt 22 is the continuation of excerpt 24.

(Excerpt 24)

13. Lee: *ewu, kulay?*  
   wow so  
   ‘Wow, is it so?’

14. Koh: *thwu-man oywe-se*  
   two-only memorize-so  
   ‘I only memorize Two so’

15. Sung: *wen-un manhi hayse kulenci*  
   one-TC many do maybe  
   ‘Maybe it’s because I played Version One many times’

16. Lee: *wen-i:: ↑ hwaksilhi swipkin swip-ketun ↑*  
   one-NM definitely easy-NOM-IND easy-ketun  
   ‘One is definitely easy, you see’

17. Sung: *wen-un:: XXX*  
   one-TC  
   ‘As for One’

18. Lee: *wen-i  swipki-n swiwu-ntey::*  
   one-NM easy-NOM-TC easy-but  
   *wang:::-i paysinha-ko kule-l ttay, chongal phaythen-ul molukeyss-e.*  
   king-NM betray-and such-PRS time bullet pattern-AC don’t know-INT  
   ‘One is easy but when the King betrays you, I don’t know the bullet pattern’

yet-TC I-NM one-TC well not do try-PST-you see
‘I have not played Version One well yet, you see’

one-TC I-NM sensuously avoid-PST-INT cannot help-PST-INT
‘As for Version I, I avoided it intuitively. I couldn’t help it’

21. Lee:  *um:: kamkakcekulo phiha-nun pangpep-to iss-nuntey*
um:: sensuously avoid-IN way-also exist-but
‘Um, (there is) a way to avoid it intuitively but’

22.  *ike-y wang-ul kakkai-se sso-canha::*
this one-NM king-AC close-at shoot-you know
‘In this game, (you) shoot the king at a close distance’

23.  *kulemyen:: ku samwulai-na, ku thwu kathun kyengwu-nun::*
then:: that samurai-or, that Two like-IN case-TC::

*chongal phaythen-ul al-ki ttaymwuney*
bullet pattern-AC know-NOM because

‘then, in the case of Samurai or Version II, because I know the bullet pattern’

24.  *kakkai wase sso-telato eti ttak cicem-ey iss-ta phiha-ketun,*
close come shoot-even though somewhere DM spot-at stay-TR avoid-you see
‘even if (the enemy) shoots (me) from a close distance, (I) stay in a spot and avoid it, you see’

25.  →  *kuntey, wen-un to::cehi kam-i an cap-hi-nun keya,*
but one-TC no matter what intuition-NM not get-PAS-RL keya

*wen kath-un kyengwu-nun.*
one like-IN case-TC

‘But, as for (Version)I, I just don’t get it no matter what, in a case like (Version) I’

After the third challenge by Sung, Lee seems to try to align himself with Sung by (i)
confirming Sung’s assessment that Version I is easy (line 11 in excerpt 21), (ii) reconfirming it (line 13), and (iii) agreeing with Sung’s assessment (line 16). While Lee was positioning his subjectivity as a gamer in relation to the information or images that he himself created first, he now positions his stance in relation to the other (the participant Sung) with whom he is developing and elaborating the interaction. In line 16, Lee uses an adverb hwaksilhi (certainly) and ends his utterance in ~ketun as if the information is not familiar to Sung. He modifies his idea and assesses Sung’s stance toward him, negotiating his position throughout the excerpt by unfolding a weakness of his play: He does not understand the bullet pattern.

From line 21 through 24, Lee demonstrates his knowledge of the game, but despite this verbalized know-how and gaming skill, in line 25, his utterance denotes his realization of the fact that he just doesn’t have any sense of the Version I game.

The ending pattern ~(u)n/nun keya (i) marks Lee’s surprising realization and (ii) demonstrates how Lee organizes his position. Throughout the narrative about Aero Fighter shown in excerpts 20, 21, and 22, adverbs that function as intensifiers occur only in two places, line 16 and line 25. Lee uses the adverb hwaksilhi ‘certainly’ to emphasize the easiness of Version I, which is a positive evaluation, with the ending ~ketun. On the other hand, he uses the adverb tocehi ‘no matter what’ to emphasize the difficulty of the shooting technique, which is a negative evaluation, with the ending–(u)n/nun keya. With this organization of his talk, Lee builds his stance of involvement in claiming the positive evaluation of the game and his stance of distance in assessing his own capacity or skills.

The ending ~ketun, as mentioned, marks information that the speaker assumes the hearer is not familiar with. Interestingly, Lee asks Sung if he thinks Version I is easy in line 11 of excerpt 21, which means that the information is shared and it could have been
expressed with the ending ~cahna without any meaning alteration or shift. Note in line 19 and lines 23–24, Lee uses ~ketun in uttering information only he has access to—that he hasn’t played Version I that often (line 19) and that he knows how to avoid the bullets since he knows the pattern of fire for Samurai or Version II (lines 23–24).

In describing the game tactic of killing the king in line 22, on the other hand, he uses the ending ~cahna, which is an indication that he knows that Sung is familiar with the game. Hence he uses both endings to frame his subjectivity as a gamer and involve the hearer in the process of building their emerging interactional identity as both being gamers. Thus, up until line 24, the speaker denotes his involvement in evaluating the game and its degree of difficulty by demonstrating his knowledge of the game and other comparable games. In line 25, however, the speaker distances himself from his subjectivity as a gamer that has emerged.

The speaker elongates the adverb to::cehi ‘no matter what’, indicating stress given to the word, and claims that he just cannot grasp it or get the sense of how to avoid the bullets in Version I. He emphasizes Version I repeatedly. The use of ~un/nun keya in this negative statement encodes the speaker’s distance: It makes his opinion an objective statement, and indicates that it is a realization that he was not aware of before. The negative statement indicates that its affirmative was expected (Tannen, 1993, p.26).

The Korean men’s interactions observed in the discourse about Aero Fighter in these excerpts show minimal use of minimal responses, disfluencies, and discourse markers, which are generally perceived to be linguistic resources employed by women. These excerpts also show how the men build their stances subjectively by recounting what they find to be meaningful content with rather competitive and comparative positioning. Englebretson (2007) claims that stancetaking occurs on three levels, as physical action, personal
attitude/belief/evaluation, and social morality. The participants in the Aero Fighter discourse interactively and competitively mark their stances on their personal evaluations of the game. Their stance taking occurs interactionally as Lee and Sung position themselves as gamers.

5.2.2 Positioning through competing for meaning

The following excerpt (25) demonstrates how subject positioning emerges by competing for meaning. The two interactants align with each other in marking their stances on in-class essay writing.

(Excerpt 25)

1. Jin: a, na-nun kulssil-ul mos sse kacko com kekceng-i toy-ci
   oh I-TC handwriting-AC cannot write with little worry-NM become-NOM
   ‘Oh, I am worried because my handwriting is bad’

2. Lee: @@ ke-n ne-na na-na ttokkath-un ke ani-ya::
   that-IND you-or I-or same-RL ke not-INT
   ‘Aren’t we the same about that’

3. waynyahamyen-un:: na, na-nun:: meli sayngkak-i cap-hye kacikwu::
   because-TC I-I-TC head thought-NM grab-PAS with
   ‘Because I have an idea of what to write’

4. → Cheum-ey-n icey maum-ul katatum-kо
   first-at-TC now heart-AC calm-and

   incey kulsssi-lul mak chenchenhi ssu-ki sicakha-n-ta?
   now handwriting-AC DM slowly write-NOM begin-IN-ta

   ‘At first, I calm myself down and begin to write slowly’

5. ku nalumtaylo caki mancokha-n kulssi-ka nao-nunty,
   that somewhat self content-IN handwriting-NM produce-but
   ‘I am content with my own handwriting to some degree’

6. Jin: kuchi::
   right
7. Lee: *Ike-y sikan-i ccoch-ki-kwu:: meli-ey iss-nun ke-l*
this thing time-NM chase-PAS-and head-in exist-RL thing-AC

cengliha-lla po-myen cwungpan-ey ttak mak-hi-canha.
organize-intend try-then middle-in DM block-PAS-you know

‘Time is running out, and when I try to organize my thoughts, I get blocked right in the middle, you know.’

