

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Repetitional Responses in Korean Conversation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4943c70f>

Author

Kim, So Yeon

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Repetitional Responses in Korean Conversation

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Applied Linguistics

by

So Yeon Kim

2016

© Copyright by

So Yeon Kim

2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Repetitional Responses in Korean Conversation

by

So Yeon Kim

Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics

University of California, Los Angeles, 2016

Professor Sung-Ock Shin Sohn, Co-Chair

Professor Charles Goodwin, Co-Chair

This dissertation investigates repetitional utterances mobilized in response to yes/no polar questions in Korean conversation. In an effort to keep the initiating action constant, the questions were restricted to those that primarily request confirmation. Repetitional responses in such sequences can be categorized into two types: minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats. Research indicates that minimal repeats tend to promote a closure of the current sequence, with the respondents not elaborating further on the response. By doing so, the respondents signal that they have understood the question as a request for confirmation and that they will orient to the question precisely as such. Non-minimal repeats carry “extra” components that can be omitted without damaging the comprehensibility of the turn. The findings of this study have shown that these extra elements are not randomly chosen but are closely related to what the response attempts to do beyond confirming the question. Furthermore, non-minimal repeats tend to be

followed by further talk from the respondents. Repetition in disaffirmative responses has also been analyzed. As a dispreferred action, repetitional responses for disconfirmation show different sequential development patterns than their affirmative counterparts. Disconfirmatory repetitional responses have been examined with reference to specific grammatical structures with which they are frequently deployed, such as *-(nu)ntey* ‘but’ and *-i/ka aniko* ‘{it} is not - but.’

By examining ways in which repetition comes into play in responsive turns, this dissertation demonstrates 1) the systematicity underlying the deployment of repetitional responses in Korean question-answer sequences, 2) the relationship between the forms and functions of repetitional responses, and 3) the interactional functions of repetition as a resource for question recipients to display their understanding and orientation vis-à-vis the prior question.

The dissertation of So Yeon Kim is approved.

Hongyin Tao

Charles Goodwin, Committee Co-Chair

Sung-Ock Shin Sohn, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2016

To my family

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Repetition in Various Interactional Contexts	3
1.2 Repetition in Question-Answer Sequences and Other Responsive Turns	7
CHAPTER 2: DATA AND METHODOLOGY	13
2.1 Data	13
2.2 Transcription	13
2.3 Methodology	14
CHAPTER 3: “MINIMAL REPEATS” IN AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES	18
3.1 Requests for Confirmation	18
3.2 Formal Distinction among Repetitional Responses	23
3.3 Minimal Repeats	24
3.3.1 Minimal Repeats in Response to Negative Questions	27
3.3.2 Minimal Repeats in Response to Positive Questions	44
3.3.2.1 Predicate Repeats	44
3.3.2.2 Noun Phrase Repeats	58
3.4 Discussion	71
CHAPTER 4: “NON-MINIMAL REPEATS” IN AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES	74
4.1 Non-minimal Repeats Projecting Further Informing	75
4.2 Non-minimal Repeats and Speaker Stance	84
4.3 Use of Connectives in Non-minimal Repeats	96
4.4 Discussion	106
CHAPTER 5: REPETITION IN DISAFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES	110
5.1 Outright Disconfirmation with a Reversely Polarized Predicate Repeat	110
5.2 Repetition with a Contrastive Connective <i>-(nu)ntey</i>	123
5.2.1 [Repeat- <i>(nu)ntey</i>] Format	124
5.2.2 [Repeat with reversed polarity- <i>(nu)ntey</i>] Format	130
5.3 Repetition with Negation	136
5.4 Discussion	142
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	145
6.1 Summary of Findings	145
6.2 Implications of the Study	147
6.2.1 Interplay of Form and Function	147

6.2.2 Type Conformity	148
6.3 Suggestions for Future Research	149
APPENDIX A.....	151
APPENDIX B	152
REFERENCES	153

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without enormous help from the following people. My deepest gratitude goes to all of my committee members, Professor Charles Goodwin, Professor Hongyin Tao, and Professor Olga Yokoyama. Thank you so much for guiding me for the past years and giving me precious feedback on my academic work, including my dissertation proposal and drafts.

I cannot thank Professor Sung-Ock Sohn enough for all her support and encouragement throughout my years in the graduate program. I am so blessed to have you as my advisor and my mentor. This dissertation would literally not be present without your help and prayers.

I would also like to thank Pastor Soon and Dr. Jane Choi for supporting me and cheering for me during the time I was writing this dissertation. I have learned what caring for others truly means through your examples.

My friends have also helped in various ways, by offering food (my favorite!), praying for me, proofreading my drafts, and most importantly, making me laugh. My graduate life would have been much more difficult without your presence. I was hesitant to list my friends here in fear of missing some of them, but I would like to express my gratitude to: Eunyoung Bae, Jihyeon Cha, Jung Yun Choi, Minie Choi, Kyoungmi Ha, Bahiyyih Hardacre, Yunkyung Heo, Don Lee, Heeju Lee, Seunggon Jeong, Jaehyun Jo, Hyeri Kim, Hyunyoung Kim, Jinhee Lee, Yumi Lee, Jon Tancinco, and Eunkyung Yi.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my family, who supported me, guided me, and cheered for me from the very beginning. Thank you for always believing in me.

I thank God for walking with me through this journey.

VITA

2004 B.A., English Language and Literature
B.B.A., Business Administration
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea

2004-2006 Teaching Assistant
Department of English Language and Literature
Seoul National University

2006 M.A., English Linguistics
Seoul National University
Seoul, Korea

2008-2009 Teaching Associate
Department of Applied Linguistics and TESL
University of California, Los Angeles

2009-2011 Instructional Technology Consultant
Center for Digital Humanities
University of California, Los Angeles

2011-2012 Senior Instructional Technology Consultant
Center for Digital Humanities
University of California, Los Angeles

2012-2013 Test of Oral Proficiency Assistant Coordinator
Office of Instructional Development
University of California, Los Angeles

2013 Certificate in TESFL
University of California, Los Angeles

2013-2014 Test of Oral Proficiency Coordinator
Office of Instructional Development
University of California, Los Angeles

2014 Teaching Fellow
Department of Writing Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

2014 Teaching Fellow
Department of Applied Linguistics
University of California, Los Angeles

2013-2015	Graduate Student Researcher UCLA Language Alliance University of California, Los Angeles
2015	Adjunct Professor Department of Modern Languages and Cultures Santa Monica College, Santa Monica
2015-2016	Teaching Fellow Department of Asian Languages and Cultures University of California, Los Angeles

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- Kim, S. Y. (2005). English non-native speakers' use of *but* in conversation. *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 4, 1-21.
- Kim, S. Y. (March, 2007). The interactional use of *but* in nonnative speaker English conversation. Paper presented at the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Honolulu, HI.
- Kim, S. Y. (April, 2007). The interactional use of *But* in advanced-level and intermediate-level nonnative speaker English conversation. Paper presented at the Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Costa Mesa, CA.
- Kim, S. Y. (October, 2009). Emergent patterns of conjunctive adverbial *though* in academic spoken English: A corpus-based study. Paper presented at the Conference of the American Association for Corpus Linguistics, Edmonton, Canada.
- Kim, S. Y. (July, 2010). Conjunctive adverbial *though* in academic spoken English: A corpus-based study. Paper presented at the International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, Kobe, Japan.
- Kim, S. Y. (March, 2014). Designing an advanced-level Korean heritage language class with service-learning opportunities at Korean community centers. Paper presented at the International Conference on Heritage/Community Languages, Los Angeles, CA.
- Kim, S. Y. (April, 2014). The use of possessive pronouns in Korean person reference: The case of the first-person plural possessive pronoun *wuli* in family member reference. Paper presented at the Workshop on East Asian Linguistics, Los Angeles, CA.
- Kim, S. Y. & Sohn, S.-O. (June, 2015). The effects and challenges of incorporating service-learning into a Korean language program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Korean, Monterey, CA.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Repetition is prevalent in language use. Some repetitions are done intentionally. Poetry, for example, often contains intentional repetitions. Some are done without intention, or without much preplanning. Even if the scope of the phenomenon is confined to conversation, on which this dissertation is focused, repetition can occur in diverse environments. For instance, one may repeat him/herself, or others; one may repeat to provide a response, or to elicit a response (e.g., to initiate a repair); one may repeat what came immediately before the turn, or what was said earlier in the conversation; one may repeat verbatim, or with variations.

Repetition has thus attracted the attention of researchers for a long time in various disciplines, such as linguistics, literary theory, anthropology, and communications (Johnstone, 1987; H. Kim, 2002). What is fundamentally intriguing about repetition is that it is often redundant and repetitive from a formal semantic point of view, and yet, is utilized with great frequency in a variety of contexts and types of discourse. Although, for some researchers and fields of study, there was once a view that repetition was an outcome of unsophisticated and inarticulate speech (Shimanoff & Brunak, 1977; Cf. Ochs & Schieffelin, 1983), a more recent line of studies concur with the perspective that repetition is systematic and functional (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Johnstone, 1987; Norrick, 1987; Tannen, 2007; Stivers, 2005). This dissertation is also an attempt to find the orderliness underlying repetition that occurs in a specific sequential environment and position. Specifically, this study has its focus on repetitional responses in Korean conversation that are mobilized in response to yes/no polar questions.

What needs to precede an inquiry about response turns is an understanding of question turns. Questions have long been understood as a vehicle for actions, such as eliciting information, suggesting, inviting, requesting, and complaining (De Ruiter, 2012; Enfield, Stivers, & Levinson, 2010; Goody, 1978; Steensig & Drew, 2008). Questions also impose terms, constraints, and agendas on question recipients (Hayano, 2013; Heritage, 2003, 2010). Following this line of thought, responses are then also taken as an action through which question recipients can display their acceptance of or resistance to the terms of questions. This dissertation thus seeks to find what actions are achieved through repetitional responses and how the forms of repetition interplay with those actions.

Although research on repetitional responses, and responsive turns in general, is ever growing (Bolden, 2009; Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; S. Lee, 2013; Stivers, 2005), no research has yet been done to systematically examine repetitional responses in Korean conversation. Research on responsive turns in Korean conversation has so far concentrated on turn-initial tokens (H.R.S. Kim, 2013; S. Kim, 2015), particles (M. Kim, 2013), and non-repetitional affirmative responses (S. Lee, 2015). Therefore, by examining ways in which repetition comes into play in responsive turns, this dissertation aims at demonstrating 1) the systematicity underlying the deployment of repetitional responses in Korean question-answer sequences, 2) the relationship between the forms and functions of repetitional responses, and 3) the interactional functions of repetition as a resource for question recipients to display their understanding and orientation vis-à-vis the prior question.

This dissertation is organized as follows. Chapter 1 covers introduction and literature review on the topic of repetition. The use of repetition in various contexts, such as repair sequences, oppositional contexts, and storytelling sequences, will be reviewed first. The second

half of the literature review will present the studies on repetition in responsive turns. Chapter 2 introduces the data and methodology of this dissertation. The analytical framework of this dissertation, conversation analysis, will be reviewed with special attention to the concepts that are most relevant to this dissertation. Chapter 3 is the first analysis chapter, which examines affirmative responses deployed in a minimal-repeat form. The distinction between minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats will be introduced, with further categorization within minimal repeats. Chapter 4 examines affirmative responses in a non-minimal repeat form. In general, non-minimal repeats are deployed to achieve more than just confirming. The relationship between the non-minimal forms and the extra actions embedded in them will be discussed. Chapter 5 focuses on repetitional responses provided for disconfirmation. In addition to disconfirmation given in a minimal repeat form, an expanded response forms will be discussed with special reference to the accompanying grammatical structures. Chapter 6 is a conclusion with the summary and implications of the findings.

1.1 Repetition in Various Interactional Contexts

In ordinary conversation, repetition occurs frequently in a variety of discursive contexts; however, it is not always viewed favorably on an intuitive level. Pointing out the conventional wisdom that repetition is considered undesirable in conversation, Tannen (2007) writes:

“You’re only repeating yourself” can only be heard as a criticism. One cannot say, “Wait a minute, I haven’t repeated myself yet,” as one can say, “Wait a minute, I haven’t finished what I started to say.” (p. 62)

From a purely propositional point of view or in the layman’s intuitive conception, repetition is indeed redundant. Shimanoff and Brunak (1977), for example, call repetition used for self-repair “redundant repetitions” (p. 132) because they do not add to, or further clarify, the propositional

content. As opposed to redundant repetitions, “non-redundant repetitions” (Shimanoff & Brunak, 1977, p. 133) have poetic or rhetorical effects, such as giving emphasis.

The contradiction between the seemingly redundant nature of repetition and its prevalence in discourse and texts has attracted researchers from various disciplines (Johnstone, 1987; H. Kim, 2002; Tannen, 2007). For instance, the poetic and rhetorical effects of repetition just mentioned have a long history of research in literary theories and poetics (Jakobson, 1966; Kiparsky, 1973; Levin, 1973). Repetition is also known to play a key part in child discourse and/or language acquisition (Brown, 1998; M. Goodwin, 1990, 2006; Keenan, 1977; Köymen & Kyratzis, 2014), and language pedagogy (Larsen-Freeman, 2012).

As one of the earliest studies on repetition in conversation, Tannen (1987) provides a good overview of the phenomenon. She claims that repetition facilitates conversation in four dimensions: production, comprehension, connection, and interaction. By reusing what has been uttered before, rather than constantly formulating the talk with novel expressions, repetition reduces processing efforts for both production and comprehension. It is also a connective device serving a “referential and tying function” (Tannen, 1987, p. 583). On an interactional level, repetition is used for various purposes, including managing the floor, displaying listenership or providing response, and creating or reacting to certain effects, such as humor and persuasion. Tannen (1987) concludes that repetition, as a whole, creates “interpersonal involvement” by “[providing] a resource to keep talk going—where talk itself is a show of involvement, of willingness to interact, to serve positive face” (p. 584). Because her research touches upon a wide range of repetitions in terms of form and context, the conception of interpersonal involvement, which she proposes as the overarching purpose of repetition in conversation, is quite broadly defined.

While Tannen provides an overall picture of repetitious utterances in conversation, other researchers narrow down their focus to specific forms, functions, or contexts of repetition. Repair sequences are one of the environments that are characterized by frequent occurrences of repetition (H. Kim, 2002; Schegloff, 1987; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sack, 1977; Selting, 1996; Sorjonen, 1996). It can be used in self-repair (Reiger, 2003; Schegloff, 1987) or as a repair initiator by others (Selting, 1996; Schegloff et al., 1977), as shown below respectively:

(1) Repetition as self-repair (Reiger, 2003, p. 60, underlines in original)

Lauren: I mean as thirty-one thirty-two that's that's about that's
about how old people are these days when they get their
first assistant professor job

(2) Repetition as a repair-initiator by others (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 368)

1 A: Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an' Fridays
2 I'm home by one ten.
3 B: -> One ten?
4 A: Two o'clock. My class ends one ten.

By examining English-German bilinguals' use of repetition for self-repair, Rieger (2003) finds that the grammatical structures chosen for self-repair differ between English and German. Given these findings, she concludes that "repetition as a self-repair strategy is a very orderly phenomenon" (Rieger, 2003, p. 68). Research on repetition as a repair initiator has also found regularities, for example, in regards to the relationship between the prosody of repetition and its function (Selting, 1996).

The use of repetition has also been observed in disagreement contexts (M. Goodwin, 1990, 2006; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Pomerantz, 1984). Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) argue that repetition in opposition differs from that in repair sequences with reference to both turn construction and accompanying prosody. Speakers of repair-initiating repetition often let the

prior speaker (i.e., speaker of the trouble source) take the next turn to amend his/her own utterance, and such repetition is also produced with a tentative, rising intonation (e.g., Excerpt 2). On the contrary, oppositional repetition is “immediately followed by further talk that explicitly opposes what prior speaker said” and is spoken with “distinctive contours that not only focus attention on the trouble as trouble, but also call into question the competence of the party who produced such an object” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987, p. 208). Excerpt 3 illustrates a case in point, taken from the context of children’s arguing.

(3) Repetition in opposition (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987, p. 207, italics in original)

((The girls are trying to trick the boys into believing that they have found some frogs.))
Pam: We found a frog.
Chopper: A *frog*, y’all did not.

As another use of repetition in disagreement contexts, Pomerantz (1984) notices partial repeats as one of the prevalent components in the speaker’s disagreement with the other party’s self-deprecation, as shown in Excerpt 4.

(4) Repetition in disagreement with self-deprecation (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 83)

B: ... I’m tryina get slim.
A: -> Ye:ah? [You get slim, my heavens.
B: [heh heh heh heh hh hh
A: -> You don’t need to get any slimah,

Repetition in conversation is also found in storytelling sequences (Norrick, 1987; Shimanoff & Brunak, 1977; Wong, 2000). Revisiting Shimanoff and Brunak’s (1977) notion of “verbal brackets” and Norrick’s (1987) “repair repeat,” Wong (2000) examines the use of repetition in storytelling sequences. Excerpt 5 is an example taken from her article, in which the

word ‘immediately’ is repeated in such a way that it marks the beginning and the end of a parenthetical remark.

(5) Repetition in storytelling (Wong, 2000, p. 414)

C: the guy who brought them ba:ck, knew exa:ctly (.) he and
-> I went out immediately while David sort of sprawled on the
-> bed (0.5) immediately and got three different things that
they: al:ways use: when they’re sick which is, quite often
I think. An’ he went to the pharmacy, [knew just what to ask=
W: [They get sick too:
C: =for:

In Wong’s (2000) terms, the “first and second sayings” of the same element (e.g., the word ‘immediately’ in Excerpt 5) comprise a turn structure of “first saying + insertion + second saying” (p. 415). She argues that repetition in such an environment, i.e., the second saying, is a resource for the speaker to signal the resumption of self-interrupted storytelling. In that sense, repetition in storytelling can be considered an oral counterpart to the connective devices in writing, such as *and*, *but*, and *or*, which “create conjunctive or cohesive relations” (p. 416). This function of repetition as a discourse-cohesive device is repeatedly mentioned elsewhere as well (Norricks, 1987; Ochs, 1979; Tannen, 2007).

Previous studies reviewed thus far illustrate diverse contexts in which repetition figures in the midst of ordinary conversation. That is, repetition can be used as a self-repair, a repair initiator, an indication of disagreement, and a discourse-cohesive device. This of course is not an exhaustive list, neither for the context of repetition nor for its functions. The next section will review another set of studies that have focused on confirmation-granting repetitional responses in various sequences, including question-answer sequences.

1.2 Repetition in Question-Answer Sequences and Other Responsive Turns

Repetitional responses in question-answer sequences have been examined most rigorously in the field of conversation analysis (henceforth, CA). In CA, questions are seen as imposing terms and constraints on question recipients (Raymond, 2003). For instance, by asking yes/no polar questions, questioners impose a grammatical constraint on respondents to answer the question in ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ Respondents, in turn, may or may not abide by the terms and constraints of the questions imposed on them. By providing yes/no answers in response to polar questions (i.e., type-conforming responses), the respondents not only answer the questions, but also show their acceptance of the terms and constraints of the questions. Contrarily, by responding polar questions with some other forms than ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (i.e., non-type-conforming responses), the respondents may still answer the questions, but simultaneously indicate their resistance to accepting the terms of questions (Raymond, 2003).

Repetitional responses have also been analyzed in this vein; they answer questions but resist simply accepting the terms of questions. Excerpt 6 illustrates a repetitional response to a polar question, in which a physician asks a patient if he can access her computerized records.

(6) Repetition in response to a polar question (Heritage & Raymond, 2012, p. 182)

```
1 Doc: Miss:uz Robinson.
2 Pat: Yes.
3 Doc: Ri:ght. >Can I< jus' put you on the machi:ne?
4 Pat: -> You ca:n.
```

Heritage and Raymond (2012) argue that the primary function of repetitional responses is to “assert the respondent’s epistemic and social entitlement in regard to the matter being addressed” (p. 185). Therefore, in Excerpt 6, the patient’s repetitional response implicitly exerts her right to reject the request. The somewhat ritualized response “I do” by brides and grooms in a wedding ceremony also “imparts an element of agency to the assent that would otherwise be lacking in a

more pallid ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response” (Heritage & Raymond, 2012, p. 187). Heritage and Raymond (2012) summarize the characteristics of repetitional responses as follows:

While these repetitive responses remain indexically tied to the questions to which they respond, they differ from straightforward anaphoric yes/no responses. Specifically, they resist the field of constraint exerted by the question in three respects: (i) they modify the terms of the question by confirming, rather than simply affirming, the propositional content of the prior yes/no question, (ii) they exert agency with respect to those terms, asserting more authoritative rights over the information at issue, than the questioner had already conceded through the design of the question, and (iii) relative to yes/no responses, they are associated with sequence expansion. (p. 186)

Schegloff (1996) also demonstrates the confirmation-granting function of repetitional responses. His study focuses on a specific sequential environment in which a speaker (A) makes an inference from the interlocutor’s (B) prior statement and B confirms the inference by repeating A’s utterance.¹ Excerpt 7 and the following analysis were taken from Schegloff (1996). Rita tries to recall a name of a place (line 2), and finally remembers it with her husband’s help in lines 3 and 5.

(7) Repetition for confirmation (Schegloff, 1996, p. 182)

```
1 Rita: ...y'know we: went to the mo:vies.=
2 =We went to: uh:m. uh to: (m)u(h):
3 What's *the name of ( ) ((off-line))
4 Evelyn: (Sh'beau)?
5 Rita: (** **) (Millbrae) ((off-line))
6 Millbrae.which is over past Burlingame.
7 (0.2)
8 Evelyn: -> Yeah th[at's 'n far away.
9 Rita: [(and-)
10 Rita: => That's far away. And- there were two good movies...
```

In line 6, Rita tells Evelyn the name of the place, Millbrae, and characterizes it as a place “over past Burlingame.” Evelyn then draws an inference from Rita’s statement and reformulates it as

¹ A’s statement may not be formulated as a question grammatically; however, a statement about “B-events,” which refer to events “known to B [hearer], but not to A [the speaker],” makes B’s confirmation relevant for the next turn (Labov & Fanshel, 1977, p. 100).

“far away” (->). In line 10, Rita confirms Evelyn’s inference with a repetitive response (=>). Schegloff (1996) emphasizes the import of repetition in this context as follows: “Rita’s repeat of [‘far away’], in contrast to ‘yeah’ or ‘that’s right,’ shows not only agreement with the proposition that Millbrae is in fact ‘far away,’ but that that is what she had been doing—conveying ‘far away-ness’—by the practice that she had employed in her preceding talk” (p. 182). In other words, with a repetitive response, the respondent not only confirms the interlocutor’s utterance, but also claims that s/he had indeed been alluding to what the interlocutor just said explicitly. Therefore, Schegloff’s (1996) findings are in line with Heritage and Raymond’s (2012) analysis that repetitive responses claim the respondent’s entitlement to the matter at issue.

Other studies have made similar claims with reference to repetitive responses deployed in assessment sequences (e.g., Excerpt 8) and assertion sequences (e.g., Excerpt 9; Excerpt 10).

(8) Repetition in assessments (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, p. 24)

1 Mum: Miriam’s going next week,
 2 Les: Ye:s: ye:s:.
 3 (0.4)
 4 Mum: She[’s been in hot water with’er Mum t’day,
 5 Les: [M-
 6 Les: Why::?
 7 Mum: .hh We:ll. (0.2) Uh you know (.) there’s a cr:ize with the
 8 girls now to have (.) a secon:d. (1.1) ring ih- a secon:d
 9 uh earring in on[e ear].
 10 Les: [Oh: it’s very chea:p isn’t it.
 11 Mum: -> It’s very cheap yes’n this is u- this is what Ann said. An’
 12 Ann said (0.3) she- she’ll haf (.) tuh have another. (0.5)
 13 .hh (.) hole in’er ear...((continues story))

(9) Partial repetition in response to an assertion (Stivers, 2005, p. 140)

1 LAN: This’s smelling goo:d I might start eating raw meat,
 2 (0.2)
 3 JUD: S::ee:?
 4 (1.0)
 5 LAN: Yeah but I’m not [that weird.]
 6 GIO: [I th(h)ink] it’s just all the spices.
 7 (0.2)
 8 LAN: -> It is.

(10) Full repetition in response to an assertion (Stivers, 2005, p. 144-145)

1 ROB: Oh I'm such a ^so: gla:d t'have a chat with you cz
2 I ^do want t'know'n I'm en^joying it 'n the children're
3 love[ly.
4 LES: [.tch
5 LES: -> ^Oh yes.=They ^are lovely:: I[h if a little exciteable.
6 ROB: [()]
7 ROB: Th[a:t's w't I thought. I've ^thirty in that roo- I=
8 LES: [Hm:.
9 ROB: =do:. sympathize with you.

Heritage and Raymond (2005) find that, when speakers try to upgrade their epistemic stance in second position assessments, they deploy partial repeats and place it before an agreement token 'yes,' as in Excerpt 8. By doing so, the speakers index their epistemic independence and authority over the matter being assessed. Similarly, in her analysis of repetitional utterances in assertion sequences, Stivers (2005) finds a connection between repetition and the speaker's epistemic claim. Furthermore, She makes a distinction between partial repeats and full repeats. Partial repeats are observed in a sequential position in which the prior speaker overtly downgrades his/her epistemic stance (e.g., "I th(h)ink" in Excerpt 9), whereas full repeats are used when there is no such epistemic downgrade in the prior turn (e.g., Excerpt 10). She thus analyzes full repeats as a device to claim the speaker's epistemic authority in the face of a high epistemic force to compete with. Both of the studies by Heritage and Raymond (2005) and Stivers (2005) speak to the point that participants concern about not only whether they agree, but also on whose terms the agreement is made.

The review of previous work thus far aimed at showing various interactional functions achieved by repetition. Several CA studies on repetitional responses have been overviewed in a little more detail in Section 1.2, as they pertain to the target subject and analyses of this dissertation more closely. The analyses of this study will show that repetitional responses in

Korean conversation share a similar function of granting confirmation as those just reviewed in English examples. It will also be revealed, however, that there are finer distinctions within the category of repetitional responses and that the forms of repetition play a role in making such distinctions.

CHAPTER 2

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data

The data for this dissertation consist of phone conversations and face-to-face interactions among family and friends. The phone conversation data were taken from the CallFriend Korean Speech Corpus, created by the Linguistic Data Consortium in the mid-1990s (henceforth, LDC Corpus). It contains audio-recordings of a total of 100 phone conversations, which took place in the U.S. or Canada mostly between family members and friends. Each conversation lasts for approximately 30 minutes. Additional demographic information of the participants is available in regards to their gender, age, years of education, and hometown. The face-to-face data were personally collected in Korea. The participants include male and female speakers ranging from their mid 20s to late 50s. The recordings of face-to-face interactions were made during three different occasions, a total length of which is approximately five hours.

2.2 Transcription

The data were transcribed following the Jeffersonian transcription conventions (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Jefferson, 2004; see Appendix A for the transcription symbols). Three-line transcription was used for 1) original Korean words rendered in Yale Romanization, 2) morpheme-by-morpheme gloss (see Appendix B for the list of gloss), and 3) English translation. Curly brackets { } in English translation indicate the words that were not overtly spoken in Korean but inserted for smooth translation (e.g., zero anaphora). Square brackets [] in English translation indicate what was overtly marked and conveyed in Korean, but not with the words in

those brackets (e.g., modality marked with modal suffixes). Transcription in Korean was included at the end of each excerpt for the convenience of Korean readers.

2.3 Methodology

This dissertation employed conversation analysis (henceforth, CA) as the analytic framework. CA is a distinctive approach to analyze the systematicity and orderliness of everyday talk, i.e., language as actually used in social interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013; ten Have, 1999). CA arose from sociology in the 1960s and early 1970s and developed into a separate discipline in its own right the last several decades. Along its developmental path, the domains of CA have extended to cover from ordinary conversation to institutional talk such as news interviews, courtroom discourse, and classroom interaction. Thus, the term ‘talk-in-interaction’ is widely used in CA as an encompassing term referring to the full range of speech exchange systems (Markee, 2000; Maynard, 2013).

From a CA perspective, every detail of talk-in-interaction is systematically organized and deeply ordered. Harvey Sacks, one of the founding fathers of CA, has phrased this trait of talk as ‘order at all points.’ The aim of CA-based research is to detect the orderliness of social interaction as it is demonstrated by participants themselves so that the findings can ultimately lead to the construction of “a natural observational science of social life” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 34).

CA maintains strong skepticism toward bringing in any social category or presumed assumption unless it is demonstrably oriented to by the participants. In other words, CA-based research starts from a process of ‘unmotivated looking’ and precludes premature theorization on the analyst’s end. Accordingly, a typical CA paper does not dwell on the articulation, testing, and

revision of preset analytic hypotheses. Instead, conversation analysts work with recordings of naturally occurring interaction and the transcripts made out of those data. When the initial unmotivated looking into the data seems to reveal certain systematic patterns or shared characteristics in the ways in which participants do social interaction, analysts search for a larger collection of similar phenomena (Mondana, 2013).