8. *kulayse cwungpan ihwu-ka,*
so middle after-NM
‘after the middle,’

9. Jin: → *kulayto ne-n na pota nas-canha::*
even that you-TC I than better-you know::

na-n kul cincca mos ssu-canha
I-TC writing really cannot write-you know

‘Even then you are better than me, you know. I really cannot write, you know.’

10. Lee: *kunkka cwungpan ihwu-lul kase maum-i takuphay-ci-myen-un*
so middle after-AC reach heart-NM rush-become-then-TC
‘So after the middle, when I start to rush’

11. *Caki-to molukey wenlay philcek nallaka-nun ke-y nawa mak.*
self-even unknowingly original handwriting scribble-IN fact-NM shown DM
‘without knowing, my original scribbling handwriting comes back’

12. *kulemyen caki mam-taylo nallaka-myen-un::*
then self heart-as scribble-COND-TC
‘then if my handwriting scribbles’

that-NM great-IN black mark-be-you see
‘That is the great black mark you see’

14. Lee: *kulenikka, waynyamyen-un iltan ttak pwa-ss-ul ttay::*
that’s right because-TC first DM see-PST-PSR moment::

nwun pakk-ey na-canha
eye outside-at out-you know

‘That’s right, because when you saw it, it is out of favor’
Jin and Lee are both college students and they are talking about an essay exam they had to take. The main concern of this discourse is that their essay exam is graded on handwriting instead of content. The topic is first brought up by Jin, as he worries because his handwriting is bad. Lee aligns himself with Jin’s concern in line 2, saying that he is not different from Jin (aren’t we the same), and takes over the floor as he elaborates on his stance from line 3. In line 4, Lee explains how he begins to write with a thought in his mind. This is noteworthy information and sets up the premise for his later remark about his scribbling handwriting. The ending ~ta with rising intonation in this utterance marks the speaker’s perception of the information as noteworthy and contextually signals the orientation of the event that he wants to unfold. As soon as Lee begins to denote how he loses his concentration on writing neatly after he writes half his essay, Jin interrupts, taking the floor and attempting to claim again his initial stance, that his handwriting is bad. Lee does not yield the speakership to Jin and continues to elaborate on how his normal, bad handwriting re-asserts itself in the later part of his essay. Jin continues to align with Lee, but his stance taking seems to be competitive rather than collaborative as he interrupts again in line 13 and completes Lee’s utterance. On the structural surface, it is clear that both Jin and Lee are collaboratively positioning their stances in regard to their handwriting on the essay exam, as shown in the turn-taking sequence: Lee produces his own case in line 12, Jin takes over and points out kuke ‘that one’ is the minus point in line 13; then Lee immediately agrees, with kulenikka ‘that’s right’ and suggests the reason why poor handwriting is a black mark in line 14. Jin in turn agrees with
Lee with his utterance of kulehci ‘right’ and produces a direct evaluation that handwriting itself should not be a criterion for the evaluation of the essay in line 15. Even though their turntaking appears to be active and their stance taking is collaborative, Jin and Lee seem to compete to take the floor, particularly Jin, who seems to want to gain entitlement to the speakership as he is the one who initiated the topic.

Stance taking often involves three aspects: (i) evaluation of a proposition introduced in the context, (ii) positioning of the speaker, and (iii) alignment among interactants (Du Bois, 2007). The excerpts in this chapter demonstrate that Korean men create their stances in such a manner and stance taking occurs based on the speakers’ personal attitudes, beliefs, and evaluations, as well as physical action. Stance taking also occurs interactionally and is constructed collaboratively and/or competitively among participants with respect to other stances. On the other hand, stance taking is indexical, and often it evokes aspects of a broader sociocultural framework (Englebretson, 2007), such as gender roles.

5.2.3 Positioning through collaborative meaning construction

As seen in the previous section, the subjectivity of the discourse interactants emerges through stance taking in the discourse context. Stance taking occurs in evaluating a proposition or an object, and subjective positioning occurs through meaning engagement such as negotiation and competition. Men’s collaboration in meaning construction is observed in excerpt 26.

(Excerpt 26)

1. Kim: na-n ku @ ku yenge calha-te-n ku acessi-ka nemwu kiek-ey @nam-nun-ta@ I-TC that @ that English speak well-RT-IN that Mr-NM very memory-in remain-IN-ta
‘As for me, I remember that man who speaks English very well’

2. Oh: *ung::, intheyli?*
yes:: intelli
‘yes, intelligent?’

3. Choy: *(1.0) eyllithu eyllithu*
elite elite
‘Elite, elite’

4. Oh: *eyllithu*
elite
‘Elite’

5. Kim: *ku salam ttak kase khaynyusuphikhu ingkullisi-ha-nikka*
that person DM go can you speak English-say-when
‘That man, when I went over to him and said can you speak English,’

6. *kitalye-ss-ta-nun tusi yeysu kulekwu o-tula,*
wait-PST-DC-IN as if yes say come-you see
‘as if he was waiting, he said yes and came over, you see’

7. Oh& Kim: @@

8. Choy: *yeysu,*
yes
‘Yes.’

9. Oh: *ku salam emcheng taptaphay-ss-te-n keya*
that man very frustrate-PST-RT-RL keya
‘He was very frustrated (annoyed)”

10. Choy: @@

11. Kim: *ung*
yeah
‘yeah’

12. Oh: *kyeysok wuli chyetapo-myense::*
continuously us stare-while
‘while he was staring at us continuously’

13. Kim: *ung, a, towa cwu-l-kka ma-l-kka, towa cwu-l-kka ma-l-kka mak…*
yeah oh help give-PRS-Q not-PRS-Q help give-PRS-Q not-PRS-Q DM
‘yeah, should I help (them) or not, help (them) or not…’
Excerpt 24 is a discourse that involves the three interactants who went on a trip to Europe as a group. Because they traveled together, the experiences that they share in this context are already known to every participant of this interaction. While they walk down memory lane, they talk about how they got on the wrong train in Italy and Kim initiates the topic of the man who helped them on the train. Kim’s initiation is marked by the sentence ender ~ta with falling intonation in line 1. Falling intonation here indicates that Kim does intend to maintain the speakership in regard to this topic. It seems that he only introduces the topic and expects the other participants to be involved in building the episode about the man who helped them. With Kim’s initiation, Oh and Choy become actively involved in building a shared impression of him as an “intellectual” in line 2 and “elite” in lines 2 to 4. Then Kim builds up the episode that provides the reason for why they came to see him as intellectual or elite. Oh collaborates with Kim in lines 9 and 12 and provides additional information to Kim’s utterances in lines 5 and 6. Kim states his impression of the man’s promptness in line 6, saying that he looked like he had been waiting to help (kitalyesstanun tusi yeyssu kulekwu o-tula) and both Oh and Choy collaborate in constructing the meaning of kitalyesstanun tusi ‘as if he was waiting’. Kim’s impression of the man’s promptness and eagerness to help is shared by both Oh and Choy, who laugh immediately after Kim’s input, and in the following sequence, Choy repeats the word yeyssu ‘yes’ and Oh supplements Kim’s kitalyesstanun tusi ‘as if he was waiting’ with his interpretation that the man was annoyed (line 9), as he kept looking at them (line 12).

The ~(u)n/nun keya in line 9 indicates that Oh is providing his assumption about the man’s immediate response, and Oh gives evidence for this assumption in line 12 kyeysok wuli chyetapomyense ‘while he was staring at us continuously’. Upon this utterance, Kim
elaborates on the man’s intention in a quotative construction, as if Kim read the man’s mind. Kim and Oh thus interactively collaborate in meaning construction with their shared assumptions and in so doing, they align with each other. The next excerpt is from later in the same conversation.