CA recognizes turn-taking as a basic form of organization for conversation (Clayman, 2013). Turns can be composed of one or more smaller constituents called ‘turn constructional units (TCUs),’ whose types vary between sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical objects. Crookes’ (cited in Markee, 2000) definition of a turn as “one or more streams of speech bounded by speech of another, usually an interlocutor” (p. 82-83) indicates that turn transitions are, in principle, accompanied by speaker changes. The boundaries of TCUs are the legitimate places for speaker transition, thus called ‘transition-relevance place (TRP).’ Normally, the interlocutor recognizes a TRP of the current speaker’s turn and starts the next turn at the TRP. Sometimes the interlocutor’s mere provision of continuers or minimal acknowledgment tokens, such as *mm hm*, at the TRP leads the current speaker to continue the story (Jefferson, 1984). If no participant other than the current speaker self-selects the next speakership at the TRP, the current speaker may choose to continue the turn until the next TRP arrives again (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974).

There are a set of principles and mechanisms that CA finds to operate to an extensive degree in most talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 2007). The first mechanism involves the minimal unit in a sequence organization called ‘adjacency pairs.’ Adjacency pairs refer to “certain classes of utterances [that] conventionally come in pairs” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 39). For example, the utterance of greetings typically comes with return greetings of the interlocutor,

questions with answers, and invitations with acceptances or rejections. Between the two parts in adjacency pairs, the sequence-initiating utterances are referred to as ‘first pair parts,’ e.g., questions, invitations, etc. The following responsive utterances which had become ‘relevant’ by the production of the first pair parts are referred to as ‘second pair parts,’ e.g., answers, acceptances, etc.

The second important notion in relation to sequence organization is ‘preference organization’ (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). The notion of preference is a concept often used to describe two distinctive turn shapes of second pair parts. First pair parts such as invitation and request make two alternative responses possible or relevant in second position, i.e., positive vs. negative responses. It is observed that the two alternative second pair parts are designed in systematically different ways. The positive or ‘preferred’ ones are produced straightforwardly and without delay while the negative or ‘dispreferred’ ones are marked with signals of delay and hesitation (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). This preferred/dispreferred distinction should not be taken as reference to the psychological states of speakers or hearers. Rather, the terms indicate “structural features of the design of turns associated with particular activities, by which participants can draw conventionalized inferences about the kinds of action a turn is performing” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 44).

The last notable mechanism occurring frequently in talk-in-interaction is a sequential organization called ‘repair organization’ (Jefferson, 1974, 1987; Kitzinger, 2013; Schegloff, 1979, 1992, 2000; Schegloff et al., 1977). Repair mechanism allows participants to deal with trouble or problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. If the identification of the ‘trouble source’ leads participants to stop the course of action to address the problem, we see an emergent practice of repair organization. An incipient repair tends to be marked by various

devices including “pauses, silences, sound stretches, cut-offs, and phrases such as ‘you know’ and ‘I mean’” (Markee, 2000, p. 102). In analyzing repair sequences, the distinction between ‘self’ and ‘other’ is made in terms of who initiates the repair and who actually carries out the repair, which results in the classification of repair sequences into four different types: self-initiated self-repair, other-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, and other-initiated other-repair. What is conventionally referred to and understood as ‘correction’ mostly corresponds to the last type of repair, i.e., other-initiated other-repair.

Thus far, some of the key terms and concepts in CA have been introduced. The analyses presented in the following chapters are based on the framework of CA, which essentially views conversation as a sequentially organized structure.

CHAPTER 3

“MINIMAL REPEATS” IN AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES

As the first of the three analysis chapters, this chapter contains several sections. The first section explicates the target sequence of this dissertation, namely, question-answer sequences that request confirmation. The following section introduces the notions of minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats, which is a central distinction repeatedly addressed throughout this dissertation. This chapter concludes with the third section, which examines minimal repeats in affirmative responses. By investigating what the participants choose to repeat when they do repeat (part of) the prior turn for confirmation and what bearing that choice may have on the development of the subsequent sequence, this chapter will demonstrate that repetitional responses are an orderly interactional practice.

3.1 Requests for Confirmation

Questions can be a vehicle for many different actions, such as information-seeking, requests, offers, and assessments (Enfield et al., 2010; Steensig & Drew, 2008). A request for confirmation is one of these actions that can be executed by questions, and it is done when the question speaker has some prior knowledge on the issue being inquired about (Stivers & Enfield, 2010; Yoon, 2010). Below are two examples of confirmation-request questions, taken from Stivers (2010) for English and Yoon (2010) for Korean, respectively:

(1) Confirmation request in English (Stivers, 2010, p. 2777)

Those are shri:mp fajitas ri:ght,

(2) Confirmation request in Korean (Yoon, 2010, p. 2788)

1 Koo: wenlay khu-canh -ayo.
 orginally tall-COM.not-POL
She has been tall since birth, right?

Excerpts 1 and 2 show a parallelism between English and Korean in that both languages use tag questions for confirmation requests. Although tag questions are mostly utilized for confirmation requests,² they are not the only type of question that can execute this action. According to Stivers' (2010) statistical findings from the English data, 33% of the polar questions in her corpus were used for confirmation requests, of which 77% were done through declarative questions, 9% through interrogative questions, and 14% through tags. In a comparative study on Korean conversation, Yoon (2010) found that 41% of the polar questions in her data were used for confirmation requests.³ These findings show the prevalence of the confirmation-request action in question-answer sequences.

My data also confirmed that questions are frequently used for confirmation requests in Korean conversation and that these questions can take different forms. Excerpts 3 through 5 illustrate various question forms mobilized to request confirmation in Korean conversation.

(3) Interrogative form

1 A: way- ku ne- khullep kath-un ke: iss-ci anh-nya?
 DM that you club same-RL thing exist-NOM not.do-Q
-> I mean- aren't there somethi:ng like clubs?

2 mwe extra: activities kath-un ke.
 DM extra activities same-RL thing
Something like extra: activities.

3 (1.0)

4 B: nay-ka mwe yeki w-ase (.) mwe activity ha-myen mwe hay.
 I-NM DM here come-and DM activity do-if what do.INT

² In Stivers' (2010) English data, "[n]early all of the tags in the corpus were used to request confirmation" (p. 2777).

³ Yoon's (2010) research does not provide further classification with respect to the type of each polar question used for confirmation requests (e.g., interrogatives, declaratives, and tags).

What's the point of me doing activities here.

- 1 A: -> 왜- 그 너- 클럽 같은 거: 있지 않냐?
2 뭐 extra: activities 같은 거.
3 (1.0)
4 B: 내가 뭐 여기 와서 (.) 뭐 activity 하면 뭐 해.

(4) Declarative form

- 1 Tay: kulemyen ne talu-n ke-nun ton nay-ko ha-n-ta-ko?
 then you different-RL thing-TC money pay-and do-IN-DC-QT
 -> **Then [you said] you paid for the other one?**
2 Jun: e.
 yes
 Yeah.

- 1 Tay: -> 그러면 너 다른 거는 돈 내고 한다고?
2 Jun: 어.

(5) Tag

- 1 B: incey-nun: wuli (.) atul-to incey-nun (.)kyelhonha-l nai-ka
 now-TC our son-also now-TC marry-PRS age-NM

 tway-ss-unikka
 become-PST-because

 Now: my (.) son has now (.) come of age to get married
2 nay-ka contaymal-ul hay-ya-cyo:.
 I-NM honorific.speech-AC do-must-COM.POL
 -> **so I should use honorific speech {to you}, right.**
3 (0.8)
4 B: kuleh-cyo?
 be.so-COM.POL
 -> **{That} is so, right? [= Shouldn't I?]**
5 A: ani-yo?
 no-POL
 No?
- 1 B: 인제는: 우리 (.) 아들도 인제는 (.) 결혼할 나이가 됐으니까
2 -> 내가 존대말을 해야죠:..
3 (0.8)
4 B: -> 그렇죠?
5 A: 아니요?

In Excerpt 3, A requests B for confirmation concerning whether there are student clubs or extra(curricular) activities available in B's school. A's question in line 1 (*khullep kathun ke: issci anhnya?* "isn't there something like clubs?") is formulated with an interrogative ender *nya*, which is one of the several interrogative sentence enders available in Korean, such as *-na*, *-(nu)-nya*, *-ni*, *-nka*, and *-kka* (H. Sohn, 1999; Yoon, 2010). A's question is also formulated as a negatively polarized question using post-verbal negation [predicate + *-ci anh*].⁴ Korean has two types of negation: pre-verbal negation [negative adverb *an* + predicate] and post-verbal negation [predicate + *-ci anh*]. Previous research has shown that the epistemic force of the questioner is stronger when a negative question is formulated with post-verbal negation than with pre-verbal negation (J. Park, 2008; Y. Park, 2009).⁵ In other words, the speaker of a post-verbal negative question, such as A in Excerpt 3, is likely to have some knowledge of the matter inquired about. This makes the question heard as a request for confirmation rather than a request for new information.

In Excerpt 4, Tay's request for confirmation in line 1 (*kulemyen ne talun kenun ton nayko hantako?* "Then {you said} you paid for the other one?") ends with a quotative particle *-ko* in a rising intonation. The particle *-ko* is traditionally classified as a complementizer connecting a quotation clause to the main verb; however, it has been grammaticalized into an utterance-final particle with the main verb omitted (S. Sohn, 2015). Thus, although Tay's question in Excerpt 4 does not contain the main verb of 'saying,' the quotative particle *-ko* still indicates that Tay has

⁴ Post-verbal negation is also called "long-form negation" or "periphrastic negation" (H. Sohn, 1999, p. 388).

⁵ With respect to the questioner's relative epistemic force conveyed through the question form, Y. Park (2009) compares the difference between post-verbal negative questions and pre-verbal negative questions in Korean to the difference between negative interrogative questions and negative declarative questions in English. For instance, the speaker of "Doesn't your stomach hurt?" (or a post-verbal negative question in Korean) is more likely to be in a knowing position (K+) with regard to the matter at issue than the speaker of "Your stomach doesn't hurt?" (or a pre-verbal negative question in Korean).

prior knowledge about the matter by having been told about it previously. In addition, the rising intonation at the end makes a response relevant (Stivers & Rossano, 2010), turning the utterance into a request for confirmation. As Yoon (2010) points out, declarative endings with a rising intonation are more frequently deployed in making questions in Korean than overt interrogative endings. My data also show a large number of declarative questions like Excerpt 4, which miss overt interrogative endings but have either declarative endings or final particles with a rising intonation.⁶

Excerpt 5, along with Excerpt 2, shows examples of tag questions used for a request for confirmation. The two excerpts, however, illustrate two different types of tag questions in Korean: a stand-alone tag *kulehci* and a “pseudo-tag question” with a suffix *-ci* or *-canh-* (Suh, 2006; Yoon 2010; Yun & Lee, 2007). A stand-alone tag question *kulehci* is comprised of a pro-predicate *kuleha-* ‘be/do so’ and a committal suffix *-ci* (H. Sohn, 1999; Yoon, 2010). It is appended to the end of a statement and makes a form of [statement + tag], similar to tag questions in English.⁷ A pseudo-tag question has a committal suffix *-ci* or its negative version *-canh-* agglutinated to the predicate of the main statement, leaving a single clause as a result, not two (e.g., [statement-*ci*] or [statement-*canh-*]). Both *-ci* and *-canh-* convey the speaker’s belief that the proposition is true, with *-canh-* indexing an even stronger belief than *-ci* (H. Lee, 1999; Kawanish, 1994; Kawanish & Sohn, 1993).⁸ As such, both markers are frequently used for pseudo-tag questions in Korean, seeking confirmation or agreement from the interlocutor. Koo’s

⁶ To reflect the ending used in a Korean question (e.g., interrogative vs. declarative endings), questions with declarative endings were translated as declarative questions in English (e.g., “You left?”), whereas questions with interrogative endings were translated as interrogative questions with subject-verb inversion (e.g., “Did you leave?”).

⁷ The difference between *kulehci* and English tag questions is that *kulehci* does not change its polarity based on the polarity of the preceding statement as the English tag questions do (Yoon, 2010).

⁸ Grammatically, *-canh-* is a negative form of *-ci*: the committal suffix *-ci* + negation verb stem *anh-* > *-canh-* (H. Sohn, 1999; S. Sohn, 2010). However, their functional difference does not lie in the positive/negative polarity, but in the degree of the speaker’s commitment to the proposition (Kawanish, 1994; Kawanish & Sohn, 1993).

utterance in Excerpt 2 and B's first turn in Excerpt 5 (lines 1-2) are examples of the pseudo-tag question, using *-canh-* and *-ci*, respectively. In excerpt 5, as there is no uptake from A in response to B's first request for confirmation (e.g., the 0.8-second pause in line 3), B adds a tag question (*kulehcyo?* “{That} is so, right?”) to pursue a response.

As illustrated so far, polar questions in various forms are used for a request for confirmation in Korean. Despite the variations in the question formats, they all make either a ‘yes’ or a ‘no’ answer relevant for the response. In English, the most researched language with respect to question-answer sequences, it has been observed that type-conforming answers, such as ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ are the most preferred responses to polar questions (Raymond, 2003). Other forms of responses, including repetitional responses, are mobilized to execute certain actions beyond affirming or disaffirming the questions. As introduced in Section 1.2, previous studies show that repetitional responses in English grant confirmation beyond affirmation (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Raymond, 2003; Schegloff, 1996) and exert the respondent's agency and epistemic primacy over the issue at hand (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Stivers, 2005). In the remainder of this chapter, I will examine repetitional responses in Korean conversation with a special focus on what I call “minimal repeats.” To do so, the distinction between minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats needs to be explicated first.

3.2 Formal Distinction among Repetitional Responses

My data reveal that repetitional responses can be largely divided into minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats with reference to their form.⁹ By minimal repeats, I refer to a type of repeats in which further omission of any part would make the turn unnatural or incomprehensible.

⁹ A similar distinction is made with English data in Stivers (2005), in which she classifies repeats after assertion into partial repeats and full repeats. Partial repeats refer to anaphoric repeats “with stress on the copula/auxiliary” as in “It is” or “It does” (Stivers, 2005, p. 139) whereas full repeats “reproduce” the initial claim (Stivers, 2005, p. 144).

In other words, each element in minimal repeats is essential for the turn to be taken as a repeat and cannot be omitted. Minimal repeats are further subdivided into predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats, which will be described in more detail shortly. Non-minimal repeats, on the other hand, carry some “extra” elements that can be omitted further, in the sense that the remaining turn would still be comprehensible and conceivable as a repeat.

When repetition occurs in affirmative answers to confirmation requests, it can be in either form, a minimal repeat or a non-minimal repeat; however, the choice does not seem to be random. Several patterns are recurrently observed as follows: 1) minimal repeats in response to confirmation requests do not promote sequence expansion in general; 2) negative questions are frequently responded with minimal repeats, especially predicate repeats; 3) minimal repeats in response to positive questions vary more widely in type, including noun phrase repeats, predicate repeats, or predicate repeats with modified endings; 4) non-minimal repeats tend to project turn and/or sequence expansion. The rest of this chapter focuses on minimal repeats. Non-minimal repeats will be examined in Chapter 4.

3.3 Minimal Repeats

As briefly mentioned above, minimal repeats in Korean have roughly two subtypes: predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats.¹⁰ Excerpt 6 exemplifies a predicate repeat:

(6) Predicate repeat

- 1 Hoo: ani- ssu-nun tey-ka iss-e?
 no write-RL place-NM exist-INT
 No- there is a place to write {it} {on the form}?
- 2 Dan: e iss-e.

¹⁰ In theory the sub-categorization into predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats could also be applied to non-minimal repeats; however, the subdivision seem less relevant for non-minimal repeats because most of them are in full sentence form, i.e., it is difficult to determine if the repeat is predicate-centered or non-predicate-centered.

yes exist-INT
-> **Yeah there is.**

1 Hoo: 아니- 쓰는 데가 있어?
2 Dan: -> 어 있어.

In line 2, Dan responds to Hoo's request for confirmation by repeating the predicate *isse* "there is." Repeating a predicate is one of the three ways to replace a predicate with a pro-term in Korean (H. Sohn, 1999).¹¹ In some cases, other elements tightly associated with the predicate need to be repeated along with the predicate in order for the response to sound natural. See Excerpts 7 and 8 for example:

(7) Predicate repeat with a modifying adverbial

1 Ken: cal iss-e?
 well exist-INT
 You're doing well?

2 Yun: e. cal iss- cal iss-nun- e. cal i(h)ss-nu(h)ntey(hh),
 yes well exist well exist yes well exist-CIRCUM
 -> **Yeah. {I'm} doing we- {I'm} doing well bu- Yeah. {I'm} doing**
 we(h)ll bu(hh)t,

1 Ken: 잘 있어?
2 Yun: -> 어. 잘 있- 잘 있는- 어. 잘 있(ㅎ)는(ㅎ)데(ㅎㅎ),

(8) Predicate repeat with a tightly associated subject

1 Suh: kam-i o-nya?
 sense-NM come-Q
 Does {that} make sense?

2 Bak: ung. ung. icyey kam-i o-n-ta.
 yes yes now sense-NM come-IN-DC
 -> **Yeah. Yeah. Now {it} makes sense.**

1 Suh: 감이 오냐?
2 Bak: -> 응. 응. 이제 감이 온다.

¹¹ According to H. Sohn (1999), the other two ways for pro-predicate replacement in Korean are using 1) the anaphoric adjective *kulehta* 'be so' or 2) *hata* 'do, be in the state of' as a pro-predicate. The latter has limited usages.

In Excerpt 7, the adverbial *cal* ‘well’ is repeated along with the predicate *isse* ‘{I} am’ throughout Yun’s self-repairs for several times. As H. Sohn (1999) points out, adverbials modifying a predicate usually survive pro-predicate replacement in Korean. Repeating the predicate only, without *cal*, in Excerpt 7 would alter the implication of the response. Excerpt 8 speaks to a similar point. Here, *kami ota* ‘make sense’ is repeated altogether as a fixed collocation despite the grammatical category of *kami* ‘sense’ being the subject of the predicate *ota* ‘come.’ Omitting *kami* in the response may not be impossible, but is less likely to occur. Therefore, Excerpts 7 and 8 illustrate that certain predicate repeats retain other closely associated elements as well and can still serve as minimal repeats.

The second type of minimal repeats is termed noun phrase repeats. As in predicate repeats, noun phrase repeats do not necessarily contain noun phrases only. A noun phrase may be repeated with other elements, such as particles, suffixes, a copula, or a polite ending. The term “noun phrase repeat” was chosen as more of an umbrella term to note the fact that the predicate is either absent or at least not the core element in this type of repeats. Excerpt 9 shows a canonical example of a noun phrase repeat, and Excerpt 10 is an example of a noun phrase repeat with a particle attached:

(9) Noun phrase repeat: [noun phrase only]

- 1 Han: taum- taum cwu-kwun-yo kuni[kka?
 next next week-APP-POL so
Next- so {it} is next week?
- 2 Sam: [taum cwu.
 next week
 -> **Next week.**
-
- 1 Han: 다음- 다음 주군요 그니[까?
 2 Sam: -> [다음 주.

(10) Noun phrase repeat: [noun phrase + particle]

- 1 Nan: kukka ike-nun incey east panghyang-ulo ka-nun [ke-ci
so this-TOP now east direction-toward go-RL thing-COM
So now this is towards the east, right
- 2 Yul: [e east
yes east
- panghyang-ulo.
direction-toward
- > **Yeah towards the east.**

- 1 Nan: 그까 이거는 인제 east 방향으로 가는 [거지.
2 Yul: -> [어 east 방향으로.

In Excerpt 9, Han requests Sam for confirmation with regard to the week in which a future event of their interest will occur. Sam's response in line 2 repeats the noun phrase *taum cwu* 'next week' only, without any predicate. This is a clear example of a noun phrase repeat, which is also a minimal repeat. In Excerpt 10, Yul has been explaining the directions to her house to Nan, and Nan asks for confirmation in line 1. In response, Yul repeats part of Nan's question in [noun phrase + particle] format (*east panghyangulo* 'towards the east direction'). This type of repeats was categorized as noun phrase repeats in my analyses because the repeat was centered on a noun phrase rather than a predicate.

3.3.1 Minimal Repeats in Response to Negative Questions

Given the distinction between predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats, it has been found that the choice of a minimal repeat varies with the type of the prior question. When a question is given in a positive form, a minimal repeat may occur in various forms as exemplified

in Excerpts 6 through 10; it may be a verbatim predicate repeat (Excerpts 6 and 8), a predicate repeat with a switch in the ending (Excerpt 7), or a noun phrase repeat (Excerpt 9 and 10).

In response to a negative question, however, responses mostly involve a predicate repeat. In addition, subsequent to these predicate repeats in the minimal form, the respondents usually do not expand the sequence any further. See Excerpt 11 for example. Eun has moved to a new neighborhood recently. The excerpt starts with Lia's topic-proffering question to Eun.

(11) New Friends

- 1 Lia: kulay = ne com (.) chinkwu com sakwi-ess-ni?
be.so.INT you little friend little make.friends-PST-Q
Right=did you make some (.) some friends?
- 2 Eun: na[:?
I
Me:?
- 3 Lia: [°ung°
yes
°Yeah°
- 4 Eun: ani::ǂ
no
No::ǂ
- 5 (.)
- 6 Lia: ung?
yes
Huh?
- 7 Eun: ani::ǂ eti ka-se sakwi-e chinkwu-lul.
no where go-and make.friends-INT friend-AC
No::ǂ Where {do I} make friends.
- 8 Lia: °um::° ai ↑kulayto.
uhm no still
°Uhm::° No ↑still.
- 9 Eun: kyohoy? H
church
Church? H
- 10 Lia: kyohoy an naka-ni?
church not go.out-Q
Don't {you} attend church?

11 Eun: an naka.
not go.out-INT
-> **{I} don't attend.**

12 Lia: °ung.°
yes
°Yeah.°

13 (.)

14 Lia: .ts .h ecukkey: Hiyengi-hantey phyenci-ka w-ass-e:ǃ
yesterday PN-from letter-NM come-PST-INT
.ts .h Yesterday: a letter came from Hiyeng:ǃ

1 Lia: 그래=너 줌 (.) 친구 줌 사귀었니?

2 Eun: 나[:?]

3 Lia: [°응°

4 Eun: 아니::ǃ

5 (.)

6 Lia: 응?

7 Eun: 아니::ǃ 어디 가서 사귀어 친구를.

8 Lia: °음::° 아이 ↑그래도.

9 Eun: 교회? H

10 Lia: 교회 안 나가니?

11 Eun: -> 안 나가.

12 Lia: °응.°

13 (.)

14 Lia: .ts .h 어즈께: 희영이한테 편지가 왔어:ǃ

In response to Lia's initial question concerning whether Eun has made some friends in the new neighborhood (line 1), Eun disaffirms it with an elongated negative particle in a slightly rising intonation (line 4). The prosodic tone of Eun's response conveys that Lia's question is asking something obvious. Lia responds back, however, with an "open class repair initiator" in line 6 (*ung?* "Huh?"), possibly indexing the inappropriateness of Eun's prior turn (Drew, 1997). In response, Eun reproduces her disaffirmation almost in the same prosody, and then questions the presupposition of Lia's initial question in a more explicit manner. That is, Lia's question of whether Eun has made new friends presupposes that there are places around Eun's new neighborhood for her to meet new people and make friends. The prosody of the negative particles by Eun indicates that her question in line 7 is rather a negative assertion and a challenge

against Lia's initial question than a genuine request for information (Koshik, 2005). Lia's subsequent turn also treats Eun's question as an assertion, as shown by the fact that Lia rejects the underlying assertion with *ai* 'no' and pursues her initial inquiry with *kulayto* 'still,' rather than taking the question at face value and answering it. Eun then offers a candidate answer to her own question in line 9, but only with a strong puff of air almost as a dismissive snort. Prompted by Eun's candidate answer conveyed in a dismissive tone, Lia requests confirmation in line 10 with a pre-verbal negative question.¹² Eun provides a verbatim predicate repeat in response in line 11. Moreover, there is no attempt from Eun to expand on her confirmatory answer any further. Lia also acknowledges Eun's confirmation in line 12 and proceeds with a topic transition in line 14. This excerpt, therefore, demonstrates a case in which a request for confirmation designed as a negative question is responded with a minimal predicate repeat and that the repeat turn does not get expanded.

Another example is shown in Excerpt 12. Bom, who lives in Philadelphia, calls Yoo in New York, and says that the call is free because she has earned it by participating in a data collection for research. The excerpt starts with a comment from Yoo, who does not know that the free call has to be made within the U.S. or to Canada only.

(12) Free Call

1 Yoo: e:. .h e=iwang-i-myen hankwuk-ulo ha-ci
oh already-be-if Korea-toward do-COM

kule-sy-ess-eyo enni:ǃ
be.so-HON-PST-POL sister

Oh:. .h well=other things being equal {you} should've made {the call} to Koreaǃ

2 Bom: ung?

¹² J. Park (2008) has found that, when the question addresses a negative observation (i.e., a noticing of absence of an event) inferred from the previous talk rather than from the questioner's independent knowledge, the negative question tends to deploy pre-verbal negation, not post-verbal negation.

- yes
Huh?
- 3 Yoo: kongcca-ntey hankwuk-ulo ha-ci.
 free-CIRCUM Korea-toward do-COM
{It's} free, so {you should've} made {the call} to Korea.
- 4 hankwuk-un an toy-n-tay-yo?
 Korea-TOP not work.out-IN-HEARSAY-POL
[They say] {calling to} Korea is not allowed?
- 5 Bom: an toy-n-tay. haha[hah
 not work.out-IN-HEARSAY
 -> **[They say] {it's} not allowed. hahahah**
- 6 Yoo: [a: tto kule-n ke tto pemwi-lo
 EX again be.so-RL thing again limit-as
 cenghay-cwu-na [tto:?
 decide.INF-give-Q again
Ha:h do {they} decide on such thing {for you} as the limit?
- 7 Bom: [.hh
- 8 Yoo: a:i cham:.
 EX EX
Gee:s.
- 9 Bom: <kulay-ss-e[yo:>
 be.so-PST-POL
<{It} was so:>
- 10 Yoo: [enni mwe ha-ko cinay-se-yo?
 sister what do-and spend.time-HON-POL
What are {you} up to {these days}?
-
- 1 Yoo: 어: .h 어=이왕이면 한국으로 하지 그러셨어요 언니:¿
 2 Bom: 응?
 3 Yoo: 공짜데 한국으로 하지.
 4 한국은 안 된대요?
 5 Bom: -> 안 된대. ㅎㅎ [ㅎ
 6 Yoo: [아: 또 그런 거 또 범위로 정해주나 [또:?
 7 Bom: [.hh
 8 Yoo: 아:이 참:.
 9 Bom: <그랬어[요:>
 10 Yoo: [언니 뭐 하고 지내세요?

Based on the assumption that the free call Bom has earned would have no toll restriction

(*iwangimyen* ‘other things being equal’), Yoo reproaches Bom in line 1 for not having used the

free call for a call to Korea. As Bom responds with repair initiation in line 2, Yoo renews the reproach in line 3, but this time with her assumption more explicitly expressed: *kongccantey* “{It’s} free.” Then, in line 4, Yoo withdraws her assumption in such a way that she overturns it into a request for confirmation (*hankwukun an toyntayyo?* “[They say] {calling to} Korea is not allowed?”). Note that the confirmation request is done with a negative question. In response, Bom provides confirmation in line 5 with a minimal repeat in a predicate repeat form. Her confirmation is then followed by laughter presumably because she finds it funny that she had already tried to be “smart” with the free call and Yoo is thinking just the same. Despite Yoo’s subsequent sarcastic comment (line 6) and sighing exclamations (line 8), however, Bom does not pursue the topic any further, but proceeds to close the sequence in line 9. Yoo also aligns with Bom’s sequence-closing move and makes a topic transition in line 10. This excerpt then illustrates the same pattern as Excerpt 11: 1) a confirmation request made in a negative question is responded with a minimal predicate repeat, and 2) the respondent does not expand the sequence further.

Excerpt 13 is another example of a predicate repeat in response to a negative question. This excerpt was chosen to show a clear contrast with Excerpt 14, which is an example of a non-minimal repeat in response to a negative question. In Excerpt 13, Sil got a bob haircut and is describing to Lim what her new hairstyle looks like.

(13) Haircut

1 Sil: ikhey kwi-lo nemki-myen-un
 like.this ear-toward pass-if-TOP

 kunyang syoskhesthu-ha-n ke kathi kul-ay.
 just short.cut-do-RL thing same be.so-INT

If {I} tuck {my bangs} behind the ears like this, {it looks} just like a short cut.

2 Lim: ung:.
yes
Yeah:.

3 (0.2)

4 Lim: phama-nun: an ha-ko?
perm-TOP not do-and
And {you} didn't get a perm?

5 Sil: an ha-ko.
not do-and
-> And {I} didn't get.

6 Lim: °ung:..° elma cw-ess-e? kulayse?
yes how.much give-PST-INT so
°Yeah:..° How much did {you} pay? So?

1 Sil: 이케 귀로 넘기면은 그냥 숏컷트한 거 같이 그래.

2 Lim: 응:.

3 (0.2)

4 Lim: 파마는: 안 하고?

5 Sil: -> 안 하고.

6 Lim: °응:..° 얼마 줬어? 그래서?

The sequence in point is in lines 4 through 5. Once Sil has finished describing her new hairstyle in line 1, Lim provides an acknowledgment token in line 2 and makes a request for confirmation in line 4 concerning whether Sil did not get a perm. Line 4 is taken as a confirmation request because Sil had previously mentioned that she considered getting a haircut or a perm. Her encounter with an acquaintance, who had got a haircut, led her to choose a haircut as well. She then ended up getting quite a short haircut as described in line 1. Therefore, based on Sil's prior telling, Lim can infer that Sil has chosen not to get a perm, which Lim tries to confirm in line 4. As in the previous two excerpts, the question is again formulated as a pre-verbal negative question, and the response as a verbatim predicate repeat. Furthermore, neither of the participants expands the sequence or topic beyond the [negative question – minimal predicate repeat] sequence.

Excerpt 13 compares well with Excerpt 14 below. Sam has been talking about her son having joined a basketball team at school.

(14) Taekwondo

- 1 Sam: cal hay-se com [ikhey (.) ko(h)l-to co(h)m
well do-and little like.this goal-also little

[manhi neh-ko, hahahahah
much score-and

{He should} play well and (.) sco(h)re many go(h)als, hahahahah
- 2 Han: [hahah
[hahahahahah
- 3 Sam: .hh hay-ya toy-nuntey(h) [mwe kulenikkan com (.)
do-must become-CIRCUM DM so little

[so(h)ksa(h)ngha-ci (hahahah) .
upset-COM

**.hh {he} should do {that} bu(h)t- Well so {I'm} a little (.)
upset (hahahah) .**
- 4 Han: [hahah
[hahahahah
- 5 Han: .hhh a:yu::
EX
.hhh we::ll
- 6 Sam: .hhh=
- 7 Han: =thaykwento-nun icyey an ha-ko-yo?
Taekwondo-TOP now not do-and-POL
=And {he} doesn't take Taekwondo now?
- 8 Sam: .h thaykwento-nun an hay-ko.=thaykwento-nun
Taekwondo-TOP not do-and Taekwondo-TOP

com te iss-taka
little more exist-TRANS

**-> .h And {he} doesn't take Taekwondo.=As for Taekwondo, a little
later**
- 9 (.) han- (.) kotunghakkyo ttay-ccum: tway-se-
about high.school time-about become-and
(.) about- (.) around when {he goes to} high school-
- 10 Han: um..
yes

Yea:h.

11 Sam: kulssey:, han pen (.) hay po-l-kka kule-nuntey,
DM one time do.INF see-PRS-Q be.so-CIRCUM
We:ll, {I'm} thinking of giving a try,

12 Han: [°um.°
yes
°Yes.°

13 Sam: [.h (.) thaykwento ha-te-n ke-nikka kyeysok
Taekwondo do-RT-RL thing-because continuously

sikhi-l ke- sikil-lako sayngkak-un hay-yo:.
make-PRS thing make-intention think-TOP do-POL

.h (.) Since Taekwondo is what {he had} been taking, {I'll} keep on hav- {I'm} thinking of having {him take it again}.

15 Han: kulay-yo. kukey coh-tay-yo:.
be.so-POL that.NM good-HEARSAY-POL
Right. [They say] that's goo:d.

16 Sam: ung.
yes
Yeah.

1 Sam: 잘 해서 좀 [이케 (.) 골(ㅎ)도 좀(ㅎ) [많이 넣고, ㅎㅎㅎ
2 Han: [ㅎㅎ [ㅎㅎㅎㅎ
3 Sam: .hh 해야 되는데(ㅎ) [뭐 그러니깐 좀 (.) [속(ㅎ)상(ㅎ)하지(ㅎㅎㅎ).
4 Han: [ㅎㅎ [ㅎㅎㅎ
5 Han: .hhh 아:유:.
6 Sam: .hhh=
7 Han: =태권도는 이제 안 하고요?
8 Sam: -> .h 태권도는 안 해고.=태권도는 좀 더 있다가
9 (.) 한- (.) 고등학교 때쯤: 돼서-
10 Han: 음:.
11 Sam: 글썸:, 한번 (.) 해 볼까 그러는데,
12 Han: [°음.°
13 Sam: [.h (.) 태권도 하던 거니까 계속 시킬 거- 시킬라고 생각은 해요:.
14 Han: 그래요. 그게 좋대요:.
15 Sam: 응.

Although Sam's son enjoys playing basketball, he is not particularly good at scoring, about which Sam feels a little frustrated (lines 1 and 3). Han joins in Sam's laughter, displaying her affiliation with Sam's feelings (lines 2 and 4). As the laughter wanes, Han initiates a sequence with a question in line 7 (*thaykwentonun icye an hakoyo?* "And {he} doesn't take Taekwondo

now?”). Han’s question can be heard as a topic proffer and/or a confirmation request as questions may serve more than one action (Stivers, 2010). It is a topic proffer in the sense that Taekwondo has not been mentioned in the prior conversation and that a question can be deployed to elicit a telling from the respondent by putting him/her in a sequential position to provide a relevant response concerning the given matter. Han’s question is, however, also carefully designed to show her inference and prior knowledge about the matter at issue. The insertion of the adverb *icey* ‘now’ indicates that Han knows Sam’s son having played Taekwondo in the past. As Han has just been told that Sam’s son had joined in a basketball team, she infers that he would then have quit Taekwondo, the other athletic extracurricular activity that she knows he used to do. This inference is built into her pre-verbal negative question design (J. Park, 2008). Lastly, the addition of the connective *-ko* ‘and’ in Han’s question further adds to the sense that this question has been built as a continuation of the ongoing activity (e.g., catching up on each other’s children and their current extracurricular activities) rather than a sudden shift of the topic/agenda (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994; Bolden, 2010). Therefore, Han’s question in line 7 has enough grammatical features to be heard and treated as a request for confirmation.

Han’s question bears much resemblance to Lim’s question in line 4 of Excerpt 13 (*phamanun: an hako?* “And {you} didn’t get a perm?”). They are both structured as [topical subject + topic particle + pre-verbal negative question + connective *-ko*] and make the respondent’s (dis)confirmation relevant for the next turn. In response, the respondents both provide confirmatory answers utilizing a repeat from the question: *an hako*. “And {I} didn’t get.” in Excerpt 13 in line 5; *.h thaykwentonun an hayko*. “.h And {he} doesn’t play Taekwondo.” in Excerpt 14 in line 8. Note, however, that the two responses diverge with respect to the type of the repeat. Sil’s response in Excerpt 13 takes a minimal predicate repeat form whereas Sam in

Excerpt 14 responds with a non-minimal repeat with the topical subject repeated along with the predicate. The sequential development subsequent to the repeat also diverges accordingly. In Excerpt 13, Sil does not expand on her minimal repeat answer, and Lim collaboratively brings a closure to the Q-A sequence with an acknowledgment token and a new question (*°ung:° elma cw-ess-e? kulayse?* “°Yeah:° How much did {you} pay? So?”). By contrast, Sam elaborates on her non-minimal repeat response in Excerpt 14 by latching further information about her plans for her son to resume Taekwondo. Non-minimal repeats and the subsequent sequence development will be explicated further in the next chapter. Suffice it to say, this parallel pattern between minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats is recurrently found in my data.

The sharp contrast between Excerpts 13 and 14 lends support to the claim that a minimal predicate repeat in response to a negative question is a methodical practice on the part of the respondent. J. Park’s (2008) research on negative questions in Korean shows that, when negative questions are mobilized to request confirmation, the most common type of affirmative responses is a stand-alone particle ‘yes,’ such as *ung*, *e*, or their variants. My data also include many instances of negative questions that are responded with an affirmative particle only. Thus, a repetitional response to a negative question is not a default or random choice of the respondent, but provides a way to convey confirmation with greater agency (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012). What my findings further suggest is that the speakers make a finer distinction within repetitional responses and mobilize a minimal repeat when their goal is to convey confirmation only and nothing beyond. In response to negative questions, such minimal repeats take the form of predicate repeats. By repeating the predicate only, the respondents 1) show their orientation to the question as a request for confirmation, 2) provide confirmation with more authoritative force

than an affirmative particle, and 3) convey that their goal is providing confirmation precisely, with no further action forthcoming.

Although the previous excerpts all show examples of minimal predicate repeats collaboratively leading to a topic closure, it is not to suggest that such sequential development is necessarily guaranteed or dominant. The interlocutor may reopen the topic, alluding to the insufficiency of the minimal repeat as a full response for the matter at issue. Excerpt 15 illustrates such case. Joo and Gon are talking about their call being recorded for research purposes, and Joo, who signed up for the call recording, has understood the 30-minute limit in the instructions as a requirement to meet a 30-minute minimum.

(15) Thirty Minutes

1 Joo: kuntey samsip pwun tway-ss-nun-ci an tway-ss-nun-ci
 by.the.way thirty minute become-PST-IN-NOM not become-PST-IN-NOM

 [ettehkey a-nya:?
 how know-Q

By the way how do {we} know if {it's} been thirty minutes or not:?

2 Gon: [.hh

3 (1.0)

4 Gon: keki-se mwe: meyseyci-ka nao-keyss-ci mwe.=
 there-from DM message-NM come.out-may-COM DM
Well [I believe] a message will come out of there.=

5 Joo: =ya cikum han si sipo pwun-i-ntey
 hey now one hour fifteen minute-be-CIRCUM

 ya samsip pwun tongan yaykihay-ya tway:.
 hey thirty minute for talk-must become.INT

=Hey {it} is 1:15 now and- Hey {we} must talk for 30 minutes.

6 Gon: ((cough)) ku cen-ey kkunh-umyen an- an toy-nya?
 that before-at hang.up-if not not work.out-Q
((cough)) if {we} hang up before then, is {it} not okay?

7 Joo: e an toy-ci:.
 yes not work.out-COM
-> No {it's} not okay:.

8 (0.2)

9 Gon: kuke ettehkey: ni-ka al-a.
that how you-NM know-INT
How do you know that.

10 Gon: .hh [((cough))

11 Joo: [kulem ettek ha-↑ni:. keki-se philyoha-ntey. calyo.
then how do-Q there-at need-CIRCUM data
Then what {should I/they} ↑do:. They need {it}. The data.

12 Gon: .h mwe kulem cwucey-nun mwe: (.)
DM then topic-TOP DM

cikum nokum: toy-ko iss-nun ke-nya?
now recording become-and exist-RL thing-Q

.h Well then the topic is- we:ll (.) is it recording now?

1 Joo: 근데 삼십 분 됐는지 안 됐는지 [어떻게 아냐:?
2 Gon: [.hh
3 (1.0)
4 Gon: 거기서 뭐: 메세지가 나오겠지 뭐.=
5 Joo: =야 지금 한 시 십오 분인데 야 삼십 분 동안 얘기해야 돼:.
6 Gon: ((cough)) 그 전에 끊으면 안- 안 되냐?
7 Joo: -> 어 안 되지:.
8 (0.2)
9 Gon: 그거 어떻게: 니가 알아.
10 Gon: .hh [((cough))
11 Joo: [그럼 어떡 하↑니: . 거기서 필요한데. 자료.
12 Gon: .h 뭐 그럼 주제는 뭐: (.) 지금 녹음: 되고 있는 거냐?

On lines 1 and 5, Joo displays her understanding that the call has to make 30 minutes in length. Gon requests confirmation in line 6 with a negative question, ensuring the unacceptability of the reverse case. Joo responds with an affirmative particle *e* ‘yes’ followed by a minimal predicate repeat *an toy-ci*: “{It’s} not okay:.” The committal ender *-ci* in Joo’s response indexes her commitment to the truth of the propositional content (H. Lee, 1999), i.e., that it is not acceptable to terminate the call before the 30-minute threshold. Being the one with first-hand access to the instructions for the call, Joo assumes epistemic primacy over the issue of what is or is not allowed in the call. Her superior epistemic stance, as such, further supports her commitment to

the response indexed by *-ci*. As in the previous excerpts, the minimal predicate repeat here is not followed by any elaboration on the respondent's end, and this is also partly explained by Joo's epistemic authority over the issue. That is, given her superior epistemic stance, Joo's minimal repeat with no further account may be taken as a sufficient response to the request for confirmation. However, after a 0.2-second delay, Gon challenges the epistemic authority embedded in Joo's minimal repeat by specifically asking for an account for her confirmation (line 9). Only after Joo resorts to the ultimate authority over the issue, *keki* 'there' (= the party/organization conducting the research), Gon proceeds with a topic transition (line 12).

A similar case is provided in Excerpt 16. The excerpt starts with Gia informing Nam that their mutual friend Nobuko is taking 18 units next semester. This is more than average and is normally allowed only for those whose GPA is 3.0 or higher.

(16) GPA

- 1 Gia: .H Nopukko-nun:, han- (.) yelyetelp kay tut-nun-ta?
 PN-TOP about eighteen item take-IN-DC
.H Nobuko: is taking about 18 units?
- 2 Nam: Wo:w.
 EX
Wo:w.
- 3 (0.5)
- 4 Gia: .hh kuntey toykey wusky-e:.
 but very funny-INT
.hh But {it's} so funny:.
- 5 pothong:, (.) G- GPA-ka cokum (.) sam ccem:: yeng tway-ya
 usually GPA-NM little three point zero become-must
Usually:, (.) {your} GPA should be 3.0
- 6 toy-n taum-ey (.) ku cengto tut-key ha-keteng:.
 become-RL next-at that extent take-let do-INFO
After {it} reaches {3.0} (.) {they} let {you} take that many:.
- 7 Nam: ung.
 yes
Yeah.

8 Gia: .h kuntey: (.) kyay-nun: (.) kyay-hako, (.)
but she-TOP she-and
.h Bu:t (.) she: (.) she and, (.)

9 ani kukka- .h pothong salam-tul-i, (.)
no I.mean usually person-PL-NM
.h etten salam-un kunyang tut-key ha-ko
certain person-TOP just take-let do-and
**No I mean- .h usually people, (.) .h some people just let {you}
take {that much}**

10 etten salam-un nemwu manhta kule-ko, drop ha-la kule-ko,
certain person-TOP too much be.so-and drop do-IM be.so-and
Some people say {that's} too much, and tell {you} to drop,

11 Nam: ung.
yes
Yeah.

12 Gia: yeltwu kay-man tul-ula kule-ko
twelve item-only take-IM be.so-and
And tell {you} to take 12 units only
kule-n-ta kule-te-la?
be.so-IN-DC be.so-RT-DC
[I heard] {they} do so?

13 Gia: .h (.) etten salam-un-
certain person-TOP
.h (.) Some people-

14 Nam: kuntey [kyay-nun GPA-ka sam ccem yeng-i
by.the.way she-TOP GPA-NM three point zero-NM
an tway-ss-ess-e?
not become-PST-PST-INT
By the way her GPA hadn't reached 3.0?

15 Gia: [()]

16 Gia: .h an toy-ci:ǂ mwe:
not become-COM DM
-> **.h {it} doesn't reach:ǂ we:ll**

17 (1.0)

18 Nam: mwe C mac-ko i- D mac-ko
DM C get-and D get-and
Well, getting C's and- getting D's,
ile-n key manh-ass-na po-ci kulemyen?
be.this-RL thing.NM many-PST-Q see-COM then
[I guess] {she} had many of such cases then?

19 Gia: e. kule-ntey-to:. (.) manh- (.) manhi tut-key ha-te-la?
 yes be.so-CIRCUM-even much much take-let do-RL-DC
Yeah. Even so:. (.) a lot- (.) [I noticed] {they} let {her} take a lot?

20 Nam: °ung:..°
 yes
 °Yeah:..°

1 Gia: .h 노부꾸는:, 한- (.) 열여덟 개 듣는다?
 2 Nam: Wo:w.
 3 (0.5)
 4 Gia: .hh 근데 되게 웃겨:.
 5 보통:, (.) G- GPA 가 조금 (.) 삼 점:: 영 돼야
 6 된 다음에 (.) 그 정도 듣게 하거덩:.
 7 Nam: 응.
 8 Gia: .h 근데: (.) 개는: (.) 개하고, (.)
 9 아니 그까- .h 보통 사람들이, (.) .h 어떤 사람은 그냥 듣게 하고
 10 어떤 사람은 너무 많다 그러고, drop 하라 그러고,
 11 Nam: 응.
 12 Gia: 열두 개만 들으라 그러고 그러ندا 그러더라?
 13 Gia: .h (.) 어떤 사람은-
 14 Nam: 근데 [개는 GPA 가 삼 점 영이 안 됐었어?
 15 Gia: [()
 16 Gia: -> .h 안 되지: 뭐:
 17 (1.0)
 18 Nam: 뭐 C 맞고 이- D 맞고 이렇게 많았나 보지 그러면?
 19 Gia: 어. 그런데도:. (.) 많- (.) 많이 듣게 하더라?
 20 Nam: °응:..°

After Gia says that Nobuko is taking about 18 units next semester (line 1), she implies that something is incongruent about that situation in line 4 (*toykey wuskye*: “so funny:.”). She starts her account by citing the GPA restrictions on the possible number of units for enrollment (lines 5-6). The beginning of line 8 (*kuntey: (.) kyaynun*: “Bu:t (.) she:”) foreshadows a contrastive statement, mostly likely that Nobuko does not meet the GPA requirement to take 18 units. The statement, however, does not get expressed completely but is self-repaired into another statement with a new subject (*ani kukka- .h pothong salamtuli*, “No I mean- .h usually people,”). As Gia continues with the new statement about how the restrictions on enrollment vary across different advisors, Nam cuts in at line 14. Nam requests confirmation about what has only been implied

but not said explicitly, namely, whether Nobuko had failed to meet the 3.0-GPA requirement. Again, as repeatedly illustrated in the previous examples, the confirmation request is formulated with a pre-verbal negative question, reflecting the inference the speaker has made based on the prior talk (J. Park, 2008). In response, Gia provides a minimal predicate repeat (*an toyci:ç* “{it} doesn’t reach:ç”), which is followed by a discourse marker *mwe*: “we:ll” but not expanded further. As in Excerpt 15, the respondent provides confirmation in the manner that the response should be taken as sufficient and even obvious. However, after a 1.0-second pause, Nam requests further explication with respect to the basis of Gia’s confirmation, thus reopening the topic with another Q-A sequence. In line 19, Gia provides confirmation with an affirmative particle *e* “Yeah” and reattempts a topic closure by rerouting the trajectory of the talk from Naboko’s GPA, back to the enrollment restrictions. Thus, both Excerpts 15 and 16 illustrate the cases in which a response with a minimal predicate repeat encounters the questioner’s resistance to closing the topic. Nonetheless, the tendency for the respondent not to expand on the minimal repeat still persists.

In summary, this section has shown the ways in which minimal repeats are mobilized in response to negative questions. When a request for confirmation is formulated as a negative question, especially with pre-verbal negation, respondents utilize a minimal repeat by repeating the predicate of the question only. This minimal predicate repeat tends to promote sequence closure and topic transition with the respondent not expanding his/her turn beyond the repeat. In other words, by granting confirmation with a minimal predicate repeat, the respondent not only exerts his/her agency and epistemic authority over the matter at issue, but also presents ‘doing confirming’ as the core action of the turn. A topic closure, however, is a collaboratively achieved action and thus does not always follow a minimal predicate repeat. The question speaker may

reopen the topic by treating the minimal predicate repeat as an insufficient account for the confirmation.

3.3.2 Minimal Repeats in Response to Positive Questions

This section examines minimal repeat responses produced in response to positive questions. As previously mentioned, the forms of minimal repeats vary more widely when a request for confirmation is formulated as a positive question than as a negative question. Both predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats are observed in response to positive questions, and the predicate repeats not only takes a verbatim form but also a repeat with a modified ending. The general pattern of minimal repeats, that is, sequence progression and no turn expansion, still persists across different types of minimal repeats that are produced in response to positive questions. In this section, I will demonstrate what motivates the respondents to utilize various forms of minimal repeats in response to positive questions.

3.3.2.1 Predicate Repeats

Verbatim predicate repeats, which have been illustrated in the previous section in relation to negative questions, occur in response to positive questions as well, as previously shown in Excerpts 6 and 8. Both excerpts were reproduced here with more surrounding turns. In Excerpt 17, Dan, who is preparing for an application for the U.S. citizenship, asks Hoo if he knows his Selective Service Number, a military service number for male U.S. citizens and immigrants. The excerpt starts with Hoo's answer to the question.

(17) Selective Service Number

1 Hoo: kuke: (0.5) a-nuntey- (.)
that know-CIRCUM

Tha:t[=Selective Service Number] (0.5) {I} know but- (.)

ceki e- ssu-l swu eps-canh-a keki-taka.
there write-PRS means not.exist-COM.not-INT there-at
In there- {you} can't write {it} in there, right.

2 citizenship- (.) mwe citizenship application-eyta
citizenship DM citizenship application-at

sse-ya tway?
write-must become.INT

Citizenship- (.) well {you} need to write {it} on the citizenship application?

3 Dan: e.
yes
Yeah.

4 (.)

5 Hoo: ssu-nun ke eps-nuntey¿
write-RL thing not.exist-CIRCUM
There isn't writing {it} {there}¿

6 Dan: e. kuke e- na kukey eps-e kac-ko
yes that I that.NM not.exist-INF have-and

na cikum mos ssu-ko iss-ess-e:.
I now cannot write-and exist-PST-INT

Yeah. That- I don't have that so I haven't been able to write.

7 Hoo: ani- ssu-nun tey-ka iss-e?
no write-RL place-NM exist-INT
No- There is a place to write {it} in?

8 Dan: e iss-e.
yes exist-INT
-> Yeah there is.

9 (3.2)

10 Hoo: °iss-na?°
exist-Q
°Is there?°

11 Dan: e iss-[e.
yes exist-INT
-> Yeah there is.

12 Hoo: [nay-ka po-nikka eps-te-ntey¿
I-NM see-because not.exist-RT-CIRCUM
I saw and there wasn't¿

13 (1.2)

14 Dan: ne- e:t- kuke t- ne-hantey khatu-ka iss-nya?
 you that you-to card-NM exist-Q
You- that- Is {your} card with you?

 1 Hoo: 그거: (0.5) 아는데- (.) 저기 어- 쓸 수 없잖아 거기다가.
 2 citizenship- (.) 뭐 citizenship application 에다 써야 돼?
 3 Dan: 어.
 4 (.)
 5 Hoo: 쓰는 거 없는데;
 6 Dan: 어. 그거 어- 나 그게 없어 갖고 나 지금 못 쓰고 있었어:.
 7 Hoo: 아니- 쓰는 데가 있어?
 8 Dan: -> 어 있어.
 9 (3.2)
 10 Hoo: °있나?°
 11 Dan: -> 어 있[어].
 12 Hoo: [내가 보니까 없던데;
 13 (1.2)
 14 Dan: 너- 어:ㄷ- 그거 ㄷ- 너한테 카드가 있냐?

Hoo affirms that he knows his Selective Service Number in line 1, but starts to question the connection between the number and Dan’s U.S. citizenship application (lines 1-2). He believes that the application has no field requiring for the number (*ssul swu epscanha kekitaka*. “{you} can’t write {it} in there, right.” in line 1; *ssunun ke epsnuntey* “There isn’t writing {it} {there}” in line 5). As Dan affirms that the form requires the number (*e*. “Yeah.” in line 3) and asserts his inability to complete the form not knowing his own number (line 6), Hoo yet again requests confirmation in line 7. Note that the confirmation request is formulated as a positively polarized declarative question and that Dan answers it with a minimal predicate repeat in line 8. Moreover, during the subsequent lengthy pause for 3.2 seconds, Dan does not expand on his answer, nor does he launch a new sequence. When Hoo finally breaks the pause with yet another request for confirmation in line 10, Dan reproduces his minimal repeat response (line 11), which is overlapped with Hoo’s last attempt to insist his position (line 12). Nonetheless, Dan, again, does not elaborate on his confirmation or expand the sequence any further (line 13), but proceeds with a new Q-A sequence in line 14.

This excerpt illustrates a case in which the respondent “upgrades” the assertive force of his response by switching the response from a stand-alone affirmative particle (*e* “Yeah” in line 3) to a repetitional form (*e isse* ‘Yes there is’ in lines 8 and 11) as the questioner’s questioning action perseveres. And yet, the type of the repeat the respondent chooses, i.e., a minimal predicate repeat, is followed by no further account or expansion on the respondent’s end, which confirms that the general pattern of minimal repeats operates in response to positive questions as well.

Another example of a predicate repeat in response to a positive question is shown in Excerpt 18 below. The target sequence in this excerpt (lines 5-7) has previously been presented in Excerpt 8 (as an instance of a minimal repeat containing an additional element closely tied to a predicate). Bak, who is studying abroad in Philadelphia, plans on travelling around Los Angeles, where his friend Suh lives. Prior to the excerpt, Suh has told Bak the distance from Los Angeles to Las Vegas and from Los Angeles to the Grand Canyon in miles. Bak had thought that Las Vegas and the Grand Canyon were close to each other, but realizes that the Grand Canyon is much farther from Los Angeles.

(18) Distance

- 1 Bak: keki-ka sangtanghi me-n tey-kwuna?
 there-NM quite far-RL place-APP
[I realize] that’s quite far?
- 2 na-nun po-nikka ha- lasupeykasu-hako kulayntukhaynyen-hako
 I-TOP see-because Las Vegas-and Grand Canyon-and
 ke:uy mwe-
 almost DM
**When I saw {on the map}, Las Vegas and the Grand Canyon {are}
 a:almost like-**
- 3 Suh: lasupeykasu-ese- (0.5) nun: (0.5) han- tases sikan yeses sikan
 Las Vegas-from TOP about five hour six hour
 kelly-e.

take-INT

From Las Vegas (0.5) {it} takes about five hours, six hours.

4 Bak: e:::.
yes
Yeah:::

5 Suh: kulenikka- yel sikan kellin- (.) kukka- icey- (.)
so ten hour take so now
So- {from Los Angeles} {it} takes ten hours- (.) so- now- (.)

taychwung toy-keyss-ci. [kam-i o-nya?
roughly work.out-may-COM sense-NM come-Q
{You} can roughly tell, right. Does {that} make sense?

6 Bak: [ung:
yes
Yeah:

7 Bak: ung. ung. icey kam-i o-n-ta.=
yes yes now sense-NM come-IN-DC
-> Yeah. Yeah. Now {it} makes sense.=

8 Suh: =kawuntey iss-nun ke-ci lasupeykasu-[ka.
center exist-RL thing-COM Las Vegas-NM
=Las Vegas is in the middle.

9 Bak: [e:: kule-n ke-kwuna;
yes be.so-RL thing-APP
Yeah:: [I realize] {it} is so.

10 Suh: e.
yes
Yeah.

11 Suh: h cito:-sang-ulo-nun ccokumah-key nao-ciman
map-on-by-TOP small-ADV appear-but
h O:n the map {the areas} appear small, but

12 Bak: ung
yes
Yeah

1 Bak: 거기가 상당히 먼 데구나?
2 나는 보니까 한- 라스베가스하고 그랜드캐년하고 거:의 뭐-
3 Suh: 라스베가스에서- (0.5) 는: (0.5) 한- 다섯 시간 여섯 시간 걸려.
4 Bak: 어:::
5 Suh: 그러니까- 열 시간 걸리니- (.) 그까- 이제- (.) 대충 되겠지. [감이 오냐?
6 Bak: [응:
7 Bak: -> 응. 응. 이제 감이 온다.=
8 Suh: =가운데 있는 거지 라스베가스[가.
9 Bak: [어:: 그런 거구나;
10 Suh: 어.

11 Suh: h 지도: 상으로는 쪼그맣게 나오지만
 12 Bak: 응

Upon hearing the distance between the places in miles, Bak expresses his realization (line 1) and then tries to display his previous misunderstanding, i.e., he thought Las Vegas and the Grand Canyon were almost next to each other (line 2). Before Bak completes his turn, however, Suh cuts in in line 3, emphasizing the distance between the two places. In response Bak shows his understanding with an elongated acknowledgment token (*e:::*. “Yeah:::”). After several attempts trying to explain the relative distances between the places in different ways (e.g., miles vs. hours), Suh is positive about Bak’s understanding of the matter at issue as indicated by his use of a pseudo-tag question in line 5 (*taychwung toykeyssci*. “{You} can roughly tell, right.”). As Bak affirms the question in line 6, Suh adds a request for confirmation in overlap, to ensure Bak’s understanding (*kami onya?* “Does {that} make sense?”). The positively polarized interrogative question is responded with two affirmative particles followed by a minimal repeat in line 7. Immediately after Bak’s repetitional response, Suh self-selects the next turn by latching yet another line of explanation on the relative location of Las Vegas with reference to the other two places (line 8). When Bak gets the floor back in line 9, he does not pursue the topic further; rather, he expresses his realization one more time with the apperceptive ending *-kwuna* as in line 1, thus confirming his understanding. Unlike in lines 1-2, however, he does not expand his turn in line 9, but yields the floor to Suh (lines 10-11). Therefore, just as Excerpt 17, this excerpt also illustrates that minimal predicate repeats occur in response to positive questions that request confirmation. Furthermore, the tendency of minimal repeats not getting expanded also seems to be working in response to positive questions as well.