(Excerpt 27)

15. Kim: \( a, \text{kuntey ku ttay, mak kuppakhayse kulen-ci} \)
oh but that time DM urgent maybe-NOM
‘Oh, but at that time, maybe because I was desperate,’

16. → \( \text{ku salam-i malha-nun ke-y mak tul-li-nun keya mak} \)
that person-NM speak-RL ke-NM DM hear-PAS-RL keya DM
‘I could understand what he was saying’

17. Oh: \( \text{Ung} \)
yeah
‘yeah’

18. Kim: \( \text{mwela mwela mak @} \text{mal-ul ha-nuntey, @} \text{alatut-keyss-tela} \)
something something DM @} word-AC say-and @} understand-guess-RT
‘He said something something, and I could understand him’

19. Oh: \( \text{kuntey ku salam palum-i ccom swipkey tul-li-ki-n tul-li-tela} \)
but that person pronunciation-NM little easily hear-PAS-NOM-TC hear-PAS-you see
‘But his pronunciation is easy to understand’

20. Kim: \( \text{Kunkka-n yenge-lul paywu-n salam-i ha-nun yenge-nun} \)
so-TC English-AC learn-IND person-NM speak-IN English-TC
\( \text{alatut-ki-ka swip-tela} \)
understand-NOM-NM easy-you see

‘So, it is easy to understand English spoken by one who learned English you see’

Then the focus of the conversation shifts to Kim’s surprise about the man, and this shift is signaled by \( ah, \text{kuntey} \) ‘oh, but’ in line 15. The second occurrence of \((u)n/nun keya\) in line
16 denotes Kim’s unexpected and surprising realization that he could understand the man’s English. He positions himself as one who can speak English when there is an enabling factor such as desperation. Oh, who has been an active collaborator in constructing meaning in this interaction, now aligns with a different position in line 19. Oh suggests a different factor that contributed to Kim’s understanding: The man’s pronunciation. Although Kim and Oh align in terms of understanding English, they also disalign with each other: Kim takes a stance on his capacity whereas Oh takes a stance on the man’s pronunciation.

5.2.4 Positioning through sociocultural expectations

The following excerpt denotes stance taking on a matter of social morality. The talk is between two college students, and it is about societal expectations of men who have served in the military. The excerpt is framed as a narrative about the participants’ part-time work experiences, and the participants’ gendered identity emerges in the context of sociocultural expectations of filial piety and masculinity.

(Excerpt 28)

1. Jung: *(hh...) tayhaksayng-i-layto, kath-un tayhaksayng-i ani-canha::*
   (inhale) college student-is-though same-IN college student-is not-you know ‘Even though (we are) college students, (we are) not the same college students, you know’

2. *...thukhi namca-tul-un kwuntay-lul ka-ss-ta-o-myen:: iltan*
   …especially man-PL-TC military-AC go-PST-DC-come-when:: first ‘…Especially men who served in the military, then first,’

3. *(2.2)*

4. *kunyang ikhey hakep-to iss-keyss-ciman*
   just DM study-also exist-will-but ‘(We) have studies to do but financially, from parents,’
5. Lee: *kuchi*
   right
   ‘(you’re) right’

   DM finance-with parents-HT-to:: DM independent-NOM not-PRS Q::
   ‘(we should) be independent financially from (our) parents’

7. *com XXX hay-ya toy-ci anh-ul-kka-ey tayhan ku:: philyoseng-ul*
   DM XXX do-must be-NOM not-PRS-Q-in regard that:: necessity-AC
   *cemcem nukki-ko-nun iss-nuntey…*
   more and more realize-NOM-IN exist-but…
   ‘I realize the need to be independent but…’

The two participants (Jung and Lee) are college students in the same age group. Their conversation takes place during the resting hour at their part-time workplace. Jung begins the conversation by clearly marking his stance on college students who have served in the military. Jung distinguishes college students who have served in the military from those who have not (*tayhaksayngilayo, kathun tayhaksayngi anicanha* ‘even though (we are) college students, (we are) not the same college students, you know’). Serving in the military has sociocultural significance to Korean men. In particular, it matters greatly to college students, since many of them serve in the military while they are in college and thus, military service marks a significant juncture in their campus lives. There is a socioculturally accepted general sentiment that a man becomes a true man only after military service (*namcanun kwuntaylul kaya namcaka toynta* ‘a man can be a real man only after he served the nation’). One of the qualities or characteristics that separates this marked group of college students (who have served in the military) from the unmarked group (who have not served in the military yet) is financial independence. The speaker does not provide background reasons for his stance on
the necessity of men becoming financially independent from their parents after they have served in the military. Even without an explanation of Jung’s stance, however, the other participant, Lee, agrees with him (kuchi ‘that’s right’) without any dispute or difference in stance. This seems to attest that this stance on military service and its reference to gendered identity or masculinity is shared between the participants.

Another sentiment that is often associated with military service is filial piety. Given the fact that male military service is mandatory in Korea, the social Discourse of military service is constructed in a way that emphasizes son-parent relationships such as motherly love, fatherly trust, parental sacrifice, filial piety, and so forth. Jung also constructs his subjectivity as a dutiful son, and the fact that he served in the military gains its worth in conjunction with his gendered identity as a son. Note that the adverb thukhi ‘especially’ is used to mark ‘men’ (thukhi namcatulun... ‘especially for men…’), associating military service with masculine identity, and iltan ‘for a moment’ to denote economic power as the basic trait of manhood or masculinity.

Men’s economic power seems to hold a significant value to Jung, as, later in this conversation, he constructs his subjectivity as a dutiful son who has the economic power not only to support himself but to aid his parents. Almost immediately after his utterances in excerpt 26, Jung talks about where he works, how he earns money, and how much he earns. He talks about his work experience at a gas station and a tractor factory. In particular, talking about the tractor factory leads him to the topic of working at an industrial complex, which leads him to the topic of LG, another place he worked, in excerpt 29.
139. Jung: *thukhi ceyil cca-n tey-ka,*
especially most stingy-IN place-NM
‘Especially, the most stingy place is,’

140. *cca-n tey-ka eti-nya-myen, eylci.*
stingy-IN place-NM where-Q-suppose LG
‘where is the most stingy place, (that’s) LG’

141. *Nay-ka eylci-eyse han sam, sa, o kaywel ilhay-ss-na?*
I-NM LG-at about three four five month work-PST-Q
‘I worked at LG for about 3, 4, 5 months’

142. *ceytayha-ko:: ani, o kaywelun toy-keyss-ney,*
discharge-and no five month-TC be-must-I think
‘after I was discharged, no, it must have been about five months’

143. *samwel isip il-nal ceytayha-ko:: palo ku ithul,*
March twenty one-day discharge-and:: instantly that two days
‘(I was) discharged on March 21st, and two days right after’

144. *(1.3) sam-il iss-taka palo*
three-day exist-TR instantly
‘after three days.’

Working at LG in conjunction with his military service marks an important juncture in Jung’s narrative. In lines 142 to 144, he talks about how quickly he found employment immediately after he was discharged from the military. Jung is again creating his subjectivity in reference to military service and his economic power to support himself and his parents. After Jung briefly mentions LG, as seen in excerpt 29, he shifts back to the previous topic, the tractor manufacturing company, to talk about how he aided his mother with his earnings.

(Excerpt 30)

145. *XXX mwulsan-eyse thulaykthe mantu-l ttay::*
XXX corporation-at tractor make-PRS time::
‘When I was making tractors at XXX corporation’
This narrative of Jung performing his filial duty even before he served in the military alludes to the speaker being a filial son. As the speaker contextualizes his subjectivity as a dutiful son, he is in effect framing his perception of masculinity. That is, filial piety is one quality that conforms to what it means to be a true man, in conjunction with serving in the military.

Immediately after he concludes the previous talk about the tractor factory, in excerpt 31 Jung explicates his stance, which seemingly provides background information for why he immediately sought employment after being discharged. He states that he could no longer ask his parents for an allowance once he came back from the military.

(Excerpt 31)

158. Jung: *kuliko ka-ss-taka, ceytayhayse te isang icycle, kule-canha.*
and go-PST-after discharge more longer DM you know
‘and since I’m back after being discharged from the military, no longer, you know’

159. (clicking tongue)
*kwuntay ka-ss-ta o-nikka XX mos ha-keyss-tela.*
military go-PST-return-once XX cannot do-intend-you see
‘once I came back from the military, I couldn’t do it you see’

160. Lee: mos ha-ci
    cannot do-definitely
    ‘Definitely can’t do it.’

This stance is consistent with what Jung stated in the beginning of this discourse. In excerpt 26, he refers to general social expectations for men who should be self-reliant economically, whereas in excerpt 29, the same proposition is stated from a more personalized stance. Jung is framing his identity as a son and a military dischargee. This stance is assumed to be a shared one as the speaker expects the interlocutor, Lee, to agree with him as shown in line 158, kulecanha ‘you know’. Jung’s expectation is met accordingly as Lee confirms Jung’s stance, mos ha-ci ‘definitely can’t do it’ in line 160. Lee rather strongly affirms that he shares Jung’s stance (a man who served in the military should be able to support himself) with two linguistic traits: (i) he echoes the same verb Jung used right before his turn (mos ha-ta) and (ii) he uses the committal ending ~ci.