The following excerpts show a slightly different type of predicate repeats that are observed in the same sequential environment, i.e., in response to positive questions mobilized to

request confirmation. This type of predicate repeats will be called a predicate repeat with a modified ending because it takes the same predicate stem as in the question, but with a different ending agglutinated to the stem. These responses are still considered minimal repeats in that they do not carry extra elements that may be omitted without damaging comprehensibility or the naturalness of the turn. Predicate repeats with a modified ending also follow the general tendency of minimal repeats by promoting turn transition and sequence progression, but at the same time they fine-tune the content for which they provide confirmation. An example is shown in Excerpt 19. The excerpt starts with Kai's answer to Tin's question of whether the call has to be recorded in English.

(19) Recording

- 1 Kai: .hh ani ike hankwukmal mwusun liselchi ha-nun ke,
no this Korean.language what research do-RL thing
.hh No this {is} some research on Korean,
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 .ts .h ku native speaker. (0.7) e: chac-ase,
that native speaker search-and
.ts .h A native speaker. (0.7) U:hm {I was} looking for {one},
- 4 (1.0)
- 5 cenhwahay-ss-nu- hal-lako hay-ss-nuntey,
call-PST call-intention do-PST-CIRCUM
and called- was going to call {him/her},
- (0.2) ni-ka ttak sayngkakna-canh-a.
you-NM just occur-COM.not-INT
and you just came to {my} mind.
- 6 Kai: .h ttan salam-hantey sayngkakhal-lako
different person-to think-intention
- cenhwahal-la hay-ss-nuntey e:i.
call-intention do-PST-CIRCUM EX
- .h {I} was going to think- call someone else, but oh well.**
- 7 (0.7)
- 8 isanghay:. (mak) mos ha(h)-keyss-e. h h h h .h=

strange.INT just cannot do-may-INT
{That'd} be strange. I (just) can't do {it}. h h h h .h=

9 Tin: =cikum (.) record toy-nun ke-y-a?
now recording become-RL thing-be-INT
=Now (.) {it's} being recorded?

10 Kai: toy-nun ke kath-e.
become-RL thing same-INT
-> [I think] {it's} being {recorded}.

11 (1.2)

12 Kai: kukka amwu yayki-lato hay-to tway.
so any talk-even do-even.if become.INT
So {you} can talk about anything.

1 Kai: .hh 아니 이거 한국말 무슨 리설치 하는 거,
2 (1.0)
3 .ts .h 그 native speaker. (0.7) 어: 찾아서,
4 (1.0)
5 전화했느- 할라고 했는데, (0.2) 니가 딱 생각나잖아.

6 Kai: .h 딴 사람한테 생각할라고 전화할라 했는데 예:이.
7 (0.7)
8 이상해:.. (막) 못 하(ㅎ)겠어. ㅎㅎㅎㅎ .h=

9 Tin: =지금 (.) record 되는 거야?

10 Kai: -> 되는 거 같어.
11 (1.2)

12 Kai: 그까 아무 얘기라도 해도 돼.

Tin's request for confirmation is made in line 9, after Kai's explanation about the purpose of the call (line 1) and his reason for selecting Tin as his interlocutor (lines 3-8). With his confirmation request, Tin orients back to the purpose of the call, i.e., that this call is recorded and collected for research, and tries to ensure if the recording has already begun. The *-(nu)n keya* ending in his turn, grammatically structured as [a relativizer *-(nu)n* + a general noun *ke* 'thing' + intimate-level copula *ya*], is one of the grammaticalized general noun constructions (Noh, 2006). In interrogative sentences, it is used when the questioner wants to confirm his/her conjecture about which s/he has a high degree of certainty (Noh, 2006). Moreover, the questioner assumes that the respondent is more knowledgeable about the matter at hand and thus should be able to confirm his/her conjecture (Noh, 2006). Therefore, if Kai responds to Tin's question with an affirmative

particle ‘yes,’ he would acknowledge his position as a knowledgeable respondent. A response with a verbatim repeat (e.g., *toynun keya*. “{It’s} being {recorded}.”) would exert agency even further in confirming the fact that the recording has begun (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012).

In such sequential position, in which affirming the question as it is would make him a knowledgeable respondent and confirm the proposition as a fact, Kai provides confirmation with a predicate repeat with a modified ending. That is, his response uses the same predicate stem *toy* ‘become’ as in the question but a different ending *-nun ke kathe* instead of *-(nu)n keya*. The *-(nu)n ke(s) kath-* construction, literally translated as “I consider the situation to be the same as ...” (H. Lee, 2015, p. 254) and more naturally translated as “I think ...” or “It seems ...,” denotes the speaker’s conjecture, indicating that “the statement is an approximation at best” (H. Lee, 2015, p. 254). Therefore, by switching the ending from *-nun keya* to *-nun ke kathe* in the response, Kai provides confirmation, but with an epistemic downgrade. What is notable is that, despite Kai’s switch in the ending and therefore his lower degree of certainty conveyed in the confirmation than is imposed by the question, Tin does not address that as indicated by the 1.2-second silence in line 11. Kai also does not pursue the Q-A sequence further, but solicits Tin’s talk to proceed with the conversation (line 12).

Later in the same conversation, Tin also utilizes a predicate repeat with a modified ending in response to Kai’s request for confirmation as illustrated in Excerpt 20. They are planning on throwing a birthday party for their mutual friend at church, whose birthday is the upcoming Thursday. Kai first suggests the party be on Wednesday, but Tin finds out the day does not work for him. They then decide to have a party on Thursday night following the church revival meeting.

(20) Revival Meeting

1 Tin: swuyoil nal?
Wednesday day
Wednesday?

2 Kai: ung.=
yes
Yeah.=

3 Tin: =an tway:. = na swu- mokyoil nal sihem iss-e.
not work.out.INT I Thursday day exam exist-INT
={That's} not okay:.=I have an exam on Wed- Thursday.

4 (.)

5 Kai: kulem mwe mokyoil nal-un na-n nay-ka mos ka-nuntey==
then DM Thursday day-TOP I-TOP I-NM cannot go-CIRCUM
Then well as for Thursday I can't make it==

6 =a kulem mokyoil nal kulem cenyek-e? pam-[e?
EX then Thursday day then evening-at night-at
=Oh then Thursday, in the evening? At night?

7 Tin: [kkuthna-ko.
end-and
After {it} ends.

8 Tin: ung.
yes
Yeah.

9 Kai: pwuhunghoy kkuthna-ko?
revival.meeting end-and
After the revival meeting ends?

10 Tin: °ung.°
yes
°Yeah.°

11 Kai: e:ç (.) ne- kulem- kumyoil nal: (.) >mwe-ya < mokyoil nal
yes you then Friday day what-be.INT Thursday day
pwuhunghoy o-l swu iss-e?
revival.meeting come-PRS means exist-INT
**Yea:hç (.) you- then- on Friday: (.) >What is {it}< on Thursday
{you} can come to the revival meeting?**

12 (0.2)

13 Tin: ka-ya-ci.
go-must-COM
-> {I} should go.

14 Kai: ung::.. mwe kumyoil nal mwe iss-nun ke-n ani-ko?
yes DM Friday day what exist-TOP thing-TOP be.not-and

Yeah::. Well and {you} don't have something on Friday?

15 (0.5)

16 Tin: kumyoil nal mwe swuep pakke eps-unikka.
Friday day DM class only not.exist-because
On Friday well {I} only have a class.

1 Tin: 수요일 날?
2 Kai: 응.=
3 Tin: =안 돼:.=나 수- 목요일 날 시험 있어.
4 (.)
5 Kai: 그럼 뭐 목요일 날은 난 내가 못 가는데==
6 =아 그럼 목요일 날 그럼 저녁에? 밤[에?
7 Tin: [끝나고.
8 Tin: 응.
9 Kai: 부흥회 끝나고?
10 Tin: °응.°
11 Kai: 어: (.) 너- 그럼- 금요일 날: (.) >뭐야< 목요일 날 부흥회 올 수 있어?
12 (0.2)
13 Tin: -> 가야지.
14 Kai: 응:: 뭐 금요일 날 뭐 있는 건 아니고?
15 (0.5)
16 Tin: 금요일 날 뭐 수업 밖에 없으니까.

At first Kai thinks he cannot do Thursday (line 5), but he quickly realizes Thursday night may be another viable option (line 6). His self-repair of the timeframe from *cenyek* ‘evening’ to *pam* ‘night’ in line 6 indicates that he is alluding to the time period after the church revival meeting. Tin also shows his orientation to the same time period with his overlapping turn in line 7 (*kkuthnako*. “After {it} ends.”), although the missing subject therein triggers Kai’s confirmation request in line 9. That Tin agrees to hold the party after the revival meeting suggests his attendance to the revival meeting as well, which is precisely what Kai tries to confirm in line 11. After a 0.2-second pause, Tin provides confirmation with a predicate repeat with a modified ending. The change to the predicate stem from *o-(ta)* ‘to come’ in the question to *ka-(ta)* ‘to go’ in the response is still considered a repeat in my analysis since the choice between the two verbs is based on the speaker’s orientation point rather than a difference in the motions depicted by the

verbs. The ending, however, has changed from *-(u)l swu iss-* ‘can’ to *-(e/a)ya* ‘should, ought to.’ By doing so, Tin still successfully confirms his attendance to the revival meeting, and further clarifies that it is out of his responsibility or willingness that he goes to the meeting, not merely out of his ability. Again, the modification in the ending and the correction on the terms of confirmation made thereof do not attract a special treatment from Kai; he acknowledges Tin’s answer (*ung::* “Yeah::”) and proceeds to initiate another Q-A sequence in line 14.

Excerpts 19 and 20 have demonstrated that, unlike an affirmative particle ‘yes,’ which acquiesces to the terms and constraints imposed by a question as is (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Raymond, 2003), a predicate repeat with a modified ending marks a change in the terms of confirmation to which the respondent assents. However, an affirmative particle and a predicate repeat with a modified ending may also occur together. An example is shown in Excerpt 21. Tay and Jun are friends and both have a preschool-age child. Prior to the excerpt, Jun told Tay that she called Tay several times recently only to be unanswered. The first line in the excerpt marks the end of Tay’s account for her recent whereabouts. The topic of the conversation then transitions into Tay’s daughter and her preschool.

(21) Preschool

- 1 Tay: kuleko-nun, mwe cip-e iss-ess-ci mwe.
 then-TOP DM home-at exist-PST-COM DM
Then, well {I} stayed home.
- 2 Jun: °ung.° .h kyay preschool-un cal tany-e?
 yes she preschool-TOP well attend-INT
 °Yeah.° .h **She attends the preschool well?**
- 3 Tay: e:.
 yes
Yeah:.
- 4 Jun: cohahay?
 like.INT
{She} likes {it}?
- 5 Tay: ung. cohaha-te-la-kwu:ç

- yes like-RT-DC-QT
 -> **Yeah. [I noticed] {she} likes {it}:ᵛ**
- 6 Jun: et- (.) eti-ya:? kyohoy-ese ha-nun ke-ya?
 where-be.INT church-at do-RL thing-be.INT
Wh- (.) where is {it}? {It's} run by the church?
-
- 1 Tay: 그리고는, 뭐 집에 있었지 뭐.
 2 Jun: °응.° .h 개 preschool 은 잘 다녀?
 3 Tay: 어:.
 4 Jun: 좋아해?
 5 Tay: -> 응. 좋아하더라구:ᵛ
 6 Jun: 얼- (.) 어디야?: 교회에서 하는 거야?

Jun's first inquiry about Tay's daughter appears in line 2, asking whether she is attending the preschool well. Tay's affirmation in line 3 implies that her daughter enjoys going to the preschool, and yet Jun requests confirmation in line 4 (*cohahay?* “{She} likes {it}?”). In response, Tay affirms with an affirmative particle *ung* ‘yes,’ followed by a predicate repeat with a modified ending (*cohahatelakwu:ᵛ* “{I noticed} {she} likes {it}:ᵛ”). The *-telakwu* ending, which is a stylistic variation of *-telako*, is an evidential marker indicating that the propositional content has been obtained through one's past perceptual experience (M. Kim, 2005; S. Sohn, 2015). Furthermore, the addition of the quotative particle *-ko* to a similar evidential marker *-tela* gives the *-telako* ending a function to reassert one's own prior claim with an epistemic authority (M. Kim, 2005; S. Sohn, 2015). Therefore, while Tay's initial affirmative particle affirms the proposition that her daughter likes the preschool as a factual knowledge, the predicate repeat with the *-telako* ending overtly indicates that the statement is based on her own direct experience and thus further strengthens her confirmation. As in the previous excerpts, the repetitional response does not get expanded, and the interlocutor, Jun, also proceeds to a new sequence with another question in line 6.

The excerpts presented thus far to illustrate predicate repeats with a modified ending show that the respondent switches the ending for various purposes, such as adjusting the degree of certainty conveyed in confirmation (e.g., Excerpt 19), shifting deontic modality of the confirmed proposition (e.g., Excerpt 20), and strengthening confirmation with an epistemic authority (e.g., Excerpt 21). As an agglutinative language, Korean has a wide range of suffixes that are agglutinated to a predicate stem to denote modality.¹³ Thus, by switching the ending used in the question, the respondent confirms the propositional content, but with a shift in some aspect of modality conveyed in the statement.

What is noteworthy is that, by choosing this specific formulation, i.e., a minimal repeat comprised of a predicate stem and a modified ending with no extraneous elements, the respondent seems to achieve the dual action of confirmation and a shift in modality in the most aligning manner with respect to sequence progression. Modality can be conveyed through predicate suffixes in Korean; however, that does not imply that predicate suffixes are the only means to denote, for example, an epistemic stance or an evidential stance. In Excerpt 21, for instance, the respondent could mark evidentiality with a sensory verb instead of the *-telako* ending (e.g., *nayka ponikka cohahay* “I see that {she} likes {it}”). Therefore, the deployment of a predicate repeat with a modified ending is the speaker’s choice, and the recurrent patterns observed with this type of responses suggest that these responses achieve the action of confirming with shifted modality without interrupting progression of the sequence. As shown in the excerpts above, neither does the respondent expand his/her response beyond the predicate repeat with a modified ending, nor does the questioner halt the progression of the sequence to address the shifted modality embedded in the respondent’s answer.

¹³ H. Lee (2015) classifies modality into four subcategories: mood, deontic/root modality, epistemic modality, and speech acts.

3.3.2.2 Noun Phrase Repeats

Another type of minimal repeats observed in response to positive confirmation-request questions is a noun phrase repeat. While predicate repeats confirm a whole proposition of the prior question, noun phrase repeats pick out a specific part of the question as the object of confirmation. By doing so, noun phrase repeats show that the respondent understands the question as a request for confirmation and treats it precisely as such. In addition, just as the other types of minimal repeats presented thus far, noun phrase repeats also tend to be followed by a turn termination and a sequence transition.

Consider Excerpt 22 for example. Part of this excerpt was introduced previously in Excerpt 10 to show that a noun phrase repeat may contain other elements, such as particles, nominal suffixes, and an honorific marker. In this excerpt, Nan is travelling with her friends in New York, where Yul lives. The excerpt is part of Yul's lengthy description about how to get to her place from Manhattan. Thus, Yul keeps the floor most of the time while Nan provides acknowledgement tokens in-between until she comes in at line 11 with a question that requests confirmation. Once the question is answered with Yul's confirmation in a noun phrase repeat, Yul resumes her direction giving.

(22) East Side¹⁴

- 1 Yul: .h kukka samsip- sam[sip sa ka-na samsip yuk ka-lul tha-ko,
so thirty thirty four road-or thirty six road-AC ride-and
.h **So take 30- [34th street or 36th street and,**
- 2 Nan: [e.
yes
[Yeah.

¹⁴ For Excerpts 22 and 23, overlaps are marked in English translation as well because the speaker Nan produces a number of acknowledgement tokens in overlap.

- 3 Nan: e: [e.
yes yes
Yea:h [yeah.
- 4 Yul: [east side-lo ccwuk: ka.
east side-toward straight go-IM
[Go straight towards the east side.
- 5 Nan: e. (.) e.
yes yes
Yeah. (.) Yeah.
- 6 Yul: wayn- ku: kukka samsip sa ka-na samsip yuk ka:-y-eya-ci
DM that so thirty four road-or thirty six road-be-must-COM

tto wi-lo ol-la ka-n-ta=
again above-toward climb-INF go-IN-DC

Well so {it} has to be 34th or 36th street so {you can} go upward=
- 7 =ani-myen tto (.) ikhey- (0.2) do[wn panghyang-i-ni-
be.not-if again like.this down direction-be-because

west side-lo o-nun ke-nikka,
west side-toward come-RL thing-because

**=If not, then (.) like- (0.2) [{you'd go} downward- {you'd} head
the west,**
- 8 Nan: [e.
yes
[Yeah.
- 9 Nan: ung: [ung ung.
yes yes yes
Yea:h [yeah yeah
- 10 Yul: [ku twu- twul cwung-ey han [kaci-lul tha-ko [ol-la
that two two among-in one kind-AC ride-and climb-INF

ka-ya tway.
go-must become.INT

[{You} should take [one of the two {streets} [and go up.
- 11 Nan: [ung ung. [kukka ike-nun
yes yes so this-TOP
- 12 incey east panghyang-ulo ka-nun [ke-ci. [ike-nun.
now east direction-toward go-RL thing-COM this-TOP

**[Yeah yeah. [So now this
is towards the east, [right. [This {street}.**
- 13 Yul: [e [east
yes east

panghyang-ulo.=
direction-toward

-> [Yeah [towards the east.

14 Nan: =e:. e e.=
yes yes yes
=Yea:h. Yeah yeah.=

15 Yul: =east panghyang-ulo-
east direction-toward
=Towards the east-

16 Nan: e e.
yes yes
Yeah yeah

17 Yul: ha-nun- (.) kil-ul tha-ko [ol-la o-taka po-myen,
do-RL road-AC ride-and climb-INF come-TRANS see-if
If {you} keep coming up [along the street {towards the east},

18 Nan: [e e e
yes yes yes
[Yeah yeah yeah

19 Nan: ku- e.
that yes
Th- yeah.

20 Yul: ssain-i nawa.
sign-NM appear.INT
{You} will see a sign.

1 Yul: .h 그까 삼십- 삼[십 사 가나 삼십 육 가를 타고,
2 Nan: [어.
3 Nan: 어:[어.
4 Yul: [east side 로 쪽: 가.
5 Nan: 어. (.) 어.
6 Yul: 웬- 그: 그까 삼십 사 가나 삼십 육 가:여야지 또 위로 올라 간다=
7 =아니면 또 (.) 이케- (0.2) do[wn 방향이니- west side 로 오는 거니까,
8 Nan: [어.
9 Nan: 응: [응응.
10 Yul: [그 두- 둘 중에 한 [가지를 타고 [올라 가야 돼.
11 Nan: [응응. [그까 이거는
12 인제 east 방향으로 가는 [거지.[이거는.
13 Yul: -> [어 [east 방향으로.=
14 Nan: =어:. 어어.=
15 Yul: =east 방향으로-
16 Nan: 어어.
17 Yul: 하는- (.) 길을 타고 [올라 오다가 보면,
18 Nan: [어어어
19 Nan: 그- 어.
20 Yul: 싸인이 나와.

Because there are many one-way streets in Manhattan, Yul explains which street Nan has to take to head east (lines 1 and 4). Her explanation in lines 6-7 emphasizes that Nan will end up going in the opposite direction if she fails to take one of the recommended streets (*animyen...* “If not...”). As Yul reiterates her point for the third time in line 10, Nan requests confirmation on the direction of the two recommended streets in line 11. In response, Yul provides a noun phrase repeat preceded by an affirmative particle (*e east panghyangulo*. “Yeah towards the east.”). The selected phrase reflects what Yul considers as the focal component in Nan’s confirmation request. By repeating precisely what needs to be confirmed only, Yul displays her orientation to the action of confirming and projects nothing more than confirming. Indeed, once the parenthetical sequence with Nan’s confirmation request and Yul’s confirmation is closed with Nan’s acknowledgement tokens in line 14, Yul repeats the noun phrase again in line 15 as leverage for a resumption of her account that had stopped at line 10.¹⁵

Excerpt 22 compares well with Excerpt 23, which takes place later in the same conversation. Yul’s account of the direction to her place continues until Nan comes in again with another request for confirmation in line 9.

(23) Northern Parkway

- 1 Yul: amwu[thun sasip i exit-ulo kunyang naka-myen,
 anyway fourty two exit-toward just go.out-if
Any[way if {you} just get off at Exit 42,
- 2 Nan: [e
 yes
[Yeah
- 3 Nan: Uh-huh,
Uh-huh,

¹⁵ Although the beginning of line 17 is a little mumbled, line 15 sounds linked to line 17 in both intonation and syntactic structure. Thus, line 15 is considered as a resumption of Yul’s account sequence rather than an expansion or repetition of line 13.

- 4 Yul: kukey Northern Parkway-lang [yenkyel-i kunyang toy-keten,
that.NM Northern Parkway-with link-NM just become-INFO
That just merges into [Northern Parkway,
- 5 Nan: [e- e-
yes yes
[Yeah- Yeah-
- 6 Nan: Uh huh, Uh huh,
Uh huh, uh huh,
- 7 Yul: kulem tasi a:mwu sayngkak eps-i [ku Northern
then again any thought not.exist-ADV that Northern

Parkway-lul kkuth:kkaci tha-ko wa.
Parkway-AC end-up.to ride-and come.INT

**Then again without thinking, [drive on Northern Parkway till the
end.**
- 8 Nan: [ung
yes
[Yeah
- 9 Nan: kunyang ku exit-ul tha-ko Northern Parkway-lul, (.) tha-ko
just that exit-AC ride-and Northern Parkway-AC ride-and
Just take that exit, and take Northern Parkway, and
- 10 east-lo ka-nun ke-ci? = kyeysoK.
east-toward go-RL thing-COM continuously
Go towards the east, right?=all the way.
- 11 Yul: e. [ikey kkuth- kunyang [east-lo [o-nun ke-ya
yes this.NM end just east-toward come-RL thing-be.INT

[kyeysoK.=[waynyahamyen,
continuously because

-> **Yeah. [The end- {You} just [come [towards the east [all the
way.=[Because,**
- 12 Nan: [e. [e. [e.
yes yes yes

[e = [Okeyi.=ung ung.
yes okay yes yes

[Yeah. [Yeah. [Yeah
[Okay.=Yeah yeah.
- 13 Yul: Port Jefferson-i [Long-
Port Jefferson-NM Long
Port Jefferson- [Long-
- 14 Nan: [kkuth:-kkaci.
end-up.to

[Till the end.

15 Nan: ung.
yes
Yeah.

16 Yul: ung. Northern Parkway kkuthna-nun tey
yes Northern Parkway end-RL place
Yeah. Where Northern Parkway ends

17 Nan: ung
yes
Yeah

18 Yul: Northern Parkway-lul kyey:sok kunyang amwu sayngkak
Northern Parkway-AC continuously just any thought

eps-i
not.exist-ADV

19 [exit-iko mwe-ko eps-e.=kunyang- (.) [ccwuk:: tha-ko kkuth-kkaci
exit-and what-and not.exist-INT just straight ride-and end-up.to

o-myen,
come-if

**If {you} just keep driving on Northern Parkway without thinking,
[ignoring the exits=just- (.) [a:ll the way till the end,**

20 Nan: [ung. [ung. ung.
yes yes yes
[Yeah. Yeah.

21 Nan: ung kunyang, ung:.,
yes just yes
Yeah just, Yeah:.

22 Yul: ikey, (.) sam sa chil-ila-nun tolo-lul manna.
this.NM three four seven-called-RL road-AC meet.INT
This (.) meets Road 347.

1 Yul: 아무[튼 사십 이 exit 으로 그냥 나가면,
2 Nan: [어
3 Nan: Uh-huh,
4 Yul: 그제 Northern Parkway 랑 [연결이 그냥 되거던,
5 Nan: [어- 어-
6 Nan: Uh huh, uh huh,
7 Yul: 그럼 다시 아:무 생각 없이 [그 Northern Parkway 를 끝:까지 타고 와.
8 Nan: [응
9 Nan: 그냥 그 exit 을 타고 Northern Parkway 를, (.) 타고
10 east 로 가는 거지?=계속.
11 Yul: -> 어. [이게 끝- 그냥 [east 로 [오는 거야 [계속.=[왜냐하면,
12 Nan: [어. [어. [어. [어 =[오케이.=응 응.
13 Yul: Port Jefferson 이 [Long-

14 Nan: [끝:까지.
 15 Nan: 응.
 16 Yul: 응. Northern Parkway 끝나는 데
 17 Nan: 응
 18 Yul: Northern Parkway 를 계:속 그냥 아무 생각 없이
 19 [exit 이고 뭐고 없어.=그냥- (.) [쭉:: 타고 끝까지 오면,
 20 Nan: [응. [응. 응.
 21 Nan: 응 그냥, 응:,
 22 Yul: 이게, (.) 삼 사 칠이라는 도로를 만나.

In response to Yul’s account in lines 1 (“take Exit 42”), 4 (“stay on Northern Parkway”), and 7 (“go all the way”), Nan requests confirmation in line 9. She first summarizes what Yul has just said (*kunyang ku exit-ul thako Northern Parkway-lul, (.) thako* “Just take that exit, and take Northern Parkway and”), and asks if the instructions are still in the same directional orientation, that is, towards the east (*east-lo kanun keci?=kyeysok*. “Go towards the east, right?=all the way.”). The second half of Nan’s question is formulated almost the same as the end of her question in lines 11-12 in Excerpt 22 (*kukka ikenun incey east panghyangulo kanun keci. ikenun*. “So now this is towards the east, right. This {street}.”). And yet, unlike Yul’s response in Excerpt 22, which is a noun phrase repeat (*e east panghyangulo*. “Yeah towards the east.”), her response in Excerpt 23 is a non-minimal repeat in a sentential form despite the little difference between the two excerpts in the confirmed content (*e. ikey kkuth- kunyang east-lo onun keya kyeysok.=waynyahamyen*, “Yeah. The end- {You} just come towards the east all the way.=Because.”).

Notably, in Excerpt 23, Yul expands her non-minimal repeat response by latching a connective *waynyahamyen* ‘because,’ which clearly foreshadows more utterances to follow. The continuation of her response in line 13, however, is interrupted by Nan’s another confirmation request in line 14. Yul thus provides confirmation (line 16). In line 17, Yul gives up going back to line 13, which was cut off at “Long-”. Instead, she resumes her account that had stopped at

line 7 by Nan's initial confirmation request. Although Yul's expansion beyond her repetitive response does not get completed, this excerpt shows a clear comparison to Excerpt 22 with respect to the different patterns of sequential development subsequent to a noun phrase repeat and a non-minimal sentential repeat, respectively.

Another example of a noun phrase repeat is shown in Excerpt 24. An earlier part of this conversation was presented in Excerpt 21, in which one participant, Jun, asked the other, Tay, about her daughter enjoying the preschool. In the current excerpt, the topic of the conversation is Jun's son, Hoyeng, who is yet to enter a preschool. Tay's tag question requesting confirmation appears in lines 9 through 10, and Jun provides a noun phrase repeat as a response. As in Excerpt 22, a sequence transition is made subsequent to the noun phrase repeat by the response speaker.

(24) Born in April¹⁶

- 1 Jun: awu Hoyeng-in hh kaul-ey-na ponayl-la
 EX PN-TOP fall-in-only send-intention
 (kule-kwu iss)-nuntey,
 be.so-and exist-CIRCUM
 Ah {I'm} thinking of sending Hoyeng {to preschool} only in the fall,
- 2 Tay: ung. cikum tani-canh-a.
 yes now attend-COM.not-INT
 Yeah. {He's} now going to {one}.
- 3 (0.2)
- 4 Jun: .ts kuken preschool-un ani-ya. ta emma-lang
 that.TOP preschool-TOP be.not-INT all mom-with
 kath[i tani-nun ke-nikka.
 together attend-RL thing-because
 .ts That isn't a preschool. Since {the kids} go with {their} mom.
- 5 Tay: [kuchi emma-lang kathi ka-nun [ke-ci.
 right mom-with together go-RL thing-COM

¹⁶ In Tay's utterance in line 9, the word *cwu* 'week' was interpreted as a slip of the tongue and was translated as 'year.'

Right {they} go with {their} mom.

6 Jun: [ung kukka
yes so

7 yuchiwon-un ani-ko kunyang (0.5) .ts no-nun
preschool-TOP be.not-and just play-RL

tey-[ci:. kunyang kuntey-
place-COM just but

**Yeah so {it}'s not a preschool but just (0.5) .ts where {they}
hang out:. But-**

8 Tay: [e:.
yes

Yeah:.

9 Tay: Hoyeng-ika kumyenun (0.2) encey (0.5) ol (.) sawel(ey/im)
PN-NM then when this April-in

toy-myen-un man sam cwu
become-if-TOP full three week

10 toy-canh-a kuci.
become-COM.not-INT right

**Then Hoyeng (0.2) When (0.5) {He's} turning three this April,
right.**

11 Jun: ung ol sawel-ey.
yes this April-in

-> **Yeah this April.**

12 Tay: e:¿
yes
Yeah:¿

13 Jun: >kuntey< cwungkan-ey tuleka-ki-ka swip-ci anh-tay:.
but middle-in enter-NOM-NM easy-NOM not.do-HEARSAY
>But< {they say} it's not easy to enter in the middle:.

kunikka kwuwel-ey tuleka-kena,
so September-in enter-or
So {you} either enter in September,

14 Tay: e.
yes
Yeah.

15 Jun: ilwel-ey tuleka-kena twul cwung-ey hana-nka pwa:.
January-in enter-or two among-in one-Q see.INT
Or enter in January {It seems} {it's} one of the two {options}:.

16 Tay: e:¿ kulay?
yes be.so.INT
Oh:¿ {That} is so?

1 Jun: 아우 호영인 hh 가을에나 보넬라 (그러구 있)는데,
 2 Tay: 응. 지금 다니잖아.
 3 (0.2)
 4 Jun: .ts 그건 preschool 은 아니야. 다 엄마랑 같[이 다니는 거니까.
 5 Tay: [그치 엄마랑 같이 가는 [거지.
 6 Jun: [응 그까
 7 유치원은 아니고 그냥 (0.5) .ts 노는 데[지:. 그냥 근데-
 8 Tay: [어:.
 9 Tay: 호영이가 그면은 (0.2) 언제 (0.5) 올 (.) 사월(에/임) 되면은 만 삼 주
 10 되잖아 그지.
 11 Jun: -> 응 올 사월에.
 12 Tay: 어:¿
 13 Jun: >근데< 중간에 들어가기가 쉽지 않대:. 그니까 구월에 들어가거나,
 14 Tay: 어.
 15 Jun: 일월에 들어가거나 둘 중에 하난가 봐:.
 16 Tay: 어:¿ 그래?

As Jun says that she plans on having her son start preschool in the fall in line 1, Tay shows confusion in line 2 based on her previous knowledge about Jun's son attending some place. Jun's clarification thus follows in lines 4-7. Once Tay's misunderstanding gets resolved, as indicated by her agreement in line 5 and acknowledgement token in line 8, she requests confirmation in lines 9-10 in regards to whether Jun's son becomes three years old in April. It is notable that Tay's question started as a wh-question but shifted into a tag question, displaying her knowledgeable state over the issue at hand and turning the question into a confirmation request rather than information-seeking.¹⁷ Although quickly dropped, the wh-word *encey* 'when' provides a hint that the part to be confirmed in the following tag question is a time period, that is, *ol sawel* "this April." In response, Jun answers precisely with that noun phrase. Again, by repeating precisely what needs to be confirmed, and that element only, Jun shows her orientation to the action of confirming and projects that no further action is forthcoming in relation to the

¹⁷ In Korean, wh-words are not preposed to the beginning of a wh-question. Therefore, the beginning of line 9 (*Hoyengika kumyenun (0.2) encey* [Lit. Hoyeng then (0.2) when]) is understood as "Then when does Hoyeng" rather than the speaker self-repairing the turn with *encey* 'when' to begin a wh-question.

response. Upon Tay’s acknowledgement of confirmation in line 12, Jun shifts the topic back to the issue of when her son should start preschool in line 13.¹⁸ Therefore, this example of a noun phrase repeat also conforms to the general pattern of a minimal repeat.

The last example of a noun phrase repeat is shown in Excerpt 25. Here a noun phrase repeat occurs in two separate turns. In both cases, the repeat is followed by another repetitional noun phrase, which either paraphrases the first repeat or further specifies the first repeat. In this respect, this excerpt illustrates a turn expansion beyond a noun phrase repeat, albeit brief. The tendency of sequence progression is still observed soon after the response with a noun phrase repeat. The excerpt starts with Sam’s prayer request to Han for her husband’s upcoming interview to become an Elder at church. Han has also known about the interview.

(25) Interview

- 1 Sam: .h e samo-nim kitchay cw-eyo:.
 yes wife-HN pray.INF for-IM
 .h Oh ma’am, please pray for {him}.¹⁹
- wuli moksa-nim .h next Tuesday-ey,
 our pastor-HN next Tuesday-on
 My husband .h next Tuesday,
- 2 Han: ung.
 yes
 Yeah.
- 3 Sam: e. inthepyu iss-e. eyl==
 yes interview exist-INT Elder
 Yeah. {He} has an interview. El==
- 4 Han: =e ku eylte?

¹⁸ Jun’s comment in lines 13 and 15 addresses the possible implication embedded in Tay’s question, i.e., Jun’s son will turn three in April, so that month may be a good turning point for him to enter preschool. However, it is no longer contributing to answering Tay’s question *per se*; rather, it addresses the connection between Tay’s question and the context from which the question may have been derived. Thus, lines 13 and 15 resume the topical issue brought up in line 1, rather than expanding Jun’s answer in line 11.

¹⁹ Sam calls Han *samonim* [Lit. teacher’s wife; ma’am], which is a polite address term used for married women, especially a wife of a teacher, a pastor, or a president of a company. In this case, Han is a pastor’s wife. Although the address term was translated as “ma’am” without a better option, Sam and Han have a close relationship, as indicated by both participants’ mixed utilization of an honorific ending and an intimate ending toward each other.

- yes that Elder
=Yeah {for} that Elder {position}?
- 5 Sam: ung.=
yes
Yeah.=
- 6 Han: =an kulay-to na kuke kwungkumhay kaci-kwu:,
not be.so-though I that curious.INT have-and
=Even before {you mentioned it}, I've been curious,
- 7 Sam: [ung
yes
Yeah
- 8 Han: [ta tway-ss-na ettekey tway-ss-na hay-ss-te-ni
all become-PST-Q how become-PST-Q do-PST-RT-then
{I} was wondering if {it's} done, how {it's} done
- Tuesday? [neyksuthu?
Tuesday next
Tuesday? Next?
- 9 Sam: [e.
yes
Yeah.
- 10 Sam: Next Tues[day.=[Coming Tuesday.
-> **Next Tuesday.=Coming Tuesday.**
- 11 Han: [e- [e.
yes yes
Yea- Yeah.
- 12 Han: taum- taum cwu-kwun-yo kuni[kka?
next next week-APP-POL so
So {I realize} {it}'s next- next week?
- 13 Sam: [taum cwu. [taum cwu Tuesday-ey.
next week next week Tuesday-on
-> **Next week. Next Tuesday.**
- 14 Han: [ung:
yes
Yeah:
- 15 Han: [a:
EX
Oh:
- 16 Sam: [e- (.) yey. kito com pwuthakhay-yo:.
yes yes prayer little request-POL
Yea- (.) Yes. Please pray: for him. [Lit. "I request some prayers."]
- 1 Sam: .h 어 사모님 기도해 줘요:. 우리 목사님 .h next Tuesday 에,

2 Han: 응.
 3 Sam: 어. 인터뷰 있어. 엘-=
 4 Han: =어 그 엘더?
 5 Sam: 응.=
 6 Han: =안 그래도 나 그거 궁금해 가지구: ,
 7 Sam: [응
 8 Han: [단 됐나 어떻게 됐나 했더니 Tuesday? [넥스트?
 9 Sam: [어.
 10 Sam: -> Next Tues[day.=[Coming Tuesday.
 11 Han: [어- [어.
 12 Han: 다음- 다음 주군요 그니[까?
 13 Sam: -> [다음 주. [다음 주 Tuesday 에.
 14 Han: [응:
 15 Han: [아:
 16 Sam: [어- (.) 예. 기도 좀 부탁드립니다:.

Upon Sam's topic proffer in lines 1 and 3, Han shows her prior knowledge and concern over the issue (lines 4, 6, and 8). She then proceeds to request Sam for confirmation in regards to the date of the interview at the end of line 8 (*Tuesday? neyksuthu?* "Tuesday? Next?"). Sam first provides an affirmative particle in response to "Tuesday?" only to be overlapped with Han's following utterance "Next?". Sam thus responds again. This time she responds with a noun phrase repeat "Next Tuesday," which effectively confirms both parts of Han's question ("Tuesday? Next?"). The noun phrase repeat is immediately followed by a paraphrase "Coming Tuesday," which further clarifies the previous repeat. Although the initial noun phrase repeat gets expanded with a paraphrase, the two phrases are very much alike in both format and action. In other words, the paraphrase does not seem to be prospectively projecting additional actions or expansion to be forthcoming; rather, it works retrospectively on the preceding noun phrase repeat to reinforce the action of confirming. Indeed, the turn is followed by Han's expression of realization indexed with the apperceptive suffix *-kwun* (line 12).

Han's turn in line 12 is responsive to Sam's confirmation in line 10, but at the same time deploys a rising intonation and mobilizes a response from Sam in turn (Stivers & Rossano, 2010).

Sam provides a response similar in format to her previous response in line 10. That is, the response is comprised of a noun phrase repeat (*taum cwu* “Next week”) followed by another phrase further specifying the preceding noun phrase (*taum cwu Tuesday-ey* “Next Tuesday”). Again, although the initial noun phrase repeat is expanded with an additional phrase, the second phrase operates retrospectively, almost as summation of all her previous confirmatory responses provided in lines 10 and 13. Sam’s next turn in line 16, which reroutes the conversation back to her initial prayer request, shows that she considers the confirmation-request sequence having been closed with her phrasal repeats in line 13. Therefore, in both turns with an expanded noun phrase repeat (lines 10 and 13), it is still observed that a noun phrase repeat tends to bring forth a sequence transition and progression, rather than a (substantial) expansion of the current sequence.

3.4 Discussion

This chapter has presented minimal repeats in question-answer sequences with a focus on those questions that request confirmation. Minimal repeats are subcategorized into predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats; predicate repeats confirm a whole proposition of the question whereas noun phrase repeats address a specific part of the question. The distinction between the two types of minimal repeats is relevant in analyzing how repetitional responses are shaped differently according to the polarity of the question. In other words, when a negative question (especially with pre-verbal negation) is responded with a minimal repeat, the response takes a form of a predicate repeat. On the other hand, in response to a positively polarized question, a wider range of minimal repeats are utilized, with both predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats coming into play. Although previous research has used the term ‘partial repeat’ to characterize a shape of repetitional responses, it was unclear which part of the prior turn exactly comprises a

partial repeat or if a finer distinction could be made within the broad category of partial repeats (Heritage, 1984; J. Park, 2008; Pomerantz, 1984).²⁰ In that sense, the findings of this study contribute to our understanding of repetitional responses, their subcategories, and the sequential environments in which they are deployed.

The overall pattern observed across different types of minimal repeats is that minimal repeats are oriented to an incipient transition of the turn. Raymond's (2003) seminal research on type-conformity of responses has shown that yes/no responses are most preferred in response to yes/no polar questions, promoting the closure of the current question-answer sequence. It is further noted that "any departures from that preference, including nonconforming responses, are dispreferred, noticeable, and eventful" (Raymond, 2003, p. 954). Since then, repetitional responses have been examined with reference to their markedness as opposed to the unmarked yes/no-type responses; consequently, repetitional responses are now generally understood as exerting agency and/or epistemic authority of the question recipient over the matter at issue (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Stivers, 2005). By doing so, repetitional responses confirm the proposition of the question rather than affirming it.

What has been observed with minimal repeats in this chapter is not to contradict the previous claims about repetitional responses; rather, the findings here draw attention to the formulations of repetitional responses and what the minimal forms of repetition project with respect to the development of the turn. More specifically, with minimal repeats, respondents not only provide confirmation (rather than affirmation) but also display that the question will be treated as a request for confirmation only. Thus, further actions are rarely taken after the minimal repeat, which leads to a turn transition.

²⁰ Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen's research (2015) is one of the few studies that have made a distinction among responsive turns based on their structural forms (e.g., particle responses, phrasal responses, and clausal responses).

This pattern is particularly salient in predicate repeats with a modified ending. It has been shown that, by repeating the predicate with an ending that is different from the one used in the question, the respondent accomplishes confirming the propositional content with a shifted modality. Despite the modification to modality, however, the shift embedded in the predicate repeats with a modified ending is not treated as the primary action of the turn. This resembles what Jefferson (1987) has categorized as ‘embedded correction.’ Unlike exposed correction, which is oriented to and dealt with on the surface of interaction, embedded correction is accepted and integrated into interaction without an overt acknowledgement. Therefore, in spite of the shift in modality embedded in the turn, the formulation of a minimal repeat conveys the primary action of the turn as confirmation and promotes a turn transition subsequently.

CHAPTER 4

“NON-MINIMAL REPEATS” IN AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES

This chapter examines non-minimal repeats observed in response to a request for confirmation. As the term ‘non-minimal’ suggests, this type of repeats contains certain element(s) that can be omitted without hurting the comprehensibility of the turn. For instance, if a question is “*cemsim mekessni?* (Did {you} eat lunch?),” a minimal repeat would be “*mekesse* ({I} ate)” whereas a non-minimal repeat would be “*cemsim mekesse* ({I} ate lunch).” However, the “extra” element that makes a repeat non-minimal does not have to be repeated from the question; the respondent may incorporate a new element into a repetitional response to make a non-minimal repeat. Thus, to the above question, answering with “*pangkum mekesse* ({I} ate {lunch} just now),” for example, would be also considered a non-minimal repeat in my analysis. The same is true for a new element attached to a repetitional response with a connective, e.g., “*mekko casse* ({I} ate and slept).”

Contrary to minimal repeats, which are deployed when a respondent treats the question precisely as a request for confirmation, non-minimal repeats are used when a respondent executes more actions than just confirming. The sequential development subsequent to non-minimal repeats also shows a contrast to that after minimal repeats. More specifically, non-minimal repeats tend to be followed by an expansion of a turn or a sequence whereas minimal repeats promote a transition of a turn and a sequence. Thus, a non-minimal repeat is often the harbinger of further talk. Through this expanded talk, or through the non-minimal repeat itself, the respondent achieves multiple actions beyond confirming. The following sections will

examine the types of actions achieved through non-minimal repeat responses and the structural features observed in non-minimal repeats.

4.1 Non-minimal Repeats Projecting Further Informing

As previously mentioned, non-minimal repeats contain “extra” elements that make the repeat non-minimal in nature. When respondents signal more talk forthcoming with non-minimal repeats, these extra elements often reflect the topic of the further talk. Thus, this type of non-minimal repeats not only provides confirmation over the issue at hand, but projects further informing with reference to the extra element in the repeat. Consider Excerpt 1 for example. Yun and Ken are talking about their mutual friend, Secwun, who has applied for several universities and is waiting for the results. The request for confirmation is made in line 21, in which Ken asks Yun if Secwun has been accepted at any schools near his area.

(1) University Applications

- 1 Ken: Secwuni-to hapkyek toy-n ke iss-ni?
PN-also pass become-RL thing exist-Q
Did Secwun get any admissions?
- 2 Yun: .H ku hyeng (.) hana:
that brother one
.H He (.) one {admission}:
- 3 Ken: hhh
- 4 Yun: <hwaksilhi:>-nun molu-keyss-te-ntey,
certainly-TOP not.know-may-RT-CIRCUM
{He} didn't know for sure,
- 5 Ken: e.
yes
Yeah.
- 6 Yun: toy-l ke-lay. mwe.=
become-PRS thing-DC.HEARSAY DM
But {he} said he would {get one}. Well.=
- 7 Ken: =eti.
where

=Where.

8 (0.7)

9 Yun: University of (.) New Haven-i-la-ko,
University of New Haven-be-DC-QT
{A school} called University of New Haven,

10 (.)

11 Ken: New Haven?
New Haven?

12 Yun: [ung.
yes
Yeah.

13 Ken: [yeki? [Connecticut [yeph-ey iss-nu-n ke?
here Connecticut next-at exist-IN-RL thing
Here? The one next to Connecticut?

14 Yun: [e. [e Connecticut-
yes yes Connecticut
Yeah. Yeah Connecticut-

15 Yun: e a-ney; hyeng. e.
yes know-APP brother yes
Yeah [I see] you know; Yeah.

16 (0.7)

17 Yun: keki-lang mwe
there-and DM
There and

18 (0.5)

19 Yun: cikum (.) acik hakkyo-mata thully-e kaci-ko,
now yet school-per different-INF have-and
Since {the notification schedule} is different for every school,

20 (0.5)

21 Ken: kum yeki i ccok-ey-n toy-n ke eps-ko?
then here this side-at-TOP become-RL thing not.exist-and
Then here- over this side there isn't {a school} {he} got into?

22 (0.7)

23 Yun: -> ung. ci- ku <ccokeyn:> >eps-ul ke-ya -<
yes that side-at-TOP not.exist-PRS thing-be.INT
No. <Over that side:> [I think] >there isn't-<

.h ku ccok-ey ku .h (.) aym:hesuthu-n-ka mwe?
.h that side-at that Amherst-be-Q what
.h Over that side .h (.) A:mherst or something?

24 (.)

25 Ken: e?
yes
Huh?

26 Yun: ku University of Massachusetts iss-canh-a.
that University of Massachusetts exist-COM.not-INT
[You know] the University of Massachusetts.

27 Ken: e.
yes
Yeah.

28 Yun: aymhesuthu-n-ka mwe.
Amherst-be-Q what
Amherst or something.

29 Ken: e.
yes
Yeah.

30 Yun: keki hana (.) ne-ss-ul ke-l?
there one apply-PST-PRS thing-AC
[I think] {he} applied for that one {school}?

kuntey (.) acik (0.2) palphyo-ka acik an na-ss-na pwa.
but yet notification-NM yet not out-PST-Q see.INT
But (.) [it seems] the notification isn't out yet.

31 (0.5)

32 Ken: e..
yes
Yeah..

1 Ken: 서준이도 합격 된 거 있니?

2 Yun: .H 그 형 (.) 하나:

3 Ken: hhh

4 Yun: <확실히:>는 모르겠던데,

5 Ken: 어.

6 Yun: 될 거래. 뭐.=

7 Ken: =어디.

8 (0.7)

9 Yun: University of (.) New Haven 이라고,

10 (.)

11 Ken: New Haven?

12 Yun: [응.

13 Ken: [여기? [Connecticut [옆에 있는 거?

14 Yun: [어. [어 Connecticut-

15 Yun: 어 아네; 형. 어.

16 (0.7)

17 Yun: 거기랑 뭐

18 (0.5)

19 Yun: 지금 (.) 아직 학교마다 틀려 가지고,
 20 (0.5)
 21 Ken: 금 여기 이 쪽엔 된 거 없고?
 22 (0.7)
 23 Yun: -> 응. 지- 그 <쪽엔:> >없을 거야-< .h 그 쪽에 그 .h (.) 엠:허스튼가 뭐?
 24 (.)
 25 Ken: 어?
 26 Yun: 그 University of Massachusetts 있잖아.
 27 Ken: 어.
 28 Yun: 엠허스튼가 뭐.
 29 Ken: 어.
 30 Yun: 거기 하나 (.) 냈을 걸? 근데 (.) 아직 (0.2) 발표가 아직 안 났나 봐.
 31 (0.5)
 32 Ken: 어:.

The excerpt starts with Ken’s question, asking Yun for an update on Secwun’s college acceptance status. Yun’s following response from lines 2 through 15 informs that Secwun is likely to be accepted to the University of New Haven, and lines 17 and 19 imply that the other results are unknown due to the universities’ different schedules for acceptance notifications. Despite Yun’s informing so far that Secwun may possibly have been accepted at the University of New Haven, Ken requests confirmation in line 21, specifying his vicinity (*yeki i ccok* “here this side”) as the focus of his inquiry. In response, Yun provides a repetitional answer with an extra element *ku ccokeyn*: “over that side:” which makes the repeat non-minimal. For the sake of confirmation only, this bit of response is sufficient. However, his response turn gets expanded with further talk, precisely about *ku ccok* “that side,” the element Yun had added in the preceding repetitional response seemingly redundantly. The expanded talk provides further information, which essentially accounts for the conjecture made in the preceding non-minimal repeat response; Secwun has applied for the University of Massachusetts, but the result does not seem to be out yet (=> expanded portion of the response), which leads Yun to believe that there is no school Secwun has got into “over that side” as of yet (=> non-minimal repeat). Therefore, this excerpt illustrates a non-minimal repeat response that not only achieves confirming the prior question but

also projects further informing. In addition, the topic of the further talk is indicated by the extra element in the preceding repeat.

Another example of a non-minimal repeat followed by further informing is shown in Excerpt 2, which is a continuation from Excerpt 16 in Chapter 3. Previously, Nam and Gia had been talking about course enrollment for the next semester, and Gia told Nam that their mutual friend, Nobuko, enrolled for 18 units even though her GPA was not high enough to take more than 15 units. The beginning of Excerpt 2 shows the topic of Nobuko's GPA and course enrollment gradually winding down.

(2) Japan

- 1 Nam: mwe C mac-ko i- D mac-ko
DM C get-and D get-and
Well, getting C's and- getting D's,

ile-n key manh-ass-na po-ci kulemyen?
be.this-RL thing.NM many-PST-Q see-COM then
[I guess] {she} had many of such cases then?
- 2 Gia: e. kule-ntey-to:. (.) manh- (.) manhi tut-key ha-te-la?
yes be.so-CIRCUM-even much much take-let do-RL-DC
Yeah. Even so:. (.) a lot- (.) [I noticed] {they} let {her} take a lot?
- 3 Nam: °ung:..°
yes
°Yeah:..°
- 4 Gia: hhh °kuleh-ta [kule-te-la-kwu°
be.so-DC be.so-RT-DC-QT
hhh °[I noticed] they said so°
- 5 Nam: [kyay ilpon ka-ss-ta wa-ss-kwun-a?
she Japan go-PST-TRANS come-PST-APP-INT
[I realize] she came back from Japan?
- 6 Gia: .h ung ilpon ka-ss-ta wa-ss-ci.
yes Japan go-PST-TRANS come-PST-COM
-> **.h Yeah {she} came back from Japan.**
- 7 Gia: hh .h moca yeyppu-n ke sa wa-ss-te-la-ko.
hat pretty-RL thing buy come-PST-RT-DC-QT
hh .h [I noticed] {she} bought a pretty hat from there.

[onul moca ssu-ko wa-ss-nuntey

today hat wear-and come-PST-CIRCUM
{She} came with the hat on today

- 8 Nam: [huhuh
9 Gia: .h hh ahyu
EX
.h hh Ahh ((sighing))

1 Nam: 뭐 C 맞고 이- D 맞고 이렇게 많았나 보지 그러면?
2 Gia: 어. 그런데도:. (.) 많- (.) 많이 듣게 하더라?
3 Nam: °응:..°
4 Gia: hhh °그렇다 [그러더라구°
5 Nam: [개 일본 갔다 왔구나?
6 Gia: -> .h 응 일본 갔다 왔지.
7 Gia: hh .h 모자 예쁜 거 사 왔더라고. [오늘 모자 쓰고 왔는데,
8 Nam: [ㅎㅎ
9 Gia: .h hh 아휴

Once Nam's initial question in line 1 is answered in line 2, both Nam and Gia turn the floor over to the other without initiating another sequence (lines 3 and 4). Finally in line 5 Nam begins a new sequence with a declarative question. Her question is formulated as a request for confirmation but can be understood as a topic proffer as well. The question is a topic proffer in the sense that it turns the trajectory of the talk from Nobuko's GPA and course enrollment to her trip to Japan. The way it is formulated with the apperceptive marker *-kwuna*, however, indicates that Nam has been prompted to notice the proposition that Nobuko visited Japan and came back. The rising intonation makes Gia's response relevant in the next turn so Nam's realization can be confirmed or disconfirmed.

In response, Gia provides a non-minimal repeat in line 6 with the extra element *ilpon* 'Japan.' Then, it is Gia who keeps the floor to expand her turn, and the expanded talk is an elaboration related to the topic of Nobuko's visit to Japan. As in Excerpt 1, this excerpt illustrates a case in which a non-minimal repeat is followed by a turn expansion, and the topic of the expanded talk is reflected in the extra element in the repeat. In other words, by responding to

a question with a non-minimal repeat, the respondent projects further informing on the issue at hand, which also displays his/her orientation to the question not merely as a confirmation request but also as a topic proffer.

Excerpt 3 is another example of a non-minimal repeat that contains an extra element on which the subsequent talk expands, providing a further account for confirmation. Bak is making plans for his visit to Los Angeles, where his friend, Suh, lives. In the excerpt, Bak is telling Suh how he would go to the airport on the day he leaves Los Angeles if Suh cannot give him a ride.

(3) Airport Shuttle

- 1 Bak: .hh ya isip phal-il nal:, .hhh mwe (0.2) kwuti elyewu-myen,
 hey twenty eight-day day DM rather difficult-if
**.hh Hey on the 28th, .hhh well (0.2) if {it's} hard {for you to
 give me a ride},**
- 2 na-lul ceki-ta- cwung:kan-ey ceki eti-ya.
 I-AC there-at middle-at there where-be.INT
There- Where is the place in the middle.
- 3 (0.7)
- 4 Bak: .ts lasupe- ani lasupe-ka ani- eyleyi (.) keki- (0.5)
 Las Ve no Las Ve-NM be.not L.A. there
.ts Las Ve- no not Las Ve- L.A. (.) there- (0.5)
- 5 Suh: hh
- 6 Bak: tawunthawun kath-un tey-ey hothel yeph-eyta- nayly-e
 downtown same-RL place-at hotel next-at drop.off-INF
 cwu-myen-un koki-ey:, konghang pesu-ka: han sip pwul
 give-if-TOP there-at airport bus-NM about ten dollar
- 7 cwu-myen ka-l ke-ya.
 give-if go-PRS thing-be.INT
**If {you} drop {me} off somewhere like downtown, next to a hotel,
 over there: the airport shuttle: would be running for about \$10.**
- 8 (1.0)
- 9 Suh: kule-n key iss-na?
 be.so-RL thing.NM exist-Q
Is there such thing?
- 10 Bak: e. kule-n key iss-e. mwe- thayksi tha-ko tuleka-myen

yes be.so-RL thing.NM exist-INT DM taxi ride-and enter-if
sasip pwul osip pwul nao-keyss-ci.
fourty dollar fifty dollar cost-may-COM

-> **Yeah. There is such thing. Well- if {you} go by taxi, {it} would cost \$40-50.**

11 (0.5)

12 Bak: kuntey ni-ka-
but you-NM
But if you-

13 Suh: hh

14 Bak: .ts tawunthawun ccok-ina, eti-eyta [nayle-ta cwu-myen-un,
downtown side-or somewhere-at drop.off-TRANS give-if-TOP
.ts drop {me} off around downtown, or somewhere {like that},

15 Suh: [hh

16 Bak: .h keki-se wuli hankwuk-ey-to mwe sachen wen nay-myen-un
there-from our Korea-in-also DM 4,000 won pay-if-TOP

konghang pesu wa-ss-ta ka-ss-ta ha-canh-a.
airport bus come-PST-TRANS go-PST-TRANS do-COM.not-INT

.h from there- Even in Korea the airport shuttle runs for about 4,000 won.

17 (0.5)

18 kunikka- k- kokes-to hama han .h sip pwul
so that-also probably about ten dollar

an- an-i-l ke-ya.
inside inside-be-PRS thing-be.INT

So- th- that {in L.A.} would probably be .h under \$10 as well.

19 Bak: sip pwul an-i-myen-un, [.hh keki-se ta wa-ss-ta
ten dollar inside-be-if-TOP there-from all come-PST-TRANS

ka-ss-ta [ha-nu-n ke iss-unikka,
go-PST-TRANS do-IN-RL thing exist-because

Since there're shuttle services there[=near downtown], for under \$10,

20 Suh: [hh
[hh

21 Bak: (.) .h kule-myen toy-ci mwe.
be.so-if become-COM DM
(.) .h that would do.

22 Suh: hh ung:.
 yes
hh Yeah: .

 1 Bak: .hh 야 이십 팔일 날:, .hhh 뭐 (0.2) 굳이 어려우면,
 2 나를 저기다- 중:간에 저기 어디야.
 3 (0.7)
 4 Bak: .ts 라스베- 아니 라스베가 아니- 에레이 (.) 거기- (0.5)
 5 Suh: hh
 6 Bak: 다운타운 같은 데에 호텔 옆에다- 내려 주면은 고기에:, 공항 버스가: 한 십 불
 7 주면 갈 거야.
 8 (1.0)
 9 Suh: 그런 게 있나?
 10 Bak: -> 어. 그런 게 있어. 뭐- 택시 타고 들어가면 사십 불 오십 불 나오겠지.
 11 (0.5)
 12 Bak: 근데 니가-
 13 Suh: hh
 14 Bak: .ts 다운타운 쪽이나, 어디에다 [내려다 주면은,
 15 Suh: [hh
 16 Bak: .h 거기서 우리 한국에도 뭐 사천 원 내면은 공항 버스 왔다 갔다 하잖아.
 17 (0.5)
 18 그니까- ㄱ- 고것도 하마 한 .h 십 불 안- 안일 거야.
 19 Bak: 십 불 안이면은, [.hh 거기서 다 왔다 갔다 [하는 거 있으니까,
 20 Suh: [hh [hh
 21 Bak: (.) .h 그러면 되지 뭐.
 22 Suh: hh 응:.

As Bak makes a conjecture that there must be airport shuttle services around the hotels in downtown L.A. (lines 6-7), Suh requests confirmation in line 9 (*kulen key issna?* “Is there such thing?”). In response, Bak provides a non-minimal repeat with the extra noun phrase *kulen key* ‘such thing.’ Again, the non-minimal repeat is followed by a lengthy expansion on “such thing,” i.e., the airport shuttle services that Bak thinks exist in downtown L.A.