After Jung elaborates further on the background episode before he began his work at LG, he begins to narrate his experience at LG, in excerpt 32.

(Excerpt 32)

192. ...eyekhon nay-ka eylci ka-se eyekhon colip hay-ss-ketun?
    …air conditioner I-NM LG go-and air conditioner assemble-PST-ketun
    ‘Yeah, I went to LG and assembled ACs, you see?’

193. eylci:: hwiseyn eyekhon.
    LG:: Whisen air conditioner
    ‘LG Whisen Air Conditioner’

194–5. kulay kaciko:: kongswuni-tul-hako kathi,
such with: factory girl-PL-with together
‘So, together with factory girls’

196–7. (1.2) cwuyakan cwuyakan,
day and night shift day and night shift

han cwu-nun cwukan, han cwu-nun yakan.
one week-TC day shift one week-TC night shift

‘(You work) day and night shift (alternately). One week, (you) work day shift, and another week, (you) work night shift.’

198. twicy-e ku-ke::
die-INT that-thing
‘(That one) kills you, such work shifts’

199. → salam wancenhi michy-e peli-nun keya, ku-ke.
person completely insane-completely-RL keya that-thing
‘That thing (that kind of work shift) drives people completely crazy’

200. na-to sal o khilo ppacye-ss-canha.
I-too weight five kg lose-PST-canha
‘I too lost 5 kg.’

In telling of his experience at LG, Jung first provides factual information—the type of work he did (line 192), people he worked with (lines 194–5), and the work shift he did (line 196–7)—that sets up the background for the proposition that he wants to accentuate in this episode. This proposition, which emerges contextually, is about physical labor. The intensity of the physical labor of working in such an environment is explicated in the three steps from line 198 to line 200 in a deductive structure. Jung’s statements in lines 198 and 199 are both definitive utterances. Kuke ‘that one’, a reference to the difficult work shift of cwuyakan ‘day and night shift’, is right-dislocated to mark the work shift as the focus of the utterance.\footnote{13} The

\footnote{13}The syntactic and discourse function of right-dislocation in Korean is discussed by Oh (2007) from the perspective of right-dislocation construction studies on French and English (see Lambrecht, 1987, 1994; Birner & Ward, 1998, and Gundel, 1985). According to Oh, the discourse function of right-dislocation in Korean is unclear and lacks an obvious explanation. However, by directing attention to kuke, the active referent of the topic, the right-dislocation construction seemingly functions to put focus on kuke, which refers to cwuyakan ‘day
utterance in line 198 is also performative: *twicye* describes the act of dying, a depiction of the intensity of the hardship of the physical labor. The utterance in line 199 depicts the cognitive aspect of this performance, *salam wancenhimichy-e peli-nun keya* ‘drives people completely crazy, ’realizing it in the form of ~(u)n/nun keya. Then, the resultative utterance in line 200 portrays the personal state of the speaker after such an experience.

Jung’s experience of intensive physical labor at LG is structured so that it begins in irrealis and moves to realis: *twicye* ‘it kills you’ in line 198 is an irrealis statement—it did not happen—while losing weight in line 200 is realis—it happened to him. It is also structured from general to personal: That working day and night shifts continuously drains people’s physical strength and damages their health is general knowledge, but his actual weight loss of 5 kg is a personal experience. This structure is apparent not only in the local context of this excerpt, but throughout this discourse of part-time work experience. In conversing about their work experiences, masculinity emerges as Jung marks his stance on college students who served in the military and the expected duty of sons. This is organized beginning with the general theme of military service discharges and then shifting to his experience before he went into the military and after he left the military. In both discourses, Jung talks about how he supported himself and performed his filial duty. His episodes of work experience are used to construct his gendered identity as a dutiful and mature son through marking his stance on society’s expectations of a responsible son who has been discharged from the military. Jung marks his stance on masculinity in terms of self-reliance (economic strength to support oneself), filial duty, and military service. By repeatedly presenting these ideas of masculinity, Jung contextualizes his subjectivity in a conceptual category and, in the process, his gendered identity as a son who can do such things emerges.

and night shift’. See Oh (2007) for further discussion.
In this section, the excerpts show Korean men taking stances by first evaluating propositions (which can be both tangible and intangible concepts, ideas, morality, situations, events, etc.), then positioning themselves as subjects in regard to their evaluations and aligning their subjectivity with that of other interactants, either collaboratively or competitively. In the frame of a narrative, the endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya are employed to denote different junctures of the narrated events and actions: ~ta is used to mark the orientation of the narrative as an introduction, whereas ~(u)n/nun keya occurs in evaluative utterances, marking the speakers’ stance as an epistemic one. The Korean men in these excerpts situate their experiences socially, and negotiate, confirm, and compete over their views in the interaction.

5.3 Stance-taking characteristics in women’s narratives in Korean

Studies on same-sex talk reveal that women employ collaborative approaches to language use and build on each other’s contributions in the discourse context. Commonly known women’s communication traits include more frequent use of minimal responses and questions and less topic changing than in men's communicative styles (Aries & Johnson, 1998; Coates, 1996, 1998; Tannen, 1990), as well as a frequent focus on personal experiences, people, their feelings, and personal issues (Tannen, 1990). The exchange of information is not the main purpose of their conversation; women establish and maintain their social relationships through reaffirming and strengthening friendship. Such traits can also be observed in women’s talk in Korean. The women who take part in the conversations I analyze build on each other’s input and take stances in alignment with each other by engaging with the interpretations of other interactional participants and attending to the
effects of the interaction on the other participants. This is called an “idea position” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003) and emerges intersubjectively in the discourse context.

In recounting narratives, the women participants solidify their relational identities (as friends) by the act of telling and the use of diverse linguistic forms and resources to build up empathy and their stances intersubjectively. They participate in the conversation, but the goal is not to take the floor from another speaker, but to participate in conversation with other speakers. One characteristic of women’s narratives in Korean is the recurrent use of the endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya. The endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya appear repeatedly in constructed and reported speech frames in which speakers use these endings as a strategy to mark the authenticity of their stories.

5.3.1 Intersubjective positioning through contextual identity building

The following excerpt demonstrates two commonly known traits of women’s speech styles: use of minimal responses and questions. Previously, Lee and Kim, the two female interactants, talked about Kim’s trip to Wencwu for a church retreat. Kim tells Lee about her trip with detailed episodes. As soon as Kim’s telling is complete, just before this excerpt begins, Lee takes over and gives an account of her own trip to Cengtongcin, a famous beach near Wencwu.

(Excerpt 33)

1. Lee: → (hhh) yeycen-ey wuli-to cengtongcin-ey ka-ss-ess-ta↑
   (hhh) old days-in we-too Cengtongcin-to go-PST-PST-ta
   ‘We went to Cengtongin before too, you see’

2. Kim: ung
   okay
   ‘okay’
3. Lee: *kuntey:: yakkan kilcap-tul-man hay kacikwu, han yel myeng-i ka-ss-na?* but:: some guide-PL-only do with about ten people-NM go-PST-Q ‘but, with only some guides, about 10 people went’

4. *kuntey wuli hoypi @ ichen wen nay-ko ku cengtongcin ka-ss-ta wa-ss-e @* but we fee @ 2000 won pay-and that Cengtongcin go-PST-back-PST-INT ‘but we paid 2000 won as fee and went to Cengtongcin’

5. Kim: *nwukwu-hako nwu-ka ta nay-ss-e kulemyen?* Who-with who-NM all pay-PST-INT then ‘who and who paid (for the all the cost) then?’