Chapter 3 has shown that minimal-repeats tend to be followed by a turn and sequence transition, with no further talk appended to the repeat by the respondent. In other words, with minimal repeats, respondents present their response as a sufficient answer to the question, requiring no further account. If the questioner disagrees with the response being sufficient for the question, s/he may seek a further account, as shown in Excerpts 15 and 16 in Chapter 3; otherwise, a minimal-repeat response works to promote a closure of the current sequence. In

Excerpt 2 above, Bak is, in fact, not in a position to provide definitive confirmation to Suh's question in line 9; he is not from the area, and his initial claim about the availability of the airport shuttle services in lines 6-7 is a conjecture after all, as marked by the conjecture ending *-(u)l keya*. Thus, faced with Suh's request for confirmation, which may even be heard as challenging Bak's claim, Bak provides a non-minimal repeat, projecting that his response will not be confirmation only and that the forthcoming talk will pertain to *kulen ke* "such thing." Indeed, the subsequent expansion provides Suh with the ground for Bak's conjecture (e.g., a similar service is available in Korea) and further informs about the likely price range of such services.

This section has shown cases of a non-minimal repeat that project further informing and accounts forthcoming on the respondent's end. In this case, the extra element that makes the repeat non-minimal is often a noun phrase reflecting a topical issue on which the following expansion will unfold.

4.2 Non-minimal Repeats and Speaker Stance

Another sequential environment in which a question is responded with a non-minimal repeat is when the question requests for confirmation out of disbelief. Non-minimal repeats mobilized in this environment tend to be formulated with extra components not taken from the question but newly added in the response. These extra components not only show the respondent's epistemic ground to confirm the matter at issue, but also display his/her own affective stance toward the matter, aligning with the sentiment of disbelief expressed in the question. Consider Excerpt 4 for example. Lee, the main speaker in this excerpt, is telling her friends, Cho and Bae, about an experience from her younger days. She was pursued by many guys some years ago and one particular instance involves a doctor.

(4) Doctor

- 1 Lee: keki sal-te-n, .ss cikum y^umyengha-n uysa-ya ku salam.
there live-RT-RL now famous-RL doctor-be.INT the person
This guy used to live there, .ss He's now a famous doctor.
- 2 Cho: e[:,]
yes
Yeah:,
- 3 Lee: [u]um. kuntey, na-tele cen^yek-ey:::, (.)
yes but I-to evening-in

no^l-le-lul o-lay-nu-n ke-ya::.=
play-INF-AC come-IM-IN-RL thing-be.INT

Yeah. But then, one evening:::, (.) {he} told me to come over::.=
- 4 Cho: =[cip-ulo?]
house-to
To {his} place?
- 5 Bae: [cuku-] cuku [cip-ulo?]
self self house-to
To his- To his place?
- 6 Lee: [e.!]
yes
Yeah.!
- 7 Cho: hh[h .h
- 8 Bae: [cip-ulo?]
house-to
To {his} place?
- 9 Lee: [kulayse nay-ka-] yey.!
so I-NM yes
So I- Yes.!
- 10 caki pang- o-lay-nu-n ke-ya:, kulayse [nay-ka,]
self room come-IM-IN-RL thing-be.INT so I-NM
To his room- {he} told {me} to come over:, so I,
- 11 Bae: [ka-ci]:.
go-COM
{You} should've gone:.
- 12 Lee: wuli emma-ka ka(hh)-lay,
our mom-NM go-IM.QT.INT
My mom told {me} to go(hh),
- 13 °hih::: nay-ka mi- mi:↑chy-ess-nya-kwu [cikum ike-lul]=
I-NM crazy-PST-Q-QT now this-AC
°hih::: I asked if {she's} CRAzy!=

14 Cho: [euhuhhuh]

15 [huhhuhhuhhuh]

16 Lee: =[eti namca]-ney cip-ey ka-nya-[kwu:,]
 where guy-of house-to go-Q-QT
={I} said, how on earth {I} could go to a guy's place:,

17 Cho: [h h][h]

18 Bae: [em]ma-nun
 mom-TOP

ka-lay tto?
 go-IM.QT.INT again

And {your} mom said {you} should go?

19 Lee: wuli emma ka-lay-nu-n [ke-ya ilpwule]:,
 our mom go-IM-IN-RL thing-be.INT on.purpose
-> My mom told {me} to go. On purpose:.

20 Cho: [hhahhahhahhah]

21 Bae: [umhum.]
Mm hm.

22 Lee: [ttan] ttay-nun mithing-to mos naka-key [ha-kwuse :,]
 other time-TOP blind.date-even cannot go.out-let do-while
Other times {she} didn't even allow {me} to go on blind dates:,

23 Cho: [euhuhhuhhuh]

24 Lee: [ungkumsulepkey]
 furtively
With furtive intentions

25 Bae: [uysa-la-nikka tto] ing?
 doctor-DC-because again huh
Now that {he's} a doctor, huh?

26 Lee: ung:.
 yes
Yeah:.

1 Lee: 거기 살던, .ss 지금 유명한 의사야 그 사람.
 2 Cho: 어[:,
 3 Lee: [으]음. 근데, 나더러 저녁에:::, (.) 놀러 올래는 거야::.=
 4 Cho: =[집으로?]
 5 Bae: [즈 그-] 즈그 [집으로?]
 6 Lee: [어.!]
 7 Cho: ㅎㅎ[ㅎ .h
 8 Bae: [집 으 로 ?]

9 Lee: [그래서 내가-] 예.!
 10 Lee: 자기 방- 오래는 거야:, 그래서 [내가,]
 11 Bae: [가지]:.
 12 Lee: 우리 엄마가 간(hh) 래,
 13 °hih:: 내가 미- 민:↑쳤냐구 [지금 이거를]=
 14 Cho: [으 허 허]=
 15 =[허허허허]
 16 Lee: =[어디 남자]네 집에 가냐[구:,]
 17 Cho: [흐흐][흐]
 18 Bae: [엄]마는 가래 또?
 19 Lee: -> 우리 엄마 간래는 [거야 일부러]:,
 20 Cho: [흐하하하하]
 21 Bae: [음흠.]
 22 Lee: [판] 때는 미팅도 못 나가게 [하구서 :,]
 23 Cho: [으허허허]
 24 Lee: [응큼스럽게]
 25 Bae: [의사라니까 또] 잉?
 26 Lee: 응:..

Lee starts her story by introducing the main character, a doctor who is now famous (line 1). Soon after, in line 3, she presents the “inciting incident” of her story, that the doctor invited her over one evening, with much exaggerated prosody especially on the phrase “one evening.” Her prosody clearly conveys that she considers, and perhaps considered then as well, the invitation to be inappropriate. Both recipients, Cho and Bae, show their immediate uptake, asking for the important missing information (location) at the same time (lines 4 and 5). While Cho hears Lee’s confirmation given in line 6 and responds with an audible outbreath (line 7), Bae misses it in the middle of the overlap with his own utterance (lines 5 and 6) and tries a confirmation request for a second time (line 8). As Lee reconfirms the location with intensified prosody (line 9) and proceeds with her turn (line 10), Bae says “You should’ve gone” (line 11). This prompts Lee to introduce her mom’s reaction back then, which is congruent with Bae’s reaction just given. As Lee enacts her response to her mom with marked prosody (lines 13 and 16), Bae asks for confirmation in line 18 (*emmanun kalay tto?* “And {your} mom said {you} should go?”). Bae’s question is charged with feelings of disbelief towards Lee’s mom’s reaction, as conveyed by the

adverb *tto* marking surprise and the topic particle *-nun* marking contrast between Lee's mom's reaction and Bae's expectation.

In response, Lee provides an answer in a non-minimal repeat form: *wuli emma kalaynun keya ilpwule*: “My mom told {me} to go, on purpose:.” The response is notably overbuilt for a confirmatory response, which could have been done by a minimal repeat *kalay* “{She} told {me} to go,” let alone an affirmative particle *ung* or *e* ‘yes.’ The additional elements that make the response a non-minimal repeat, such as *wuli* ‘my,’ the *-(nu)n keya* ending, and the adverb *ilpwule* ‘on purpose,’ each contribute to displaying the speaker Lee's epistemic authority and disapproving stance towards the matter at issue.

The possessive pronoun *wuli* ‘my,’ which may be omitted in Korean, emphasizes the relationship between the referent and the speaker Lee, and gives Lee an epistemic right to make an assertion about the referent. Moreover, by invoking the association between her mom and herself with the explicit use of *wuli* ‘my,’ she shows her orientation to the social norms expected of the relationship, and resorts to them as a basis for her disapproving stance towards her mom's behavior. The *-(nu)n keya* ending, when used in declarative statements as in this excerpt, “upgrades the degree of [the speaker's] assertiveness on the basis of the assumed agreement” between the speaker and the interlocutor (Noh, 2006, p. 97). The adverb *ilpwule* ‘on purpose’ also amplifies the inappropriateness of the referent's behavior in question. Thus, with all of these extra elements added in her confirmation, Lee's non-minimal repeat response does not merely confirm Bae's prior question, but shows her epistemic authority as someone who has a right to confirm about the issue and her congruent feeling of disbelief towards the issue. Again, the non-minimal repeat is followed by further talk by Lee in lines 22 and 24, which adds to her epistemic

yes I-NM dad daughter-be-CIRCUM how.INT DM daughter-be-if
 ettay. twulccay nah-ul ke-ntey. kulay-ss-te-ni,
 how.INT second give.birth-PRS thing-CIRCUM be.so-PST-RT-then

(Yeah) I {said}- "Dad, what's wrong with a girl. What's wrong if {it's} a girl. {I} will have a second {kid}." As {I} said so,

11 Hun: um[:
 yes
Yeah:

12 Ira: [eyi ches ay-ka- ches ay-ka atul-i-eya-ci::
 EX first child-NM first child-NM son-be-must-COM
 tongsayng-to pwa cwu-ko kule-ci
 younger.sibling-also see.INF give-and be.so-COM

13 kule-n-ta tto ttokkathi:?
 be.so-IN-DC again same

"Eh The first kid- The first kid should be a son:: so {he} takes care of the younger sibling" {he} says so again:?

 1 Ira: =딸이래! 그랬더니 아빠(ㅎ)가 [ㅎㅎㅎㅎ]
 2 Hun: [.hhh 어:]
 3 Ira: 아빠가 뭐(ㅎ)래는(ㅎ)줄(ㅎ)알어?ㅎㅎ
 4 Hun: [((cough)) 뭐래요?]
 5 Ira: [아빠가, .hh ㅎㅎ]ㅎ .hhh (.)
 6 .hhhhhh (.) 애! 딸이면 어떡하냐:!! [그래:ㅎㅎ]
 7 Hun: [ㅎㅎㅎㅎㅎㅎ] 아(ㅎ)빠(ㅎ)가(ㅎ)?
 8 Ira: -> 어 우리 아빠가:[=그래서 내가 .hhh]
 9 Hun: [ㅎㅎ .hhhhh]hh=
 10 Ira: (어) 내가- 아빠 딸인데 어때. 뭐 딸이면 어때. 둘째 낳을 건데. 그랬더니,
 11 Hun: 음[:
 12 Ira: [에이 h 첫 애가- 첫 애가 아들이어야지:: 동생도 봐 주고 그러지
 13 그린다 또 똑같이:?

From lines 1 through 5, Ira prefaces her upcoming punch line (line 6) with laugh tokens in such a way that the interlocutor Hun can expect how the story will turn out (e.g., something laughable) and what type of action is thus expected of her at endpoint (C. Goodwin, 1984; Jefferson, 1984). Indeed, in line 7, Hun shows her alignment with Ira by responding with laughter upon the arrival of the punch line. Moreover, she asks *Appa-ka?* ‘{Your} dad?’ and makes Ira’s confirmation relevant in the next turn, even though it is clear from her preceding laughter that she has a good

grasp of the story and knows who said the punch line. Hun's turn at line 7 is then doing a similar action as Bae's line 18 in Excerpt 4; in the form of a request for confirmation, her question displays that she understands precisely what part of Ira's story makes the punch line laughable, i.e., line 6 causes a feeling of disbelief because it was her dad who uttered the line.

In response, Hun provides confirmation with a non-minimal repeat *wuli appa-ka*: "my dad:." Just as Lee who used *wuli emma* 'my mom' at line 19 in Excerpt 4, Ira newly adds an extra component *wuli* 'my' to the reference form, which is redundant and uncalled for if she were to achieve the action of confirming only. The additional action that *wuli* 'my' is doing beyond specifying the referent can be understood as follows: a response with a verbatim minimal repeat *appa-ka*, without *wuli*, would do the job of confirming Hun's question; however, it would not show Ira's own uptake of the story as clearly. By saying *wuli appa-ka*, Ira shows her orientation to the relationship between her dad and herself. Furthermore, she invokes the normative behaviors expected of her dad as *her* dad, such as showing support, instead of unease, when she announces the sex of the baby she is carrying. Thus, by adding the extra component *wuli* to her response, Ira can effectively express her stance toward her dad's behavior; Ira's disbelief is explained just by explicitly pointing out the relationship because her dad's behavior goes against the expectation imposed on him as *her* dad. Therefore, as in Excerpt 4, the speaker deploys a non-minimal repeat in response to what is seemingly a request for confirmation, and by doing so, she not only shows her orientation to the questioner's affective stance embedded in the question, but also displays her congruent stance with the interlocuter's.

Another example of a non-minimal repeat deployed in response to a question with disbelief is shown in Excerpt 6. Min and Kay are wives of doctoral students studying abroad in

the U.S. Min asks Kay when Kay's husband will finish his program, which most likely entails Kay's family going back to Korea.

(6) Post-doctoral Position

- 1 Min: appa-nun <encey-ccum:> kkuthna-si-l yeyceng-i-eyyo?
dad-TOP when-about end-HN-PRS plan-be-POL
Around when is {your} husband planning to finish?
- 2 Kay: .h han il nyen-ina il nyen pan?
about one year-or one year half
.h In about a year or a year and a half?
- 3 Min: e: kulem mwe ay-tul ta: khiwu() tuleka-nu-n ke-ney
yes then DM child-PL all grow enter-IN-RL thing-APP

i [cip-to?
this family-also

**Yeah: Well then your family is also going back {to Korea} when
the kids are all ()?**
- 4 Kay: [ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 5 Kay: ay [icey twulccay ay- han il nyen-(ccum) tol cina-ko
child now second child about one year-about one.year pass-and

[(kuttay:-ccum) sul:[sul ka-ya-ci incey-
then-about slowly go-must-COM now

**After {our} second kid's first birthday- (around: then) {we}
should get started to go back**
- 6 Min: [e
yes
Yeah

[ung: [e:
yes yes
Yeah: Yeah:
- 7 Min: kulem i cip(.)-un mwe photak kath-un ke an ha-cyo?
then this family-TOP DM postdoc same-RL thing not do-COM.POL
Then {your} husband doesn't do something like a postdoc, right?
- 8 (.)
- 9 Kay: .h photak mwe cali-to eps-ko:,
postdoc DM opening-even not.exist-and
.h Post-doc- Well there's no opening and:,

- 10 Min: e: eme kulay-yo? [photak cali-ka eps-↑e?
EX EX be.so-POL postdoc opening-NM not.exist-INT
Oh: Oh is {that} so? There's no postdoc opening?
- 11 Kay: [ung
yes
Yeah
- 12 Kay: yey. i kwa-nun cali-ka eps-te-la-ko-yo po-myen-un?
yes this field-TOP opening-NM not.exist-RT-DC-QT-POL see-if-TOP
-> **No. {I} see that there's no opening in this field of study?**
- 13 Min: ku cengto-y-ey↑yo?
that extent-be-POL
{It}'s that {bad}?
- 14 Kay: ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 15 Min: e:::,
EX
Oh:::,
- 16 Kay: hay pwa-ya: mwe yeki-se han yuk kaywel?
do.INF see.INF-even.if DM here-in about six month
Even if {you} do: {you do} only for about 6 months here?
- 17 Min: [e:,
EX
Oh:,
- 18 Kay: [mwe (.) ha-nu-n salam-un hakkyo-eyse: [naka-se
DM do-IN-RL person-TOP school-from go.out-and

yuk kaywel cengto ha-taka:
six month about do-TRANS

**Well (.) those who do {a postdoc} do it for about 6 months after
graduation, and then:**
- 19 Min: [ung
yes
Yeah
- 20 Min: ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 21 Kay: mwe- kunyang pothong hoysa-lo (.) kunyang manhi ka-te-la-ko-[yo.
DM just usually company-to just much go-RT-DC-QT-POL
Well- [I noticed] {they} just moved to industry a lot.
- 22 Min: [e:
yes

kulem ku cip-to kule-l

then that family-also be.so-PRS

23 sayngkak-i-eyyo?=ani-myen hakkyo-
thought-be-POL be.not-if school

Oh: then {your} husband is thinking of doing so too?=or academia-

1 Min: 아빠는 <언제쯤:> 끝나실 예정이에요?
2 Kay: .h 한 일 년이나 일 년 반?
3 Min: 어: 그럼 뭐 애들 다: 키우() 들어가는 거네 이 [집도?
4 Kay: [응.
5 Kay: 애 [이제 둘째 애- 한 일 년(쯤) 돌 지나고 [(그때: 썸) 슬:[슬 가야지 인제-
6 Min: [어 [응: [어:
7 Min: 그럼 이 집(.)은 뭐 포닥 같은 거 안 하죠?
8 (.)
9 Kay: .h 포닥 뭐 자리도 없고:,
10 Min: 어: 어머 그래요? [포닥 자리가 없↑어?
11 Kay: [응
12 Kay: -> 예. 이 과는 자리가 없더라고요 보면은?
13 Min: 그 정도예↑요?
14 Kay: 응.
15 Min: 어:::,
16 Kay: 해 봐야: 뭐 여기서 한 육 개월?
17 Min: [어:,
18 Kay: [뭐 (.) 하는 사람은 학교에서: [나가서 육 개월 정도 하다가:
19 Min: [응
20 Min: 응.
21 Kay: 뭐- 그냥 보통 회사로 (.) 그냥 많이 가더라고요[요.
22 Min: [어: 그럼 그 집도 그럴
23 생각이예요?=아니면 학교-

Lines 1-6 show that Kay's husband will finish his doctoral program in a year or a year and a half and that her family will then go back to Korea accordingly. Given that Kay's husband returns to Korea immediately after graduation, Min makes an assumption that he does not intend to do a postdoc. This assumption is built into her tag question in line 7. In response, Kay provides a nonconforming answer in line 9, which provides an account for the implied affirmation rather than a direct answer to the question. The account, that there is no postdoc opening, comes across as news to Min, as evidenced in her reaction in line 10 (*e: eme kulayyo?* "Oh: oh is {that} so?"). In overlap with Kay's affirmative particle in line 11, Min adds a question that requests for

confirmation over the inavailability of postdoc openings (*photak calika eps₁e?* “There’s no postdoc open₁ing?”). The abrupt rising at the end of her question as well as her preceding reaction shows that this question is not a mere request for confirmation but is loaded with feelings of surprise and disbelief.

Kay’s subsequent responsive turn, again, shows features of a non-minimal repeat that is deployed in response to a question with disbelief. Instead of stopping at the initial affirmative particle, *yey* “Yes,” or answering with a minimal repeat, *epseyo* “There isn’t,” Kay provides a non-minimal repeat (*i kwanun calika epstelakoyo pomyenun?* “{I} see that there’s no opening in this field of study?”). She not only repeats a part that could have been omitted (*calika* ‘opening’) but also adds more components that in effect support her epistemic ground for the confirmation. More specifically, by specifying the scope of the confirmation as *i kwa* ‘this field of study (=her husband’s field of study),’ she claims her epistemic authority over the current issue as someone who has better access to the information in that particular field of study. In addition, both the *-telako* ending and the attached conditional clause *pomyenun* [Lit. If {I} see] claim that she has acquired the information through her own past perceptual experience. Therefore, the extra elements added to her repetitional response all point to her strong epistemic stance over the matter at issue. Lastly, the rising intonation accompanying her statement conveys that she has also found the fact unexpected, displaying her affective stance being congruent with Min’s.

Min receives Kay’s confirmation with yet another confirmation-request question in line 13. Once Min’s affirmative answer in line 14 is acknowledged by Kay in line 15, making a sequence closure a viable next action, Min reopens the sequence by elaborating on her previous answer in lines 16-21. Thus, the tendency of non-minimal repeats promoting further talk from the repeat speaker is observed in this excerpt as well.

This section has shown examples of non-minimal repeats that are produced in response to questions with disbelief. Responding with non-minimal repeats in such sequential environment is a way for speakers to display their understanding of and orientation to the embedded action of the question beyond requesting confirmation. Non-minimal repeats in this environment often contain extra elements that are not repeated from the question but added newly by the speaker. These elements serve to show the repeat speaker's superior epistemic stance over the issue or express the speaker's affective stance, which is aligning with the interlocuter's.

4.3 Use of Connectives in Non-minimal Repeats

In general, non-minimal repeats tend to be followed by an expanded turn or sequence by the repeat speaker, as shown in the excerpts in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2. However, such expansion is not guaranteed, at least not immediately after the repetitional response, as the interlocutor may come in by selecting him/herself as the speaker of the next turn (Sacks et al., 1974), as shown in Excerpt 6 above. Therefore, just as a topic closure mentioned in Chapter 3, a turn expansion can be achieved through collaborative work between the speaker and the interlocutor (i.e., the questioner and the respondent, in this study). To facilitate a turn expansion and prolonged speakership, the speaker of non-minimal repeats may utilize connectives as a structural device. This section will show how connectives play a role in repetitional responses so that speakers can address the prior question and, at the same time, stretch the sequential boundary allotted to a response turn.

Consider Excerpt 7 for example. Bak, who is studying abroad in Philadelphia, has been describing his school and dormitory life. Immediately prior to this excerpt, he said in a

somewhat self-belittling tone that he had been watching TV and videos in the dorm during his spare time.

(7) Living without a Car

- 1 Bak: ku- (.) kule-ko sal-ko iss-e.
be.so-and live-and exist-INT
Tha- (.) That's how {I}'m doing.
- 2 (0.7)
- 3 Suh: huhu[huh
- 4 Bak: [huh huhuhuhu°huhuh° .hhh ung:
yes
huh huhuhuhu°huhuh° .hhh Yeah:
- 5 Suh: kukey ta-ci mwe.
that.NM all-COM DM
Well that's all.
- 6 Bak: ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 7 (0.7)
- 8 Suh: mwe:. te: khu-n kel pala- ne cha eps(.)-canh-a.
what more big-RL thing.AC want you car not.exist-COM.not-INT
What more {would you} want- You don't have a car, right.
- 9 Bak: nay-ka cha-ka eps-unikka,
I-NM car-NM not.exist-because
-> **Since I don't have a car,**

nan u- iltan myenhe-to eps-canh-a:.
I.TOP first license-even not.exist-COM.not-INT
I- don't even have a {driving} license:.
- 10 (0.5)
- 11 Bak: kulenikka mwe. (.) wancenhi pal <mwukkye iss-ci> mwe.
so DM completely foot tied.INF exist-COM DM
So well. (.) I'm completely <stuck> here. [Lit. {My} feet are tied completely.]
- 12 (0.5)
- 13 Suh: e[:::
yes
Yeah:::
- 14 Bak: [kulayto yeki-nun, phillateylphia-ka, (.) tosi-ka, (.)

still here-TOP Philadelphia-NM city-NM
 cal toy-e iss-e kac-ko, cengli-ka.
 well become-INF exist-INF have-and arrangement-NM

Still here, Philadelphia, (.) the city (.) is well organized,

15 Suh: [ung
 yes
Yeah

16 Bak: [ttak a- moye: iss-ta- .h ikhey- kwupwun kwupwun
 exactly clustered.INF exist-DC like.this section section
 thak cye kac-ko moye iss-ki ttaymwuney,
 exactly make.INF have-and clustered.INF exist-NOM because

Since {things are} clustered:- .h like- divided into sections and clustered,

17 .hhh nay-ka mwe i- (0.2) ilehkey eti ka-ko kule-nun
 I-NM DM like.this somewhere go-and be.so-RL
 tey-nun pwulphyenha-n ken eps-nuntey,
 aspect-TOP inconvenient-RL thing.TOP not.exist-CIRCUM

.hhh It's (0.2) not inconvenient for me to go to places but,

18 Bak: .h [icey com yeki-se (.) phillateylphia-lul pesena-ki-ka
 now little here-from Philadelphia-AC get.out-NOM-NM
 com himtul-ci.
 little hard-COM

.h Out of here- (.) It's a little hard to get out of Philadelphia.

19 Suh: [e:
 yes
Yeah:

 1 Bak: 그- (.) 그리고 살고 있어.
 2 (0.7)
 3 Suh: ㅎㅎ [ㅎ
 4 Bak: [ㅎ ㅎㅎ ㅎㅎ ° ㅎㅎ ° .hhh 응:
 5 Suh: 그게 다지 뭐.
 6 Bak: 응.
 7 (0.7)
 8 Suh: 뭐:.. 더: 큰 걸 바라- 너 차 없(.)잖아.
 9 Bak: -> 내가 차가 없으니까, 난 으- 일단 면허도 없잖아:..
 10 (0.5)
 11 Bak: 그러니까 뭐. (.) 완전히 발 <묶여 있지> 뭐.
 12 (0.5)
 13 Suh: 어[:::
 14 Bak: [그래도 여기는, 필라델피아가, (.) 도시가, (.) 잘 되어 있어 갖고, 정리가.

15 Suh: [응
 16 Bak: [딱 아- 모여: 있다- .h 이케- 구분 구분 탁 저 갖고 모여 있기 때문에,
 17 .hhh 내가 뭐 이- (0.2) 이렇게 어디 가고 그러는 데는 불편한 건 없는데,
 18 Bak: .h [이제 좀 여기서 (.) 필라델피아를 벗어나기가 좀 힘들지.
 19 Suh: [어:

As Bak closes his telling in line 1 with an implication that his life is less than exciting, Suh shows his uptake with a delayed laughter, which is followed by Bak's joining laughter. Even after the laughter wanes, Bak does not take up speakership, passing the turn to Suh (line 4). Suh then makes an evaluative comment at line 5, which gets expanded to line 8 when there is little uptake from Bak in lines 6-7. Suh's comment (*kukey taci mwe. mwe:. te: khun kel pala-* "Well that's all. What more {would you} want-") leads to a request for confirmation about whether Bak has a car (line 8), because if Bak had a car, Suh's comment would not be as suited for the situation; for someone who has a car, s/he would not be constrained just watching TV and videos.

In response to Suh's request for confirmation formulated as a *-canh* pseudo-tag question, Bak provides a non-minimal repeat response in line 9. Instead of an affirmative particle or a minimal repeat *epse* "{I} don't have," he starts his response with a full-fledged repetitive clause *nayka chaka epsunikka* "Since I don't have a car." It is full-fledged in the sense that it not only contains the arguments that could have been omitted (e.g., the subject *na* 'I' and the object *cha* 'car') but also has the particles added (e.g., *nayka, chaka*). Moreover, note that the predicate of the non-minimal repeat ends with a causal connective *-unikka*. By repeating the question with a connective-attached predicate, Bak confirms the question and, at the same time, projects an expansion of the turn (grammatically, with a main clause).²¹ Although what actually follows the connective clause is not the main clause but an upgrade of the proposition of the connective clause

²¹ It should be noted that the continuing intonation (transcribed with a comma) also factors in for the clause to be heard as projecting a following main clause. The connective *-unikka* can be used in turn-final position as well (S. Sohn, 2003).

(i.e., Bak does not even have a driving license, let alone a car), it is shown that Suh does not come in until after line 11 (*wancenhi pal <mwukkye issci> mwe* “I’m completely <stuck> here”), which completes the slot made to be filled by the connective clause. Therefore, this excerpt illustrates that a non-minimal repeat with a connective achieves both confirming the question and concurrently projecting a turn expansion so the respondent can keep the floor.

Another similar example of a non-minimal repeat with a connective is shown in Excerpt 8. An earlier part of this conversation was introduced in Excerpt 5. Ira, who is pregnant with her first baby girl, is reporting on her husband’s reaction to her first ultrasound scan. Previously giving birth herself, Hun displays her strong epistemic stance throughout the excerpt.

(8) Ultrasound Scan

- 1 Ira: kuntey choumpa-lul ttak po-nikka,
but ultrasound-AC exactly see-because
“But once {I} see the ultrasound,”
- 2 Hun: [ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 3 Ira: [.h cincca ce pay sok-ey ayki-ka [iss-kwun-a::
really that belly inside-at baby-NM exist-APP-INT
.h “{I realize} there really is a baby in that belly::”
- 4 Hun: [ku-chyo.
be.so-COM.POL
Right.
- 5 Ira: [°e°
yes
°Yeah°
- 6 Hun: [ayki poi-ko kuleh-canh-ayo.
baby seen-and be.so-COM.not-POL
{You} see the baby and so on, right.
- 7 Ira: ey ayki-ka poi-nikka,
yes baby-NM seen-because
-> Yes since {he} sees the baby,
- 8 Hun: ung.
yes
Yeah.