6. Lee: *wuncen-un::kunkka wuncen-kath-un ke-nun kunyang::* drive-TC:: DM drive-like-RL thing-TC just:: ‘As for the driving, things like driving is just’

7. Kim: *e.* yes ‘yes’

8. Lee: *kyohoy oppa-ka wuncenha-l cwu-l ani-kka ha-kwu,* church brother-NM drive-PRS know-PRS ‘because church brothers knew how to drive so they drove’

9. Kim: *a::.* oh:: ‘oh::’

10. Lee: *cha-to kyohoy cha-lo ka-kwu,* car-also church car-by go-and ‘even car, we went by the church car’

11. Kim: *a::, kilum-un? @ @* oh:: gas-TC ‘Oh:: what about gas?’

12. Lee: *kilum-un kunyang @ @ XX @ @* gas-TC just ‘As for gas, just…’

13. Kim: *e* yes ‘yes.’

and then go-and DM this what-is that there just go-when
‘and then (we) went there and what is it, when we just got there,’

15. Kim: pangphacey?
breakwater
‘A breakwater?’

16. Lee: e. ani kunkka:: kulehkey, um, pata-ka iss-ess-e.
yeah no that’s:: like that um beach-go exist-PST-INT
‘Yeah, no, that’s…um, we were there at the beach’

17. Kim: e.
yes
‘yes’

As marked by -ta in line 1, Lee assumes speakership and takes the conversational floor as she aligns her position with the previous talk provided by Kim. Then Kim, who now takes the position of the listener, contributes to this conversation by giving minimal responses in lines 2, 7, 9, and 17 and asking questions in lines 5, 11, and 15. Kim is indirectly implying that she is interested in Lee’s story and encourages Lee to go on telling the story. In so doing, Kim is positioning herself as an active conversational participant.

In the following excerpt (34), Lee elaborates on the episode and marks significant information with ~ta as in line 18 amuto epsess-ta ‘no one was there’. This information lays out the whole setting of the story that Lee experienced and as she narrates the story, ~nun keya is used twice as a quotative construction and for a scene description.

(Excerpt 34)

18. Lee: kuntey etten pata-ey ttak tuleka-ss-nuntey, ku pata-ey amwuto eps-ess-ta↑
but certain beach-at DM enter-PST-but that beach-at no one exist-PST-_ta
‘but we went to a certain beach but there was nobody at the beach’

19. kuntey ttak tuleka-ss (. )teni, han sam-pwun-man-ey
but DM enter-PST-then about three-minute-only-in
‘but (we) entered the beach and within about three minutes’

20. *mwucangha-n kyengchal-tul-i::, ttak wa kacikwu-nun*
armed-IN police-PL-NM::DM come and-TC
‘armed policemen came and’

here-TC enter-PRS NOM not-TC district-is-DEF QT-RL keya
‘said “this is a restricted area,” you see’

22. *@@ kulay kacikwu @@ nemwu nollay kacikwu*
@@ so with that @@ very surprised and
‘with that, we were so surprised and’

23. *cincca salam-tul-i yekita iss-canha, kemun swuch paluko*
really people-PL-NM here you know black charcoal
‘people put black charcoal on here’

24. *kulen salam-tul-i mak:: cincca swu-sip myeng-i mollye o-n keya.*
such person-PL-NM DM really several-tens people-NM swarm come-RL keya
‘several tens of such people swarmed to us’

25. *nemwu mwusep-tula keki.*
very scary-you know there
‘that was a very scary (place) you know’

and then DM other beach-to move-PST-INT
‘and then we moved to another beach’

27. *ka kacikwu-nun (hh) keki-se mak ikhey yenin-tul::*
go and-TC (hh) there-at DM DM lovers-PL::
‘(we) went there and lovers,’

28. *ikhey motakpwul phiweno-n yenin-tul-to iss-ko kule-nftey*
DM campfire make-IN lover-PL also exist-and such-but
‘there were lovers who made campfires’

29. *wuli-nun kalotung @@ alay-se @@ mak::*
we-TC street light @@ under-at @@ DM::
‘We were under the street light and’

30. *lamyen kkulhye mek-ko chwuwe kacikwu::.*
ramen cook eat-and cold-because::
‘cooked ramen because (it was) cold’
31. @ @ kulekwu hay po-ko tolawas-ss-e.
   @ @ and then sun look-and return-PST-INF
   ‘and then we saw the sunrise and came back’

32. Kim:  
   a:: coh-ass-keyss-ta.
   oh:: good-PST-must-ta
   ‘Oh, it must have been good.’

Entering an unknown beach where nobody was (line 18) happened to be illegal since it was a restricted area (line 21), and dozens of armed policemen swarmed onto the beach (line 24). Through this narrative, Lee is positioning her subjectivity in alignment with Kim. In the previous talk, Kim depicted herself as a storyteller with a funny episode involving her trip to Wencwu. Lee is also building upon Kim’s subjectivity that emerged in the context and shares a similar identity/subjectivity by telling this incident that she experienced on her group trip to Cengdongcin. In Kim’s episode, Kim provided background information about her trip (that it was a church retreat), the place she went (Wencwu), and an interesting story involving the trip. Lee also provides the place she went (Cengdongcin), whom she traveled with (the church people), and an interesting episode of the trip. Kim ends her story by saying that she has returned, ollaw-ass-ci-, and Lee similarly concludes her story with the verb of tolawass-e’(we) came back’, marking the concrete coda of the story. It seems that these female speakers not only use linguistic techniques that take a collaborative approach to language use (for instance, the use of minimal responses and questions as seen in excerpt 31), but they also structure the organization of their talks in similar ways to each other. Thus, the female participants in this same-gender talk organize their talk in a way that indexes their shared stances and contextual subjectivity.
Consider excerpt 35 below for another example of the female speakers’ structural alignment in positioning their contextual subjectivity.

(Excerpt 35)

25. Kim:  
\[
na \ yosay \ ccom \ ccom \ kelli-nun \ ke-y
\]
I these day DM DM concern-RL thing-NM
‘A thing that I’m sort of concerned about is’

26. Kang:  
\[
\text{ung}
\]
yeah
‘yeah’

27. Kim:  
\[
kunyang, \ kunkka, \ pyello \ mwe:: \ nay-ka \ cohahako \ ilen \ salam-i \ iss-nun \ ke-n
\]
just that is particularly DM:: I-NM like such person-NM exist-RL thing-IN
\[
ani-ketun?
\]
not-you see
‘It’s not like I have someone that I like particularly, you see’

28. 
\[
kulen \ salam \ eps-nuntey \ (hhh), \ yenay-nun \ hay \ pokko \ siphta-n \ mal-i-ci. \ @@
\]
such person not exist-but (hhh)dating-TC do-try want-IN word-is-NOM
‘but although there is no such person, I’m saying that I want to date.’

29. Kang:  
\[
na-to \ kula-y
\]
I-too such-INT
‘I too am like that.’

30. Kim:  
\[
(hhh) \ kulayse \ weynmanhamyen-un \ kunyang \ @@
\]
(hhh) so if not too bad-TC just
‘So, if it is not too bad, just’

31. Kang:  
\[
@@weynmanhamyen-un \ sakwie, \ sakye \ polla \ @@
\]
@@if doable-TC date date try @@
‘If (the person is) not too bad, you would date.’

32. Kim:  
\[
@@kulen \ ke-yess-ketun?
\]
@@such thing-PST-you see
‘You are right, you see.’

33. Kang:  
\[
\text{ung, sasil na-to kulay.}
\]
yeah actually I-too like that
‘Yeah. Actually I’m like that too.’

The two female participants, Kim and Kang, are college friends talking about romantic relationships. Kim marks her stance in line 28 when she says that she wants to be involved in a romance even though she is not interested in any particular person. Kim is indexing her gendered subjectivity outright and Kang is aligning with her position very clearly, as she agrees with her in line 29. Kang then attempts to further extend her stance taking in line 30, upon which Kim continues to build her own stance by completing what Kim assumes Kang would say in line 31. Note that in the following sequence (line 32), Kang builds on Kim’s utterance in which kulen refers to what Kim uttered in line 31 (that they would date a man if he is not too bad), and Kang utters outright agreement with Kim in line 33; thus they are taking their stances intersubjectively.