- 9 Ira: oppa-ka ↓mak:: iss-ci coh-a kaci-ko[:,
brother-NM just exist-COM excited-INF have-and
My husband is all:: excited: so,
- 10 Hun: [huh simcang soli
heart sound
- tut-ko kule-cyo?
hear-and be.so-COM.POL
- hah And {you} hear {the baby's} heartbeat, right?**
- 11 Ira: ney?
yes
Pardon?
- 12 Hun: sin- si==ayki simcang soli-to tut-ko kulay-ss-cyo?
baby heart sound-also hear-and be.so-PST-COM.POL
Hear- Hea==and {you} heard the baby's heartbeat, right?
- 13 Ira: ey ey ey ey ey.
yes yes yes yes yes
Yes yes yeh yeh yeh.
- 14 .h °k-° kuleko ayki-ka, (.)
and baby-NM
.h °An-° and the baby, (.)
- 15 .hh mak choumpa-lo po-nuntey, mak toykey (.) mak- manhi
just ultrasound-by see-CIRCUM just very just much
- wumciki-te-la..
move-RT-DC
- .hh As {we} see through the ultrasound, {she} moves a lot:.**

-
- 1 Ira: 근데 초음파를 딱 보니까,
2 Hun: [응.
3 Ira: [.h 진짜 저 배 속에 애기가 [있구나::
4 Hun: [그쵸.
5 Ira: [°어°
6 Hun: [애기 보이고 그렇잖아요.
7 Ira: -> 에 애기가 보이니까,
8 Hun: 응.
9 Ira: 오빠가 ↓막:: 있지 좋아 가지고[:,
10 Hun: [ㅎ 심장 소리 듣고 그러죠?
11 Ira: 네?
12 Hun: 신- 시==애기 심장 소리도 듣고 그랬죠?
13 Ira: 에 에 에에에.
14 .h °ㄱ-° 그리고 애기가, (.)
15 .hh 막 초음파로 보는데, 막 되게 (.) 막- 많이 움직이더라:.

As Ira reports her husband's reactions to her ultrasound in lines 1 and 3, Hun shows her strong epistemic stance in lines 4 and 6. Similar to Excerpt 2, Hun makes Ira's response relevant with a *-canh* pseudo-tag question in line 6 (*ayki poiko kulehcanhayo* “{You} see the baby and so on, right”). Ira's response is also very much alike Bak's non-minimal response in line 9 of Excerpt 7; Ira provides an affirmative particle followed by a non-minimal repeat ending with a connective *-(u)nikka*. Again, the repetitional response, along with the affirmative particle, achieves confirmation, while the *-(u)nikka* connective (with a continuing intonation) projects an additional turn component forthcoming. Indeed, Hun shows her listenership by providing an acknowledgement token as a continuer in line 8. Only after Ira produces the main clause for the connective clause in line 9, Hun comes in with another confirmation-request question in line 10. Thus, as in Excerpt 2, this excerpt illustrates a case in which a connective is attached to a non-minimal repeat to facilitate a turn expansion, which tends to follow subsequent to a non-minimal repeat.

Excerpt 9 illustrates another example of a repetitional response with a connective. In this excerpt, the repeat speaker not only secures a slot for a turn expansion with a connective, but she manages to use the slot in such a way that she reroutes the trajectory of talk to reconnect to her previous point. Sam is telling Han about her recent visit to their mutual acquaintance, Chi, whose husband is a pastor of a church that had gone through a hard time but is now settled.

(9) Serving for Church

1 Sam: kulayse nemwu incey (.) awu (.) him- (0.2) caymi-to iss-ko
 so too now EX hard fun-also exist-and

 ku-ntey, .h
 be.so-CIRCUM

So now {it's} very (.) tir- (0.2) fun and all, but, .h

- 2 Han: ung.=
yes
Yeah.=
- 3 Sam: =toykey him- (.) himtul-ki-n himtul-ci:.
very hard hard-NOM-TOP hard-COM
={It's} very tir- (.) {It} can't be not tiring:.
- 4 Han: ung::
yes
Yeah::
- 5 Sam: samo-nim-to. samo-nim-i te himtu-n ke kath-te-la.
wife-HN-also wife-HN-NM more hard-RL thing same-RT-DC

hu[huhuhuh

The pastor's wife too. [I noticed] she seemed more tired {than the pastor}. hu[huhuhuh
- 6 Han: [aku: [yecenhi mal-lass-eyo?
EX still thin-PST-POL
My go:sh {she}'s still thin?
- 7 Sam: [.hxxx (kuntay)-
but
.hxxx (But)-
- 8 Sam: kulem-yo.
of.course-POL
Of course.
- 9 Han: ung.=
yes
Yeah.=
- 10 Sam: =yecenhi mallu-kwu:,
still thin-and
-> ={She}'s still thin: and,
- 11 Han: ung=
yes
Yeah=
- 12 Sam: =mwe .h mwe: (0.2) ilyoil (.) ta pap (0.2) chaylye cwu-ko
DM DM Sunday all meal serve.INF give-and

kule-nikkan:,
be.so-because

=Well .h well: (0.2) because on Sundays (.) {she} serves meals (0.2) for all:,
- 13 Han: aikwu:.
EX
My go:sh.

14 Sam: mwe °swu-° ceki swuyo: sengkyeng kongpwu mwe ile-n
 DM Wednesday there Wednesday Bible study DM be.this-RL
 kes-to ta wa-se
 thing-also all come-and

15 .h pap (.) mek-ko kule-ko keki-se. [kule-ko ha-n-tay.
 meal eat-and be.so-and there-in be.so-and do-IN-HEARSAY

**Well °Wed-° even for things like the Wednesday: Bible Study,
 {people} all come and .h eat (.) there. [I heard] {they} then do
 {the Bible Study}.**

16 Han: [aiko seysangey:.
 EX EX

My gosh gees:.

17 Sam: kulenikkan:, .h kulenikka nemwu himtul-ci:.
 so so too hard-COM
So:, .h so it's too tiring:.

18 Han: ung:.
 yes
Yeah:.

 1 Sam: 그래서 너무 인제 (.) 아우 (.) 힘- (0.2) 재미도 있고 근데, .h
 2 Han: 응.=
 3 Sam: =되게 힘- (.) 힘들긴 힘들지:.
 4 Han: 응:.
 5 Sam: 사모님도. 사모님이 더 힘든 거 같더라. 흥 [ㅎㅎㅎ
 6 Han: [아그: [여전히 말랐어요?
 7 Sam: [.hhhh (근데)-
 8 Sam: 그럼요.
 9 Han: 응.=
 10 Sam: -> =여전히 말르구:.,
 11 Han: 응=
 12 Sam: =뭐 .h 뭐: (0.2) 일요일 (.) 다 밥 (0.2) 채려 주고 그러니깐:.,
 13 Han: 아이구:.
 14 Sam: 뭐 °수-° 저기 수요: 성경 공부 뭐 이런 것도 다 와서
 15 .h 밥 (.) 먹고 그러고 거기서. [그러고 한대.
 16 Han: [아이고 세상에:.
 17 Sam: 그러니깐:, .h 그러니까 너무 힘들지:.
 18 Han: 응:.

Prior to the excerpt, Sam talked about the hardship Chi's husband endured with his church in the past. Line 1 thus reports on the current state; that is, serving for the church is now fun but still tiring. Sam emphasizes one more time in line 5 that Chi, the pastor's wife, is the one who is even

more tired than the pastor himself. As a reaction to such remark from Sam, Han makes an exclamation of sympathy (*aku*:: “Woo::”) and then asks for confirmation regarding Chi’s physical state (*yecenhi mallasseyo?* “{She}’s still thin?”). In response, Sam first treats the question as “unaskable” with the ‘of course’ response (Stivers, 2011) because, given Sam’s account so far, it is unlikely for Chi to have gained weight. Sam then continues her response with a repeat ending with a connective *-ko* (*yecenhi mallukwu*::, “{She}’s still thin: and,”) ²² Again, the repeat confirms Han’s question while the attached connective with a continuing intonation projects an expansion of the turn. Sam’s expanded response then provides more detailed account of the services offered at Chi’s church (lines 12, 14, and 15). Upon Han’s emotionally loaded uptake in line 16 (*aiko seysangey*::. “Woo gees::.”), Sam makes a concluding remark in line 17, which in effect reinforces and even upgrades her original comment in line 3. Therefore, by responding to Han’s confirmation request in a [repeat + a connective] format, Sam not only successfully provides due confirmation but concurrently makes a leeway to expand her turn. Moreover, in the expanded slot thus earned, she manages to redirect the trajectory of her response so it can reconnect and reinforce her own previous point.

In summary, this section has shown examples of non-minimal repeats that are used with a connective. Given that non-minimal repeats are generally followed by further talk by the repeat speaker, connectives are useful structural devices to facilitate such sequential development preferred by non-minimal repeats. The predicate-final feature of Korean makes it possible to integrate a connective into a repetitive response with no structural or prosodic juncture. This enables the [repeat + connective] response form to achieve the dual action of confirming and projecting a turn expansion within a single turn. The exemplary excerpts have shown that the

²² The ending form used in Sam’s utterance, *-kwu*, is a stylistic variation of *-ko*.

interlocutors, i.e., questioners, also orient to this dual action of connective-attached non-minimal repeats by not coming in until the projected expansion is realized.

4.4 Discussion

This chapter has examined non-minimal repeats deployed in response to questions that request for confirmation. Unlike minimal repeats, which display the respondent's understanding of and orientation to the question precisely as a request for confirmation, non-minimal repeats are mobilized when the respondent achieve more than just confirming.

When non-minimal repeats project further informing regarding the issue at hand, the extra elements in the repeat (in the sense that they can be further omitted to make the repeat minimal in form) tend to indicate the topical issue about which the expanded talk will unfold. Thus, by repeating the question with a topical element, the respondent shows his/her orientation to the question not only as a request for confirmation, but also as a topic-proffer to some extent.

When non-minimal repeats address the affective stance embedded in the questioner's request for confirmation, such as disbelief, the repeats tend to contain extra elements that are not taken from the question but newly added by the respondent. Those extra elements serve to display the respondent's epistemic and/or affective stance vis-à-vis that embedded in the question. More specifically, as the question places the respondent in a sequential position to confirm a proposition toward which the questioner conveys disbelief, the respondent emphasizes strong epistemic stance so the action of confirming is done with an epistemic authority. In addition, the repetitional response conveys the respondent's affective stance as being aligning with the questioner's.

Contrary to minimal repeats, non-minimal repeats tend to be accompanied by further talk by the repeat speaker, which leads to a turn expansion or a sequence expansion. Connectives are thus often deployed in non-minimal repeats as a device to project an expanded turn. By adding a connective at the end of a repetitional response, the respondent can hold their turn even after providing confirmation. In the slot thus secured, the respondent's talk is less tightly constrained by the question, allowing more freedom to manage the trajectory of the interaction.

Because non-minimal repeats achieve more than just confirming, when a question is clearly not a mere request for confirmation, it is often responded with non-minimal repeats. Minimal repeats in response to such questions are treated as insufficient and pursued further, as shown below. The minimal-repeat response is indicated with an arrow (->) while the questioner's pursuit is indicated with a double arrow (=>).

(10) Updates

- 1 Nah: °kuleh-kwun.° cal cinay-ni?
 be.so-APP well get.along-Q
I see. Are {you} doing well?
- 2 Lia: cal cinay-ci mwe.
 well get.along-COM DM
-> Well {I}'m doing well.
- 3 Nah: .h e: ettay. mwe h
 how.INT DM
=> .h Yeah: how's it going. Well h
- 4 ((beep))
- 5 Lia: [ung?
 yes
Huh?
- 6 Nah: [yecen- yecenhi: ku: mwe-ya. kyayney-tul man- cal manna-ko
 still still that what-be.INT they-PL meet well meet-and
 iss-e?
 exist-INT
Still- still: What's that. {You} {still} hang out with them?

 1 Nah: °그렇군.° 잘 지내니?
 2 Lia: -> 잘 지내지 뭐.
 3 Nah: => .h 어: 어때. 뭐 h
 4 ((beep))
 5 Lia: [응?
 6 Nah: [여전- 여전히: 그: 뭐야. 개네들 만- 잘 만나고 있어?

(11) A Phone Call

1 Jun: cham Ciyengi-ka cenhwahay-ss-ess-ni?
 EX PN-NM call-PST-PST-Q
By the way has Ciyeng called?

2 Tay: e:. hay-ss-ess-e.
 yes call-PST-PST-INT
-> Yeah:. {She} has.

3 Jun: ung:.
 yes
=> Yeah:.

4 => (1.0)

5 Tay: kulay-kac-ko wa-ss-ta ka-n-ta-ko kule-te-la.
 be.so.INF-have-and come-PST-TRANS go-IN-DC-QT be.so-RT-DC
 (0.5) °kulay-kac-ko kunyang° camkkan cenhwahay-ss-e:.
 be.so.INF-have-and just briefly call-PST-INT
So {she} said {she} was visiting. (0.5) °So just° briefly {she} called:.

 1 Jun: 참 지영이가 전화했었니?
 2 Tay: -> 어:. 했었어.
 3 Jun: => 응:.
 4 => (1.0)
 5 Tay: 그래갖고 왔다 간다고 그러더라. (0.5) °그래갖고 그냥° 잠깐 전화했어:.

In Excerpt 10, the questioner asks a typical ‘how are you’ question in line 1 (*cal cinayni?* [Lit. Are {you} doing well?]), which is often used to initiate a conversation and solicit general updates on the respondent’s life. When the respondent answers with a minimal repeat in line 2 (->), taking the question at face value as a yes/no question, the questioner pursues the same line of inquiry in line 3, by switching the question’s formulation to a wh-interrogative (*ettay*. ‘How’s it

going.”) As the revised question is only met with a repair initiator again (*ung?* “Huh?”), the questioner gives in and asks a topic-specifying question in line 6, which manifests her continued effort to solicit the respondent’s telling.

Similarly, in Excerpt 11, the questioner in line 1 transitions a topic (as indicated by a topic-shift interjection *cham* ‘by the way’), and asks a topic-proffer question. As the respondent provides confirmation with a minimal-repeat answer only in line 2 (->), the questioner acknowledges it but does not take speakership for a full second (=>), which alludes to the insufficiency of the respondent’s response and the questioner’s pursuit of further telling from the respondent. In line 5, the respondent thus provides further details about the phone call in question.

Therefore, minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats are both orderly interactional practices that are mobilized to achieve different actions in response to a question.

CHAPTER 5

REPETITION IN DISAFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES

This chapter examines the ways in which repetition is utilized in disconfirming answers to a question. I refrain from using the term ‘repetitional response’ in the context of disconfirmation because it is easily associated with confirmatory responses, as has been the case in literature (Mikesell, 2010; Heritage & Raymond, 2005, 2012; Stivers, 2005). Repetition in disconfirmation mostly involves repeating part of the question with negation or reversed polarity. As in affirmative repetitional responses illustrated in Chapters 3 and 4, repetition can be incorporated in disconfirmation in a minimal manner or a non-minimal manner, which affects the subsequent sequential development. As a dispreferred action, disconfirmation is formulated and treated quite differently from affirmative responses (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). Dispreferred actions in general are avoided and minimized through delays, mitigations, prefaces, and accounts (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013; Schegloff, 2007). The difference between confirmation and disconfirmation can also be observed in the ways in which repetition figures in each type of responses. The following sections will examine repetition deployed in disconfirmation in a variety of formats.

5.1 Outright Disconfirmation with a Reversely Polarized Predicate Repeat

Affirmative answers are often provided simply with an affirmative particle ‘yes,’ which maximally promotes sequence progressivity (Raymond, 2003). Chapter 3 has shown that, at least in response to a request for confirmation, a minimal repeat is also often accepted as a sufficient answer, i.e., confirmation, so the participants proceed with the next topic or agenda. With respect

to disconfirmation, responding with a negative particle only rarely occurs, and even if it does, it is hardly accepted as “a full answer” to the question, as shown in Excerpt 1 and 2 below.

(1) English Proficiency

- 1 A: ne yenge-nun.
you English-TOP
How about your English.
- 2 B: mwen- (.) yenge?
what English
What- (.) English?
- 3 A: e.
yes
Yeah.
- 4 B: ccom ha-ci.
little do-COM
{I} speak it fairly well.
- 5 A: ccom hay?
little do.INT
{You} speak it fairly well?
- 6 B: ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 7 A: kulay- cepen-[ey wa-
be.so.INT last.time-at come
Right- {you} vi-
- 8 B: [ccay:kkum.
little
Ju:st a little.
- 9 (0.2)
- 10 A: wa-ss-ta ka kaciko?
come-PST-TRANS go CONN
Because {you} visited last time?
- 11 B: aniꞥ
no
-> Noꞥ
- 12 A: kulem.
then
=> Then {how}.
-

- 1 A: 너 영어는.
 2 B: 뭐- (.) 영어?
 3 A: 어.
 4 B: 쯤 하지.
 5 A: 쯤 해?
 6 B: 응.
 7 A: 그래- 저번 [에 와-
 8 B: [째:꿈.
 9 (0.2)
 10 A: 왔다 가 가지고?
 11 B: -> 아니?
 12 A: => 그럼.

(2) Allowance

- 1 Nah: ya ne kuliko- (.) emma-hanthey yongton-un saylo pat-ass-nya?
 hey you and mom-from allowance-TOP newly get-PST-Q
Hey, and you- (.) got an allowance from {your} mom again?
- 2 Lia: ani?
 no
 -> **No?**
- 3 => (1.0)
- 4 Nah: an pat-ass-nya=ton manhi nam-ass-nya?
 not get-PST-Q money much left-PST-Q
Did't you get=Do {you} have a lot of money left?
-
- 1 Nah: 야 너 그리고- (.) 엄마한테 용돈은 새로 받았냐?
 2 Lia: -> 아니?
 3 => (1.0)
 4 Nah: 안 받았냐=돈 많이 남았냐?

In Excerpt 1, A asks about B's improvement on his English proficiency (line 1), which is answered with B's positive response (line 4). A then makes a conjecture that B's last visit to the U.S. has helped him improve his English skills (lines 7 and 10). As B disconfirms with a negative particle only (->), A pursues a further account with *kulem* 'then' (=>). In Excerpt 2, the same type of disconfirmatory response from Lia (i.e., a negative particle only) (->) is followed by a one-second silence (=>), which may be interpreted as Nah's expectation for more account to be provided by Lia. In line 4, Nah finally takes the turn with a question that requests for

reconfirmation, but this time with a reversely polarized predicate (e.g., *patassnya?* “Did {you} get?” in line 1; *an patassnya?* “Didn’t {you} get?” in line 4). She also adds another question, which conveys her conjecture about the possible reason for Lia’s disconfirmation.

The sequential development just observed with disconfirmation by a negative particle only is similarly observed when disconfirmation is done through a predicate repeat with reversed polarity. That is, outright disconfirmation with a minimal repeat (with or without a preceding negative particle) is also generally followed by the questioner’s pursuit of accounts or request for reconfirmation.

Consider Excerpt 3 for example. The excerpt starts with Yoo’s clarification that what she has been doing lately is more accurately described as ‘not studying’ rather than ‘hanging out.’ Yoo’s remark prompts Bom to remember the blind date Yoo mentioned before, which would be considered ‘hanging out.’

(3) Blind Date

- 1 Yoo: no-n:-ta-ki-pota kongpwu-lul an hay-yo.
 play-IN-DC-NOM-than study-AC not do-POL
Rather than ‘hanging out,’ {I} don’t study.
- 2 Bom: .h isangha-ta caymiss-nun il-i iss-eya toy-nuntey=
 strange-DC interesting-RL event-NM exist-must become-CIRCUM
 =cenyey (.) mwe-ya. sokaything-to (ha-n-ta kule-)
 before what-be.INT blind.date-also do-IN-DC be.so-
- 3 ha-n-taymey hay-ss-e? ku [ttay?
 do-IN-HEARSAY do-PST-INT that time
**.h {That’s} weird. {You} should have fun.=Last time- (.) What’s
 {that}. [you said] {you} are going on a blind date. You did? At
 that time?**
- 4 Yoo: [.h a an hay-ss-eyo.hah[hahahahah
 EX not do-PST-POL
 -> .h Oh I didn’t.huhuhuhuhuh
- 5 Bom: [way.hahah
 why

.h[hh

=> **Why.huhuh .hhh**

6 Yoo: [nay kukel enni-hanthey-kkaci
I.NM that.AC sister-to-up.to

7 yaykihay-ss-te-nka? .hhh ani ettehkey kunyang::, eyengpwuyeng
tell-PST-RT-Q DM how just somehow

nemeka-ss-eyo.
pass-PST-POL

I told about it to you too? .hhh I mean, somehow:: {I've} just passed up the chance.

1 Yoo: 논:다기보다 공부를 안 해요.
2 Bom: .h 이상하다 재밌는 일이 있어야 되는데=전에 (.) 뭐야. 소개팅도 (한다 그러-)
3 한대메 했어? 그[때?
4 Yoo: -> [.h 아 안 했어요.ㅎ[ㅎㅎㅎㅎ
5 Bom: => [왜.ㅎㅎ .h[hh
6 Yoo: [내 그걸 언니한테까지
7 얘기했던가? .hhh 아니 어떻게 그냥::, 어영부영 넘어갔어요.

In response to Bom's request for confirmation in lines 2-3 about whether Yoo has gone on a blind date, Yoo provides disconfirmation with a minimal predicate repeat, only with the polarity of the predicate reversed from that in the question by a negative adverb *an* 'not' (->). Note that Yoo's subsequent laughter is immediately joined by Bom's pursuit of accounts for the disconfirmation (=>).

Excerpt 4 illustrates a similar sequential development with the questioner pursuing accounts for disconfirmation that is given in a minimal repeat form. In this excerpt, the questioner offers a candidate account of her best guess, instead of asking a 'why' question. Yen, a mother of an infant, starts a telling sequence in line 1 about her family dining out last night.

(4) Dining out

1 Yen: ecey (.) ceki: i salam swuep kkuthna-ko:,

yesterday DM this person class end-and
Yesterday (.) after my husband's class:,

2 Sue: ey.=
Yeah.=

3 Yen: =cip-ey wa-se: che:um-ulo oysik-ul hay-ss-ketun-yo?
house-to come-and first-by dine.out-AC do-PST-INFO-POL
={he} got home: and {we} dined out for the fi:rst time?

4 Sue: mwusun tto cheum-ulo oysikhay-yo. oysikha-canh-ayo. hahah
what again first-by dine.out-POL dine.out-COM.not-POL
**What do you mean dining out for the first time. {You} dine out,
right. huhuh**

5 Yen: ani oysik an hay-yo:.
no dine.out not do-POL
-> No {we} don't dine out:.

6 Sue: a: ayki ttaymwuney;
EX baby because.of
=> Oh: because of the baby;

7 Yen: yey: ayki ttaymwuney cengmal:.
yes baby because.of really
Yes: because of the baby:.

8 Sue: um: [e e.
EX yes yes
Mm: yeah yeah.

9 Yen: [ceki: yay: ku ttay way Swumi ssi-ney-lang kathi
DM she that time DM PN HN-of-with together

ka-ss-taka
go-PST-TRANS

We:ll when {we} dined out with your family:

10 [nemwu (.) himtul-ese: [ku ihwulo an hay-ss-ketun-yo (hahah);
too hard-because that after not do-PST-INFO-POL
**{She} gave {us} such (.) a hard time: so {we} didn't dine out
since; huhuh**

11 Sue: [yey:.. [kunyang tol-a wa-ss-canh-ayo.
yes just turn-INF come-PST-COM.not-POL
Yeah:.. {We} just came back, right.

12 Sue: yey.
yes
Yeah.

1 Yen: 어제 (.) 저기: 이 사람 수업 끝나고:,
2 Sue: 예.=
3 Yen: =집에 와서: 처:음으로 외식을 했거든요?

4 Sue: 무슨 또 처음으로 외식해요. 외식하잖아요. ㅎㅎ
 5 Yen: -> 아니 외식 안 해요:.
 6 Sue: => 아: 애기 때문에?
 7 Yen: 예: 애기 때문에 정말:.
 8 Sue: 음: [어어.
 9 Yen: [저기: 애: 그 때 왜 수미 씨네랑 같이 갔다가
 10 [너무 (.) 힘들어서: [그 이후로 안 했거든요 (ㅎㅎ)?
 11 Sue: [예:.. [그냥 돌아 왔잖아요.
 12 Sue: 예.

As Yen says that last night was the first time that her family dined out, with an emphatic elongation on *che:umulo* “for the first time,” Sue challenges her description in line 4. Sue’s pseudo-tag question using *-canh* (*oysikhacanhayo* “{You} dine out, right”) makes Yen’s response relevant for the next turn and strongly seeks agreement from Yen (Kawanish, 1994; Kawanish & Sohn, 1993). Contrary to Sue’s expectation of affirmation and agreement, however, Yen provides disconfirmation in response, with a negative particle *ani* ‘no’ followed by a minimal repeat in reversed polarity (*oysik an hayyo* “{we} don’t dine out”) in line 5 (->). In turn, Sue shows her change of state with *a* ‘oh’ (Heritage, 1984) and offers a possible account for Yen’s disconfirmation *ayki ttaymwuney* ‘because of the baby’ (=>). Yen affirms Sue’s conjecture as correct (line 7) and clarifies that last night was the first dining-out in a long time (lines 9-10).

Excerpts 3 and 4 thus illustrate that disconfirmation provided with a minimal repeat (in reversed polarity) may well be treated as lacking accounts, just as a response with a negative particle only. Then when would a minimal repeat form be deployed in response to disconfirmation rather than a negative particle only? It seems that a reversely polarized predicate repeat is often used 1) in response to pre-verbal negation questions, 2) when the respondents need to calibrate the degree or scope of disconfirmation, and 3) when the question conveys a

high expectation for affirmation. The third case has been illustrated in Excerpt 4. The first and second cases are shown in Excerpts 5 and 6 below, respectively.

(5) Sibling Bullying

- 1 Kay: e Ciseni cincca haykkoci an hay-yo?
EX PN really bullying not do-POL
Oh seriously Cisen doesn't bully {her brother}?
- 2 Min: ha-ci::.
do-COM
-> **{She} does::.**
- 3 (.)
- 4 Kay: [ettehkey hay:?
how do.INT
How does {she} bully:?
- 5 Min: [kulayto manhi uiceshay-cyess-ci:.
still much mature-become.PST-COM
Still, {she} got mature a lot::.
- 6 Kay: kulay-yo:?
be.so-POL
Is {that} so:?

-
- 1 Kay: 어 지선이 진짜 해꼬지 안 해요?
2 Min: -> 하지::.
3 (.)
4 Kay: [어떻게 해:?
5 Min: [그래도 많이 의젓해졌지:.
6 Kay: 그래요:?

In response to Kay's negative question (with pre-verbal negation) in line 1, Min provides disconfirmation by repeating the same predicate as in the question, only without the negative adverb *an* 'not.'²³ This pattern conforms to J. Park's (2008) finding that disconfirmation in response to pre-verbal negation questions are predominantly done through "partial repeats." Subsequent to the "minimal" disconfirmation in line 2, it is observed again that the questioner,

²³ The -ci ending in Min's response marks her strong commitment to the propositional content (H. Lee, 1999), and also seems to convey the nuance of "unaskability" in this context, similar to that of 'of course' (Stivers, 2011).

Kay, probes Min for further elaboration on the response (line 4), which is indeed provided by Min in overlap (line 5).

In Excerpt 6, the respondent provides disconfirmation in a minimal predicate repeat form with calibration on the scope of the negative proposition.

(6) Car Purchase

- 1 Koh: ne kuke sa-ss-e?
you that buy-PST-INT
You bought that?
- 2 Bum: mwe.
what
What.
- 3 Koh: cha.
car
A car.
- 4 (1.0)
- 5 Bum: acik an sa-ss-e.
yet not buy-PST-INT
-> **{I} didn't buy yet.**
- 6 (1.5)
- 7 Bum: icey sa-ya-ci.
now buy-must-COM
{I} should buy soon.

-
- 1 Koh: 너 그거 샀어?
2 Bum: 뭐.
3 Koh: 차.
4 (1.0)
5 Bum: -> 아직 안 샀어.
6 (1.5)
7 Bum: 이제 사야지.

In line 5, Bum disconfirms Koh's question, but with the addition of the adverb *acik* 'yet.' This exemplifies how respondents utilize a predicate repeat for disconfirmation when they need to specify the degree or scope of the disconfirmation. Such action cannot be done by a negative

particle ‘no,’ which would negate the proposition of the question as a whole with no room for negotiation on the terms. Yet again, Bum’s “minimal” disconfirmation is still met with a 1.5-second pause rather than an uptake from Koh, thus leading Bum to elaborate on his disconfirmation (line 7).

Thus far, it has been shown how a reversely polarized predicate repeat provides outright disconfirmation in response to a request for confirmation, and how such responses are received by the questioner. Similar to disconfirmation with a negative particle only (although rarely observed), minimal-repeat disconfirmation with a predicate only or a predicate modified by adverbs is treated as a less-than-full response. In other words, subsequent to such minimal-repeat responses, the questioners tend to seek more information regarding the matter at hand in various ways, such as by asking a wh-question (Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 5), offering a candidate reason for disconfirmation (Excerpt 4), or passing on the next turn by not taking up speakership (Excerpt 6).

Another pattern often observed subsequent to minimal-repeat disconfirmation is the questioner’s request for reconfirmation. In Excerpt 7 below, for example, Nan is making plans for her visit to Yun’s house, and tries to confirm if Yun’s roommate would be home as well.