5.3.2 Intersubjective positioning through creating relational solidarity

The following excerpt (36) also illustrates the way in which women speakers work together to produce shared meanings. The same participants from the previous excerpt (33), Kang and Kim, continue to talk about romantic relationships. They have aligned their position intersubjectively as observed in the previous excerpt, and both participants alternately take the floor to talk about a man in whom they are interested. After excerpt (33), Kim talks about a male classmate that she recently decided is cute. Kang then takes the floor and talks about a male senior who attends the same class as her. She tells Kim about her impression of him, how she got to know him, and some small talks with him. Kang then
starts to wonder about how he would feel about her and begins to narrate an episode that
could imply his interest in her.

(Excerpt 36)

1. Kang: → nay-ka eymeysueyn-ul wenlay an tuleka-n-ta↑
   I-NM MSN-AC origin not enter-IN-ta↑
   ‘I didn’t use MSN originally’

2. Kim: @@ e @@ na-to an tuleka-ss-nuntey.
   @@ uh @@ I-too not enter-PST-you see
   ‘Yes, I too didn’t use (MSN) you see’

3. Kang: an tuleka-n ci han yuko kaywel tway-ss-e, kuntey
   not enter-IN NOM about six month become-PST-INT but
   ‘(It has been) about six months since I didn’t do (MSN), but’

   account-NM terminate-become-PST-RT-CNJ I-TC too not enter-because
   ‘As for me, my account terminated because I didn’t use it too’

   ((2 lines omitted)

7. All: @@ @

   enter-PRS time-every I activate-CAS-INT already terminate-exist-INT
   ‘I activate (my account) every time I go in (but, it’s) already terminated’

9. Kim: @@ @

The ending ~ta in line 1 not only signals the opening of her story but also brings out Kang's
subjectivity in the context. The ending ~ta also marks that this information is noteworthy,
preparing the hearer to anticipate the upcoming story. “Anticipation” as a distinctive type of
speech act pertains to the relational stance of the speaker and the hearer. What the speaker wants to tell and expects the hearer to anticipate are largely shaped by the contextual position both the speaker and the hearer take. The speaker portrays herself as someone who does not use MSN, and the ending ~ta encodes the significance of this information. It warns the hearer that the story about to be told is related to MSN. To this contextually established subjectivity of the speaker Kang, the hearer Kim positions herself in alignment with Kang, as seen in line 2, when she says that she too does not use MSN. In line 3, Kang talks about how long it has been since she used it, and in line 4 Kim again aligns with Kang by saying her account has been terminated because she hasn’t used it for such a long time. Then, in response to this utterance, Kang explains that she has to reactivate her account every time she uses MSN (line 8). As if Kang and Kim are competing to see who is a true non MSN-user, they build upon each other’s utterances to create their identity that has surfaced in this interactional context. Unlike the men’s discourse observed in the previous section (where the male interactants compete for their contextual identity as a gamer in excerpts 20–22 or build an idea collaboratively in excerpt 24), the women’s discourse in this excerpt is concerned with the relational aspect, rather than the activity itself. That is, rather than being concerned with how and why they are not using MSN, they show concern for “who” they are and “how” they are related to each other. Therefore, Kang and Kim are building their positions intersubjectively upon their utterances, and this act of alignment seems to be a necessary performance to enhance their solidarity as people who share the same subjectivity or identity.

Excerpt 35 is the continuation of excerpt 37, the narrative about MSN. Here, Kang tells her story about how she began to use MSN. In narrating the episode, the ending ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya occur repeatedly as if they are adjacency pairs.
Kang uses the endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya in quotative constructions from lines 10 to 13 in alternation. The use of the quotative forms indexes a local dimension of the speaker’s relational stance in this context. Kang gives a detailed account of the talk that she exchanged with a male senior, to whom she refers as oppa (a reference term that literally means ‘older
brother’, but is used to mean ‘he, him’) in present tense for various interactional effects: First, it seems to dramatize the episode as if the narrated event is a real time event that is happening at the moment of the utterance, and second, it allows identity relations to emerge in the interaction through presuppositions regarding Kang and the male senior’s relational position. In other words, in the reported speech construction, Kang is positioning their identity relation in terms of gender (a man and woman) rather than seniority (senpay and hwupay). All the marked quotative constructions with ~(u)n/nun keya and ~ta represent ku oppa’s quotes (ilenun keya line 10; kulenta↑ line 12; kule-nun keya in 13) while the unmarked quotative ilekwu in line 15 refers to Kang’s own quote. In this way, Kang is indexing her presupposition that his asking her to do MSN is an indication of his interest in her. This is the crucial aspect of her indexing of the identity relation that emerges in this context, because Kang is constructing his invitation to do MSN as what triggered Kang’s affective stance toward him, denoted in lines 14 and 17. That is, Kang confesses that she had no interest in him at that time but she begins to feel differently after kuttay ‘that time’ (line 14).

The marked quotatives ilenun keya ‘saying like this’, kulenta ‘say that’, and kulenun keya ‘saying like that’ encode different functions in this discourse. The first quotative ileh- in ~nun keya signals the introducing of the episode involving ku oppa, and direct quotes follow the utterance of ilenun keya. On the other hand, the deictic kuleh- in lines 12 and 13 occurs after the quoted statement and functions as a demonstrative to index the animator’s voice. The quotative constructions in this context organize the story’s structure as follows: The ending ~un keya in ilenun keya introduces the opening of the story; ~ta in kulenta quotes the actual utterance of the character, ku oppa, and indicates its noteworthiness in relation to the information provided in line 11 that they were not very close at that time. Then, the second
~nun keya in line 13 denotes the speaker’s surprise at the fact that he registered her in his MSN friend list, since they were not close at the time of the narrated event.

In the following sequences, ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya occur again in adjacency. The second occurrence of ~ta and ~(u)n/un keya as an adjacency pair functions to present a cause and effect relation. The statement in line 16 encodes the speaker’s action of not using MSN and ~ta indicates that this information is relevant to the statement that follows in sequence and thus holds significance in this context. Then the speaker uses the resultative condition in line 17, showing that the information was unexpected by the speaker since she was not interested in him (line 14), and this stance of mirativity is encoded in the ~(u)n/un keya construction. Such repeated occurrences of ~ta and ~nun keya in this narrative dramatize the story through active involvement of the characters (Kang and ku oppa) in a real time frame, and thus gives authenticity to her story. In addition, it contributes to creating the speaker’s subjectivity in the current discourse. The endings ~ta and ~nun keya in this reenactment of the narrated event index the speaker’s stance toward the relational subjects, and Kang’s gendered subjectivity emerges contextually and discursively.

5.3.3 Use of narrative to mark a speaker’s cognitive stance

The following excerpts (38 and 39) share similar traits with the narrative of MSN addressed in the previous pages. The participants Kim and Bang, who are college students, talk about an oppa (a school senior) whom both Kim and Bang know. Prior to excerpt 36, they were talking about Bang’s hobby of taking selfies, but then Kim abruptly introduces the oppa as a new topic. Interestingly, this topic is thrown out rather suddenly, as if the speaker had intended to talk about this matter or something reminded her of him. In the corpus data
of this excerpt, any contextual contribution that could have triggered Kim’s talk regarding
this topic is not observed. When Kim turns the topic from Bang’s hobby to this oppa, no
pause or disfluency is marked, showing no hesitation in bringing up the topic. The episode
that Kim unfolds concerns Bang, and it seems that Kim finds it informational for Bang to
know.

Kim begins to narrate her episode by marking her stance in regard to this oppa.

Names are not transcribed in the corpus; in this excerpt, to avoid confusion, C is used to refer
to the oppa and D for the other person mentioned. Excerpt 38 shows the initial context when
the topic shifts as Kim takes over the conversational floor. Kim thinks C is mad at her and
begins to elaborate on an episode that provides background information on why she thinks so.
With Bang’s minimal response of confirmation, Kim introduces the setting of the episode
with kuttay kulaysse ‘(I) said at that time’.

(Excerpt 38)

865. Kim: C-i oppa-ka na-hanthey hwana-n ke kath-ay.
C-VOC brother-NM I-to angry-RL fact seem-INT
‘C seems to be mad at me.’

866. Bang: cincca?
really
‘Really?’

867. Kim: e. ai na mollu-keyss-nuntye, nay-ka ku-ttay kulay-ss-e,
yeah oh I don’t know-guess-but I-NM that-time say-PST-INF
‘Yeah, oh, I’m not sure but I said at that time’

Kim takes the floor by marking her view about C, which gives her speakership as indicated
by Bang’s minimal response of cincca ‘really’. This utterance not only functions to check
confirmation but also urges Kim to go on with her telling of the story. Then in line 867, Kim
marks her stance of uncertainty once again and provides a time (kuttay) and an action (kulaysse).

(Excerpt 39)

875. Kim:  
\[D \text{ oppa-lang } nay-ka \text{ ku-ttay cemsim-ul mek-ess-e,}
\]
\[D \text{ brother-with I-NM that time lunch-AC eat-PST-INF}
\]
\[‘I ate lunch with D at that time’
\]

876. \[\rightarrow twul-ise cemsim-ul mek-ess-ta?\]
\[two-with lunch-AC eat-PST-ta
\]
\[‘The two of us ate lunch, you see?’
\]

877. \[kuntey ilehkey yaykiha-taka \text{ incey ku yayki-ka nawa-ss-e}
\]
\[but like this talk-TR now that story come up-PST-INF
\]
\[‘In the midst of talking like this, that story came up’
\]

878. \[kulayse molu-nun chek hay-ss-ci
\]
\[so don’t know-IN pretend do-PST-you see
\]
\[‘So I pretended I don’t know, you see’
\]

879. \[\rightarrow a \text{ mwe:: C-i-nun mwe:: huyceng-i manna-n-tako kule-te-ntey?}
\]
\[oh DM:: C-VOC-TC DM:: Huyceng-VOC meet-IN-QT say-RT-right
\]
\[Kule-nun keya.
\]
\[say-RL keya
\]
\[‘He was saying, oh, C said that he is meeting (dating) Huyceng, is that true?’
\]

Excerpt 39 is the continuation of excerpt 36. In this excerpt, Kim elaborates on a talk she had with D, who apparently knows C and the interlocutor Bang. Kim introduces the setting of her episode in line 875 using the intimate ending ~e. In the following sequence, Kim emphasizes the setting by repeating the information, ending with ~ta with rising intonation. This act of repetition with varying endings indicates that the narrated event of eating lunch with D holds significance in this episode concerning C and the interlocutor Bang. The sentential ender ~ta in this utterance marks (i) the noteworthiness of the information and (ii) the speaker’s stance.
of realization of this noteworthiness. Kim realizes the significance of the information only as she begins to narrate the episode because it is during that event that “the talk” about C and Bang surfaces, as noted in line 879. She positions herself in the role of storyteller and, at the same time, that of an active protagonist in the episode. Then she gives a detailed account of the dialogue between herself and D, presented in excerpt 40 below.

(Excerpt 40)

892. Kim:  *cinca- yo? kulay- ss-teni*
really-POL say-PST-then
“Really?” I said then’

893. →  *mwe:: kwaynchanhta- kwu ile- nun keya,*
well:: all right-QT like this-RL keya
‘Well, he says it like “it’s alright”’

894.  *kulemyense mwe:: kulayse yaykiha- taka,*
then DM:: so talk-while
‘then, so while I was talking’

895. →  *e nay- ka hancham yaykiha- taka an toy- l kes kath- un keya tto mak::*
oh I-NM for a while talk-TR not be-PRS thing seem-RL keya again DM::
‘Oh, I was talking to him for a while but then it seems not right’

896. →  *awu cakkwu ilehkey ka- myen an toy- l kes kath- un keya,*
oh repeatedly like this move-if not be-PRS thing seem-RL keya
‘Seems not right if (we) continue to talk this way’

897.  *na- to molukey kunyang,*
I-too without knowing just
‘Without knowing, I just’

898.  *e kuntey huyceng- i namca chinkwu iss- nuntey, kulay- ss- e::;*
oh but Huyceng-VOC male friend exist-you know say-PST-INT
‘said that oh, but Huyceng has a boyfriend’

899. →  *kulay- ss-teni @ oppa- ka, @ e namca chinkwu iss- e, ile- nun keya,*
say-PST-then @ brother-NM @oh male friend have-INT say this-RL keya
‘When I said it like that, he says, “oh (she) has a boyfriend,” like this’
900. Bang:  
\textit{ku:: D oppa-la-nun salam-i?}\\
that:: D brother-called-TC person-NM\\
‘That person called D?’

901. Kim:  
e, D-oppa-ka. nay-ka, ney! \textit{kulay-ss-teni},\\
yes D-brother-NM I-NM yes say-PST-then\\
‘Yes, D. I said yes, then.’

902.  
e \textit{kulay? kulem an toy-keyss-ney::,i-lay::,}\\
oh is that right then not be-will-I see this-QT\\
‘(he) said, oh, is that right? then (it) won’t do, I see.’

903.  
\textit{kulay nay-ka, e way nameca chinkwu iss-nun ke molu-sye-ss-eyo?}\\
so I-NM oh why male friend have-RL \textit{ke} don’t know-SH-POL\\
\textit{kulay-ss-teni::},\\
say like that-PST-then::\\
‘So I said “why, didn’t you know that she has a boyfriend?”’

904.  
\textit{→ a eccenci mak ile-nun keya,}\\
oh no wonder DM like this-RL \textit{keya}\\
‘(He was) saying like “oh, no wonder”’

905.  
nay-ka way-yo \textit{kulay-ss-teni},\\
I-NM why-POL say like that-PST-then\\
‘I asked him what do you mean?’

906.  
\textit{nameca chinkwu iss-nya-ko mwulepwa-ss-teni::,ni-ka wus-ess-tay kunyang::,}\\
male friend have-Q-QT ask-PST-when:: you-NM laugh-PST-QT just::\\
‘when (he) asked (you) if (you) have a boyfriend, you just laughed, he said’

907.  
\textit{E-i-n epsta-ko kulay-ss-nuntey::, ne-n wus-ess-tay-nun keya kunyang::}\\
E-VOC-TC not have-QT say-PST-but::you-TC laugh-PST-QT-RL \textit{keya} just::\\
‘E said she doesn’t have one but::, you just laughed.’

Kim reports the details of her conversation with D in this narrative. In giving this report of the dialogue that she exchanged with D, Kim uses \textit{(u)n/nun keya} repeatedly for two interactional functions: (i) to mark quotations (in lines 893, 899, 904, 907) and (ii) to mark her stance (in lines 895, 896). The speaker also employs the deictics \textit{kulay} (lines 892, 898, 899, 901, 903, 905) and \textit{ilay} (line 902) and the hearsay marker \textit{~tay} (line 906) in quotative
constructions. Interestingly, the subject marking of these deictic words shows a clear distinction: *kulay* (say that) is used to quote the speaker’s own utterances whereas *ilay* (say this) is used to quote what the other participant, D, says. With the same consistency, ~*nun keya* is used with *ilehta* only to describe D’s speech actions. Kim as a narrator of the story distances herself as a protagonist relatively far from the narrated event but keeps D in close proximity, implying that D’s utterances in the narrated event hold more significance than her own utterances. The use of ~*nun keya* in depicting what D says describes the “action” of saying at the very moment of D’s utterances, and Kim’s surprise and the unexpectedness of it. Kim’s utterances depicts D’s assessment in line 893 (*kwaynchanhtakwu ilenun keya* ‘he says it like it’s alright), Kim’s perception of the situation in lines 895–6 (*an toyl kes kathun keya* ‘seems it’s not right’), D’s recognition of the issue (*e namca chinkwu isse, ile-nun keya* ‘saying so she has a boyfriend’), and D’s deductive realization in line 904 (*eccenci mak ilenun keya* ‘saying no wonder’) and in line 907(*nen wusesstaynun keya* ‘saying that you laughed). The ending ~(u)n/nun keya is used in a place where the speaker contextually perceives the significance of the information through the process of deductive reasoning. What Kim and D say in the narrated event eventually leads to the consequence denoted in the following excerpt (40), and Kim’s perception of their dialogue as a “cause” in the given context is marked with ~(u)n/nun keya when the speaker realizes the significance of the information.

(Excerpt 41)

910. Kim *kulay, ku ihwu C-i oppa-ka,* so that after C-VOC VOC-NM ‘So, after that this C’
Excerpt 40 describes the consequence of the speaker’s narrated event (eating lunch with D): That is, C suddenly stopping calling Kim. The utterances with ~ta endings (lines 911, 915) function as evidence to support the claim in the following sequences (lines 912 and 916 respectively) in this discourse. In line 911, Kim explains how C used to call her as the premise to the resultative state depicted in line 912, and the speaker’s action denoted in line 915 provides supporting evidence for her perception of C described in line 916 (that he appears to be sullen). Note that the speaker uses ilay- in referring to her own speech whereas she uses kulay- in reference to her own speech in the previous excerpt. The fact that C used to call her once every two days is significant information and it is marked by ~ta not just to
denote the noteworthiness of the information but also to mark the speaker’s cognitive stance or perceptive stance that the speaker herself is unaware of. It also marks the information that will follow this utterance as a twist of the utterance itself. The man finds out that Bang has a boyfriend. This information is passed on by Kim, who tells D about Bang’s relationship.

After this, Kim realizes that C, who used to call her once every two days, has stopped calling her abruptly. The word she uses, ttuk ‘abrupt’, strongly emphasizes this stance. Immediately after the utterance with a ~ta ending, ~nun keya follows to mark no more calling, and this is sudden, unexpected, and surprising to the speaker, Kim. The sequence of the narrative shows that ~ta is used in precedent events, and ~nun keya is used in describing the core actions that follow after the precedent events. For instance, in the first pair of ~ta and ~nun keya in lines 911 and 912, C calling Kim once every two days is the precedent information relevant to the core action encoded by ~(u)n/nun keya. Then that action leads her to do the following action depicted by the second pair of ~ta and ~nun keya in lines 915 and 916. In short, the ending ~ta provides the motivation behind the speaker’s epistemic stance marked by ~(u)n/nun keya. In other words, the ending ~ta illustrates why the speaker says this, and why she is surprised by the fact that he stopped calling her; it’s because he used to call her once every two days. The second ~ta and ~nun keya adjacency pair also shows a similar sequential relation. The premise, that the speaker called him and asked him several questions, is described with the ending ~ta, and the speaker’s realization or impression of C, who sounded as if he was depressed and sullen, is denoted by the ~nun keya construction. The speaker’s stance of surprised or unexpected realization is motivated by the ~ta construction uttered in the earlier sequence.
5.4 Summary

In this chapter, men’s and women’s narrative strategies when using the endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya are addressed. The Korean men in these interactions use the narratives for subjective and idea positioning whereas the Korean women use the narrative for intersubjective and subjective positioning. Consistent with earlier findings from language and gender studies, the men’s interactions show that they compete and negotiate meaning to mark their stance and position their subjectivity in the context and within the broader social framework. The occurrence of ~ta and ~nun keya is observed more in their marking of their stances within the narrative than in the marking of the narrative events.

On the other hand, the women in these interactions focus on giving extensive details of their narratives in chronological order. Giving detailed information about experiences, episodes, and/or narratives is an important communicative strategy to build contextual subjectivity and gender solidarity, and to share cognitive stances. Thus, the occurrence of ~ta and ~nun keya in Korean women’s interactions is observed to be more frequent and diversified than in Korean men’s interactions. More specifically, the ender ~ta is used to depict an initial condition, a premise, or an assessment of the speakers in regard to situations, circumstances, or events, whereas ~(u)n/nun keya is used to denote an unprepared-for, unexpected, or surprising turn of events and/or a speaker’s realization of the initial situations/circumstances/events/assessment described with the ~ta ending. In this sense, the ending ~ta functions as a contextualization cue for interlocutors to anticipate more of the story and at the same time, it motivates or prepares the speakers to elaborate the narrative with the turnabout of the story denoted by the ~(u)n/nun keya construction.
These variations seem to suggest that Korean men and women use narratives as communicative strategies in their same-gender talk differently, but in accord with existing findings about gender variation in communication and language. Korean men focus on the “tale” whereas Korean women focus on the “telling,” and this difference surfaces in the use of the ending forms ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya. Korean men use “tales” to mark their stances and to position themselves subjectively while Korean women use “telling” to mark their stances and to position their identity intersubjectively.

5.5 Conclusion

In this paper, the two Korean ending forms of ~(u)n/nun keya and ~ta are addressed in terms of their discourse functions. Mirative, assumptive, and narrative functions of ~(u)n/nun keya and demonstrative, quotative, and narrative meanings of ~ta are analyzed using spoken corpus data from the Sejong Project. How these endings are used as stance-markers and any variation by gender is explored. “Stance” is the expression of attitude, emotion, certainty, and doubt, and these expressions are socially and culturally specific. Therefore, stance is bound to socialization and its expression is bound to social and cultural context (Precht, 2003). Stance requires positioning oneself in the interaction whether against or with other interactants, and thus it is an interpersonal activity rather than a subjective one. The expression of one’s stance depends on one’s interactants and their ways of expressing themselves. The speaker can either align or disalign with interlocutors depending on the position he/she may take toward what is contributed by the other conversational participants (DuBois, 2007; Martin, 2000; Precht, 2003).
Taking stance as “an articulated form of social action” (DuBois, 2007, p. 137) that is directly related to the responses of discourse participants, “gender” is an important variable in the stance-taking process. In almost all cultures, men and women are socially distinguished, and therefore, variations in some of their discourse and linguistic behaviors presumably occur everywhere.

The current study addressed how Korean men and women take stances differently using the two sentence endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya, arguing that Korean men show a tendency to position their stances subjectivity by disaligning with other discourse participants whereas Korean women tend to position their stances intersubjectively by aligning with their interlocutors.

In Korean women’s conversations, the telling of detailed information is found to be crucial. The telling of a story in chronological order seems to be important in Korean women’s interactions because it allows the speaker’s coparticipants to indirectly share the experience being narrated. Sharing experiences of intimate moments, feelings, and thoughts is vital in solidifying relationships among close friends in women’s interaction (Coates, 1998; Johnson & Aries, 1998; Pilkington, 1998). The endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya occur more frequently in Korean women’s interaction, in particular when they share their experiences, gossip, episodes, and so forth. In Korean women’s interaction, ~ta is used to mark the premise of the circumstance(s) that the speaker is about to unfold, and ~(u)n/nun keya marks unexpected realization or surprise that comes to the speaker within/through/after the premise marked by the ~ta form.

In men’s interaction, the process of the story or episode is not much emphasized; instead, the outcome of the story is considered more important. Therefore, the occurrence of
~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya is less frequent in men’s narratives than women’s narratives. Furthermore, the quotative meaning of ~ta is used less often in interaction among men compared to women’s interactions, for women tend to give details of “dialogue” in telling of their experiences, but men often tend to share only the gist, or less of the “dialogue” of the narrated event(s).

Gender cannot be isolated from other aspects of social identity and relations. Gender carries different meanings across societies, cultures, communities, and the linguistic manifestations of that meaning are likewise different across societies, cultures, and communities. Hence, women and men may use the same linguistic form but accomplish different things by doing so because their experiences, expectations, values, and so on, are different. The endings ~ta and ~(u)n/nun keya are used in Korean to express epistemic modality, but women use them to extend the speaker’s personal experience as a group experience in order to consolidate relational intimacy with their addressees.

However, these variations do not mean that these are gender-exclusive traits. Studies on cross-gender linguistic behaviors show that many communicative, interactional, and linguistic behaviors are inclusive and cross-gendered. Many women employ linguistic strategies typically associated with men’s communicative styles while many men use sympathy and minimal responses, rising intonation in declarative sentences, and so forth, to protect the positive face of the interaction participants and promote solidarity (Cameron, 1998; Haji-Hassan, 1999; Kuiper, 1998).

The findings of this study are based on limited data. Further research needs to be done either to verify or to counter these analyses. The sentence ending forms that are the focus of the study are used only among intimates; it therefore provides a basis for comparison for
future studies that might explore gender variation in the use of stance-taking in formal settings and in cross-gender interactions.
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