(7) Brother

- 1 Nan: .h ya niney tongsayng-to pwul-le:.
 hey you.PL younger.sibling-also call-IM
.h Hey bring your brother too:.
- kulem- ne-=u-=ya niney lwummeyithu ku nal-un iss-ci?
 then you hey you.PL roommate that day-TOP exist-COM
Then- you-=Hey, your roommate is home that day, right?
- 2 (0.5)
- 3 Yun: -> ani-ya: eps-e[:.
 be.not-INT not.exist-INT
No: {she’s} not:.
- 4 Nan: => [e ku nal eps-e?

EX that day not.exist-INT
Oh {she's} not in that day?

5 Yun: ung.=
 yes
Yeah.=

6 Nan: =kulem niney tongsayng pwul-le:.
 then you.PL younger.sibling call-IM
=Then bring your brother:.

 1 Nan: .h 야 니네 동생도 불러:. 그럼- 너==으==야 니네 룸메이트 그 날은 있지?
 2 (0.5)
 3 Yun: -> 아니야: 없어[:.
 4 Nan: => [어 그 날 없어?
 5 Yun: 응.=
 6 Nan: =그럼 니네 동생 불러:.

In response to Nan's request for confirmation, Yun provides disconfirmation in line 2 in a minimal manner (->), i.e., using a negative copula (aniya: 'Lit. {That}'s not {the case}') and an opposite predicate for the one used in the question (*epse*: "{she's} not:."). Nan then re-does her initial question in reversed polarity, essentially requesting reconfirmation (=>). Once Yun provides an affirmative response to Nan's request for reconfirmation, Nan resumes her agenda that has been paused at line 1 by the insertion of the confirmation-request sequence.

Excerpt 8 shows another example of a question responded with disconfirmation in a minimal, predicate-only format. Again, the disconfirmation is followed by the questioner's yet another request for reconfirmation. The excerpt starts with Gia's topic proffer about her mother having had a hard time lately. Before she proceeds to elaborate on the topic, Nam asks if her mother is at Gia's place already.

(8) Mom's Visit

1 Gia: a:h emma-ka toykey himtul-e ha-te-la. (.) ahyu. (.) .h
 EX mom-NM very hard-INF do-RT-DC EX
A:h [I noticed] {my} mom was having such a hard time. (.) Ahh.
 (.) .h

2 (1.0)

3 Nam: [cikum o-sy-ess-e?
now come-HN-PST-INT
{She's} here now?

4 Gia: [()]

5 Gia: e?
yes
Huh?

6 Nam: o- = o-si-n ke ani-ci acik.=
come come-HN-RL thing be.not-COM yet
{She} ha-=hasn't come yet, right.=

7 Gia: -> =o-sy-ess-ci.
come-HN-PST-COM
={She} has come.

8 Nam: => e pelsse o-sy-ess-e?
EX already come-HN-PST-INT
Oh {she} has come already?

9 Gia: emma-nun sipo il nal wa-ss-ko,
mom-TOP fifteen day day come-PST-and
{My} mom came on the 15th and,

10 Nam: ung.
yes
Yeah.

11 Gia: na-nun sipchil il nal ttena-nun ke-ko.
I-TOP seventeen day day leave-RL thing-and
I'm leaving on the 17th.

12 Nam: ung:..
yes
Yeah:..

1 Gia: 아:h 엄마가 되게 힘들어 하더라. (.) 아휴. (.) .h

2 (1.0)

3 Nam: [지금 오셨어?

4 Gia: [()]

5 Gia: 어?

6 Nam: 오-=오신 거 아니지 아직.=

7 Gia: -> =오셨지.

8 Nam: => 어 벌써 오셨어?

9 Gia: 엄마는 십오 일 날 왔고,

10 Nam: 응.

11 Gia: 나는 십칠 일 날 떠나는 거고.

12 Nam: 응:..

Nam's initial positively polarized question in line 3 is overlapped with Gia's indistinguishable utterance (line 4) and is only met with Gia's open-class repair initiator in line 5 (Drew, 1997). In possible anticipation of a dispreferred response (Drew, 1997; Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013), Nam recasts her question by switching its valence from positive to negative (line 6) so the question can be answered with a preferred, affirmative response. And yet, Gia provides disconfirmation in a minimal predicate form with no further account (->). As in Excerpt 7, Nam acknowledges her receipt of the answer with a change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984), and requests reconfirmation by switching the valence of her question one more time (i.e., from negative to positive). In response, Gia answers with a specific date of her mother's arrival.

The pattern of minimal disconfirmation being followed by another question requesting reconfirmation, as exemplified in Excerpts 7 and 8, further supports the claim that such disconfirmatory responses are yet to be sufficient to fulfill the questioner's overall project even though they do achieve the action of disconfirming *per se*. The questioner's subsequent request for reconfirmation seems to be deployed for several possible reasons. First of all, it may be driven by the generic preference for a preferred response (Clayman, 2002; Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013; Schegloff, 2007). By matching the valence of the question with that of the respondent's disconfirmation, the request for reconfirmation is now in the position to be affirmed, which is a preferred response over disconfirmation in general. Simultaneously, the request for reconfirmation can display the "unexpectedness" of the disconfirmation on the questioner's end, which may serve to prompt the respondent to provide further accounts for the matter at issue. In a similar vein, by asking another question that essentially probes the same issue as the initial request for confirmation, the questioner imposes powerful constraints on the

respondent to provide a relevant response in the next turn, giving him/her another chance to provide a “fuller” answer.

In summary, one of the ways in which repetition is utilized for disconfirmation is for repetition to occur with the predicate of the question, with its polarity reversed. Respondents tend to resort to this type of disconfirmatory responses 1) when the question is a negatively polarized one (especially with pre-verbal negation) (e.g., Excerpt 5; Excerpt 8), 2) when there is a need to calibrate the degree or scope of disconfirmation (e.g., Excerpt 6), or 3) when the prior question conveys a high expectation of an affirmative response for the respondent to compete with (e.g., Excerpt 4; Excerpt 7; Excerpt 8). Therefore, disconfirming with a repetitional form not only achieves the action of disconfirming *per se*, but allows the respondent to meet more various needs s/he faces in the interaction at the moment.

This section has also shown that disconfirmation provided in a minimal manner, with a predicate only or a predicate with a modifying adverb, is often followed by the questioner’s overt or implicit pursuit of further accounts. This pattern is similarly observed subsequent to a response with a negative particle only, as illustrated in Excerpts 1 and 2. The participant’s orientation to the absence of accounts in relation to disconfirmation is attributed to the generic nature of dispreferred action; dispreferred actions are designed in such a way that they are delayed, mitigated, and accompanied by accounts (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). The next section will examine other types of disconfirmatory responses that provide, and are treated as providing, a “fuller answer” by utilizing repetition.

5.2 Repetition with a Contrastive Connective *-(nu)ntey*

This section examines repetition used with a specific contrastive connective, *-(nu)ntey*, which is typically glossed as ‘and,’ ‘but,’ ‘so,’ and ‘given that...’ (Y. Park, 1997, 1999). As the broad range of glosses suggest, *-(nu)ntey* serves diverse functions, such as connecting contrastive clauses, providing background information, and mitigating dispreferred actions like disagreement (Y. Park, 1997, 1999). My investigation on responsive turns has revealed that *-(nu)ntey* is also often used with repetition in initiating a response. The [repeat-*-(nu)ntey*] format confirms the question, at least initially, and is then leveraged into imposing the respondent’s agenda that is not completely aligning with the questioner’s. The [repeat with reversed polarity-*-(nu)ntey*] format, on the other hand, initially disconfirms the question, but leaves room for alignment with the questioner at the same time. In both cases, repetition is deployed with the connective *-(un)ntey* in a response turn to signal that the answer is not simple, straightforward disconfirmation, but a complex one that involves contrastive and disconfirmatory components.

5.2.1 [Repeat-*-(nu)ntey*] Format

When a respondent initiates his/her response with the [repeat-*-(nu)ntey*] format, s/he confirms the question, at least to some extent, but signals that something contrastive would follow. By doing so, the respondent shows that the prior question is one that cannot be fully confirmed. Consider Excerpt 9. Hwa called Pei with a free call she earned by participating in a data collection for linguistics research. She explains the purpose of the call to Pei (lines 1 and 3) and closes her explanation with an assessment in line 6. Pei then comes in with a question to request confirmation in lines 7-8.

(9) Intonation

1 Hwa: linguistic ha-nun salam-tul-i,

linguistics do-RL person-PL-NM
Those who study linguistics,

2 Pei: yey.
yes
Yes.

3 Hwa: ku (.) intonation mak ikhey ikhey ha-na pwa-yo.
that intonation just like.this like.this do-Q see-POL

leykhoting [hay kaciko:.
recording do.INF CONN

Seem to work on intonation and stuff. By recording {speech}:.

4 Pei: [a
oh
Oh

5 Pei: a:ǃ
oh
Oh:ǃ

6 Hwa: kulaykaciko nemwu cal tway-ss-ci.[huhuhuhuhuh
so too well become-PST-COM
So {it's} such a good deal. huhuhuhuhuh

7 Pei: [ku(h)lay(h)-yo(h)? .h kulem
be.so-POL then

8 i nayyong-i cikum leykhoting toy-ko iss-nun ke-yeyyo?
this content-NM now recording become-and exist-RL thing-be.POL

I(h)s tha(h)t so(h)? .h Then this content is being recorded now?

9 Hwa: leykhoting toy-nuntey,
recording become-CIRCUM
-> {It's} being recorded but,

10 Pei: yey.
yes
Yes.

11 Hwa: nayyong-ul po-nun key ani:-ko, ike mak- kukka
content-AC see-RL thing.NM be.not-and this just so

han[kwuk salam==
Korea person

-> {They} don't look at the content: and, this- I mean Korean==

12 Pei: [°a-°
oh
°Oh-°

13 Hwa: =hankwukmal-ul molu-nun salam-tul-i ha-nun
Korean.language-AC not.know-RL person-PL-NM do-RL

moyang-[ieyyo=kukka-
form-be.POL so

-> =It seems that those who do the research don't know Korean=So-

14 Pei: [a:,
oh
Oh:,

15 Pei: a[:,
oh
Oh:,

16 Hwa: [into- ku: linta mal-un intonation-man ilehkey
that Linda word-TOP intonation-only like.this
chekhuha-n-ta-ko [tway iss-te-la-ko-yo?
check-IN-DC-QT become.INF exist-RT-DC-QT-POL

-> Into- Linda says, only intonation is checked like this?

17 Pei: [e:
oh
Oh:

1 Hwa: linguistic 하는 사람들이,
2 Pei: 예.
3 Hwa: 그 (.) intonation 막 이케 이케 하나 봐요. 레코딩 [해 가지고:.
4 Pei: [아
5 Pei: 아:~
6 Hwa: 그래가지고 너무 잘 됐지. [ㅎㅎㅎㅎㅎ
7 Pei: [그(ㅎ)래(ㅎ)요(ㅎ)? .h 그럼
8 이 내용이 지금 레코딩 되고 있는 거예요?
9 Hwa: -> 레코딩 되는데,
10 Pei: 예.
11 Hwa: -> 내용을 보는 게 아니:고, 이거 막- 그까 한[국 사람==
12 Pei: [°아-°
13 Hwa: -> =한국말을 모르는 사람들이 하는 모양[이에요=그까-
14 Pei: [아:,
15 Pei: 아[:,
16 Hwa: -> [into- 그: 린다 말은 intonation 만 이렇게 체크한다고 [돼 있더라고요?
17 Pei: [어:

Note that, in response to Pei's request for confirmation in lines 7-8, Hwa initiates her response in the [repeat-nuntey] format in line 9 (*leykhoting toy-nuntey* “{It's} being recorded but”). As indicated in the English translation as well, the clause ends with the contrastive connective -

(nu)ntey, which allows the listener to anticipate a turn expansion of contrastive nature. Pei indeed passes on speakership with a continuer in line 10. What follows is Hwa's elaborated answer that accounts for the reason that she could not provide a simple yes/no answer or something of the sort in the beginning. That is, by mobilizing the [repeat-*(nu)ntey*] format, Hwa successfully confirms the fact that the recording has begun (line 9), but at the same time, avoids endorsing the subject in the question, *nayyong* 'content,' as the focus of her confirmation (lines 11, 13, and 16). Pei also shows her receipt of Hwa's response as a legitimate and sufficient answer to her question by not pursuing or probing further.

Excerpt 10 illustrates another example of a response initiated with the [repeat-*(nu)ntey*] format. Sam has a son who recently joined a basketball team at his school. Prior to the excerpt, Han considered it as good news that Sam's son joined a school team. However, Sam showed her frustration concerning her son not performing as well as the other players.

(10) Basketball

- 1 Sam: mwe kyayney-tul-iyā (.) sikan thwuca-to manhi ha-ko
 DM they-PL-of.course time investment-also much do-and
 appa-ka nonyang: nol-a cwu-ko::,
 dad-NM always play-INF give-and
Well they (.) invest a lot of time and {their} dads play with them all: the time::,
- 2 Han: °ung°
 yes
 °Yeah°
- 3 Sam: kulehkey hay-ss-unikkan. kulenikkanun ha-l swu eps-ko.
 like.that do-PST-because so do-PRS means not.exist-and
 =wuli-ya mwe- .h
 we-of.course DM
{They} did so. So {you} can't help it.=We- .h
- 4 Han: °kulay.°
 be.so.INT

°Right.°

5 Sam: mwe naypelyetwu-ko (1.0) hay-ss-unikka mwe ha-l swu
DM leave-and do-PST-because DM do-PRS means
eps-ci mwe.
not.exist-COM DM

Well {we} left {him} {to play on his own} (1.0) so {we} can't help it.

6 Han: kuntey Cayhyengi-n tto wenak coha↑ha-canh-ayo.
but PN-TOP again so like-COM.not-POL
But Cayhyeng likes {basketball} so ↑much, right.

7 Sam: cohaha-nuntey,
like-CIRCUM
-> **{He} likes {it} but,**

8 Han: um.
mm
Mm.

9 (0.7)

10 Sam: e: kulehkey sengkwa-lul mos nay-yo:.
uhm like.that performance-AC cannot put-POL
-> **Uh:m {he} doesn't score that much:.**

11 Han: ung:
yes
Yeah:

12 Sam: ttan ay-tul-i nemwu cal hay:.
other kid-PL-NM too well do.INT
The other kids play too well:.

13 Han: kuluh-tu-la-kwu-yo[:.
be.so-RT-DC-QT-POL
[I've noticed] {that} is so:.

1 Sam: 뭐 개네들이야 (.) 시간 투자도 많이 하고 아빠가 노냥: 놀아 주고:.,

2 Han: °응°

3 Sam: 그렇게 했으니깐. 그러니까는 할 수 없고.=우리야 뭐- .h

4 Han: °그래.°

5 Sam: 뭐 내버려두고 (1.0) 했으니깐 뭐 할 수 없지 뭐.

6 Han: 근데 재형인 또 워낙 좋아↑하잖아요.

7 Sam: -> 좋아하는데,

8 Han: 음.

9 (0.7)

10 Sam: -> 어: 그렇게 성과를 못 내요:.

11 Han: 응:

12 Sam: 딴 애들이 너무 잘 해:.

13 Han: 그렇드라구요[:.

Sam attributes her son's less-than-satisfactory performance in basketball to not spending enough time on playing it, especially with his dad (lines 1-5). Han then switches the focus of the discussion to Cayhyeng's love for basketball, rather than his performance level (line 6). Han's turn is marked with *-canh*, which requests Sam's confirmation and shows Han's expectation for an agreeing answer (Kawanish, 1994; Kawanish & Sohn, 1993). In response, Sam indeed provides confirmation, structured in the [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] format. Again, the connective *-(un)ntey* projects an expansion, to which Han shows her orientation by passing on the turn (lines 8-9). In line 10, Sam completes her response with a remark that not only disaligns with her preceding confirmation but also shifts the focus back to her son's poor performance. Her expanded response disaligns with, or only tangentially aligns with, the initial confirmation because someone who likes basketball "so much" (*wenak*) also performs as well to some extent. Thus, by initiating her response in the [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] format, Sam confirms the fact that her son likes basketball, but displays her position not to endorse all the implications that may follow the confirmation.

The [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] format takes structural resemblance to "weak agreements" or "token agreements" discussed in literature on assessment sequences (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). The weak/token agreements are deployed to preface disagreements so as to mitigate the dispreferred and delicate action of disagreement. An example from Pomerantz (1984) is shown in Excerpt 11.

(11) MC: 1.-13 (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 73)

L: I know but I, I-I still say that the sewing machine's quicker.
W: -> Oh it c'n be quicker but it doesn' do the jo:b,

The [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] format illustrated here is deployed in question-answer sequences and does not necessarily preface disconfirmation. Rather, it is a signal to the interlocutor that there is a certain aspect in the question that the speaker cannot fully endorse and accept, be it the focus of the question or the agenda proposed by the question. Therefore, the initial confirmation with [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] is often followed by a shift in focus and/or rerouting of the trajectory of talk.

5.2.2 [Repeat with reversed polarity-(*nu*)*ntey*] Format

In the second type of responses that utilize repetition with the connective -(*nu*)*ntey*, the respondent repeats part of the question but reverses the polarity of the predicate. The function of these responses is quite the opposite of what has been shown in Section 5.2.1. In other words, while the [repeat-(*nu*)*ntey*] format initiates a response on a confirmatory note, the [repeat with reversed polarity-(*nu*)*ntey*] format (henceforth, the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format) begins the turn with disconfirmation of the question. Moreover, what follows [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] shows that there are some aspects in which the respondent's position over the issue at hand may converge with the questioner's.

The first example is shown in Excerpt 12. Prior to the excerpt, Lim told Sil that she could not get proper sleep last night after she had slept irregularly for the previous three days. As a result, she was feeling sleepy all day until 5:00PM on the day of this conversation. The excerpt starts with Sil's agreement by sharing her own similar experience from the previous day.

(12) Headache

- 1 Sil: kulay:. e↑cey nay-ka kuleh-te-la-ko.
 be.so.INT yesterday I-NM be.so-RT-DC-QT
 Right:. I was like that ↑yesterday.
- 2 (0.7)

- 3 Lim: e h=
yes
Yeah=
- 4 Sil: =swuyoil nal ha- cam-ul mos ca-ss-canh-a:.
Wednesday day sleep-AC cannot sleep-PST-COM.not-INT

sihem po-nilako:.
exam take-in.order.to

={I} didn't get much sleep on Wednesday, right. To prep for the exam:.
- 5 (0.2)
- 6 Sil: .hh
- 7 Lim: ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 8 Sil: kulay-ss-te-ni meli-ka kyey:sok aphu-ciꞑ
be.so-PST-RT-then head-NM constantly sick-COM
So {you} have a constant headache, rightꞑ
- 9 (1.0)
- 10 Lim: ung meli-nun an aphu-ntey,
yes head-TOP not sick-CIRCUM
-> Yeah {I} don't have a headache but,
- 11 Sil: [ung.
yes
Yeah.
- 12 Lim: [ceki kamki tu-n kes-celem (0.2) mom-i osulosulha-ko,
there cold enter-RL thing-like body-NM shivery-and
-> Well like having a cold (0.2) {I} feel shivery and,
- 13 Sil: ung. ung.
yes yes
Yeah. Yeah.
- 14 Lim: ca:kkwu ilehkey (0.5) nwup-ko siph-un
repeatedly like.this lie-and want-RL

[sayngkak-i manhi tul-e.
thought-NM much enter-INT

-> Like repeatedly (0.5) {I} feel like lying down.
- 15 Sil: [kulay kulay nwup-ko siph-kwu:
be.so.INT be.so INT lie-and want-and
Right right {you} want to lie down and:
- 16 Lim: ung.

yes
Yeah.

17 (.)

18 Sil: cipcwung-to an toy-ko:
concentration-also not become-and
{you} can't concentrate and:

19 Lim: ung. ung.
yes yes
Yeah. Yeah.

20 (0.2)

21 Sil: kuleh-tako cam-i phak o-nun kes-to ani-ko:
be.so-even.if sleep-NM right come-RL thing-also be.not-and
Even so {you} can't fall right into sleep:

22 Lim: mac-a. mac-a.
correct-INT correct-INT
Right. Right.

23 Sil: kulay:. kulehta-ko.
be.so.INT be.so-QT
Right:. [I'm telling you] {that} is so.

1 Sil: 그래:. 어↑제 내가 그렇더라고.
2 (0.7)

3 Lim: 어 h=

4 Sil: =수요일 날 하- 잠을 못 잤잖아:. 시험 보니까고:.
5 (0.2)

6 Sil: .hh

7 Lim: 응.

8 Sil: 그랬더니 머리가 계:속 아프지?
9 (1.0)

10 Lim: -> 응 머리는 안 아픈데,
11 Sil: [응.

12 Lim: -> [저기 감기 든 것처럼 (0.2) 몸이 오슬오슬하고,
13 Sil: 응. 응.

14 Lim: -> 자:꾸 이렇게 (0.5) 눕고 싶은 [생각이 많이 들어.
15 Sil: [그래 그래 눕고 싶구:

16 Lim: 응.
17 (.)

18 Sil: 집중도 안 되고:
19 Lim: 응. 응.
20 (0.2)

21 Sil: 그렇다고 잠이 딱 오는 것도 아니고:
22 Lim: 맞아. 맞아.
23 Sil: 그래:. 그렇다고.

After Sil shares when she was in a similar situation as Lim (line 1), and why (line 4), she comes in with a request for confirmation in line 8, which reinforces her strong epistemic stance towards the issue at hand. However, the subsequent one-second delay projects Lim's disagreeing stance (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013; Schegloff, 2007), and indeed, Lim initiates her response in the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format. While the beginning of Lim's response disconfirms the symptom asserted in Sil's pseudo-tag question (e.g., a constant headache), Lim expands her response with other physical conditions she had experienced instead. Thus, by using the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format, instead of a more definitive ending *-e/a* (e.g., *melinun an aph-a* “{I} don't have a headache”), for example, Lim signals that some aspect of Sil's question can be confirmed, e.g., that there are indeed undesirable physical features caused by a lack of sleep.

Note that Lim's expanded response, subsequent to the initial disconfirmatory repeat, finally finds a point of convergence in lines 14 and 15; Sil displays a strong agreement with Lim's description that she felt like lying down, as shown in her prosodic emphasis on *kulay* “Right” and her repeated production of the agreement token (*kulay kulay* “Right right”). Sil then takes the floor to add to the symptoms (lines 18 and 21), which are agreed by Lim in turn. Line 23 carries a tone that closes, or suggests closing, the list of ‘physical features caused by a lack of sleep.’ Therefore, this excerpt illustrates how the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format marks the response as disconfirmation initially but makes room for partial confirmation.

Another example of a [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*]-initiated response is shown in Excerpt 13. Yun has an acquaintance at school, H, who plans on registering for a singing competition and is looking for a songwriter to work with. Yun mentioned his songwriter friend, Ken, to H, which was received with much interest. In this conversation between Yun and Ken, Yun reports to Ken

on what has happened at school with H, and provides Ken with background information about him. The excerpt starts with Ken's question concerning H's musical talents.

(13) Choir

- 1 Ken: nolay-n cal hay?
song-TOP well do.INT
{He}'s good at singing?
- 2 (1.0)
- 3 Yun: nan nolay mwe- kulehkey cal ha-nun kes kath-ci
I.TOP song DM like.that well do-RL thing same-NOM

anh-untey,
not.do-CIRCUM

-> **I- don't think {he's} that good at singing but,**
- 4 Ken: °ung.°
yes
°Yeah.°
- 5 Yun: yeki (0.2) wuli hakkyo hapchangtan-i-ketun.
here our school choir-be-INFO
-> **Here (0.2) {he} sings in the campus choir.**
- 6 (0.5)
- 7 Ken: °um:..°
mm
°Mm:..°
- 8 Yun: khonsethu khwaie kuke.
concert choir that
The Concert Choir.
- 9 (0.5)
- 10 Ken: moksoli-nun manhi ollaka?
voice-TOP much go.up.INT
{He} hits high notes?
-
- 1 Ken: 노랜 잘 해?
2 (1.0)
3 Yun: -> 난 노래 뭐- 그렇게 잘 하는 것 같지 않은데,
4 Ken: °응.°
5 Yun: -> 여기 (0.2) 우리 학교 합창단이거든.
6 (0.5)
7 Ken: °음:..°

8 Yun: 콘서트 콰이어 그거.
9 (0.5)
10 Ken: 목소리는 많이 올라가?

Throughout the conversation, much of which is not shown in this excerpt, Yun seems to display a somewhat ambivalent position towards H and about putting him in contact with Ken. On one hand, he is the one who voluntarily introduced Ken to H, and at one point he also proposes the idea of recording H's demo for Ken, which could be seen as an effort to "sell" H. On the other hand, he does not seem to speak the best of H when he provides background information about him.

This somewhat ambiguous position of Yun's towards H manifests in this excerpt as well. In response to Ken's initial question in line 1 regarding H's vocal talent, Yun projects a dispreferred answer by delaying his turn for a full second (line 2). Indeed, his response starts with disconfirmation in the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format (line 3). He, however, builds the turn with multiple components that mitigate the disconfirmatory force, such as a hedge *mwe* 'well,' a degree adverb *kulehkey* 'that (much),' and a conjecture marker *-nun kes kath* 'seem to.' Finally, he marks the end of the turn with *-(nu)ntey*, making room for partial confirmation. In line 5, Yun's expanded response indeed ends on a positive note regarding H's vocal talent, i.e., he is in the campus choir, which may reflect an even more objective evaluation of H's musical capacity than Yun's personal impression expressed in line 3 (as marked with *nan* "I"). In response to Ken's minimal receipt in line 7, Yun reinforces his prior turn yet again by specifying the name of the choir in line 8. Therefore, just as in Excerpt 12, this excerpt illustrates the ways in which a respondent deploys the [repeatRP-(*nu*)*ntey*] format so as to provide disconfirmation initially but make room for additional information that confirms some aspects of the question's proposition.

In summary, this section has shown two response formats utilizing repetition and a contrastive connective *-(nu)ntey*. The first format, [repeat-*(nu)ntey*], initially confirms the question, but is eventually leveraged into rejecting to endorse all the terms of the question. On the contrary, the [repeat with reversed polarity-*(nu)ntey*] format initiates a response with disconfirmation, but signals that the subsequent part of the response may provide at least oblique confirmation on some aspects of the question. Therefore, both response formats show the ways in which repetition is deployed for the respondent to deal with multiple layers of terms and constraints embedded in a question.

5.3 Repetition with Negation

This section examines another type of disconfirmatory responses utilizing repetition. Using a negation structure [(repeat)-*i/ka aniko* ‘to be not (repeat) but’] or its variants, respondents disconfirm a question and secure a space to provide clarification that cannot be achieved by simply reversing the polarity of the question’s proposition. Unlike the *-(nu)ntey*-marked responses illustrated in Section 4.2, repetition with a negation structure does not involve partial confirmation or disconfirmation; that is, it does not seek to find any converging or tangentially aligning points between the questioner’s proposition and the response. The terms of questions are overturned with the negation structure (Heritage & Raymond, 2012), and in the expanded response slot, the respondent provides clarification on his/her own terms.

Consider Excerpt 14 for example. Sun has been having trouble getting connected to Yen, using the instructions for this research-purpose call. The excerpt starts when the call has finally been connected.

(14) Stress

- 1 Sun: .hh ayu: tutie tway-ss-ta. [ne:mwu kipwun coh-ta.
EX finally become-PST-DC too feeling nice-DC
.hh A:h it's working finally. It feels so: good.
- 2 Yen: [ey:
yes
Ye:s
- 3 Sun: [.H ehwu ilehkey malsseng-ul phiwe kaci[ko:,
EX like.this trouble-AC cause.INF CONN
.H Ahh it was causing trouble like this:,
- 4 Yen: [ani nemwu: ike ttaymwuney:- [ani ike ttaymwuney
DM too this because.of DM this because.of
I mean, because of this:-
- 5 kwaynhi suthuleysu manhi pat-ass-cyo.
in.vain stress much get-PST-COM.POL
I mean, because of this {you} got stressed out, right.
- 6 Sun: .ts ani kekey- suthuleysu pat-un key ani-ko:,
no that.NM stress get-RL thing be.not-and
-> .ts No that- {It}'s not that {I} got stressed out but,
- 7 Yen: [yey yey.
yes yes
Yes yes.
- 8 Sun: [.h e h nay-ka mewl calmoshay-se
uhm I-NM something.AC make.mistake-because

kule-n cwu-l al-ko [:
be.so-RL NOM-AC know-and

-> .h Uhm I thought I did something wrong:
- 9 Yen: [a:
oh
Oh:
- 10 Yen: [yey:
yes
Yes:
-
- 1 Sun: .hh 아유: 드디어 됐다. [너:무 기분 좋다.
2 Yen: [에:
3 Sun: [.H 어후 이렇게 말썽을 피워 가지[고:,
4 Yen: [아니 너무: 이거 때문에:- [아니 이거 때문에
5 괜히 스트레스 많이 받았죠.
6 Sun: -> .ts 아니 그게- 스트레스 받은 게 아니고:,
7 Yen: [예예.

8 Sun: -> [.h 어 h 내가 뭘 잘못해서 그런 줄 알고[:
 9 Yen: [아:
 10 Yen: [예:

As Sun displays her excitement (line 1) and past frustration (line 3), Yen assumes that Sun has been “stressed out” over getting the call to work (lines 4-5). In response to Yen’s request for confirmation formulated in a pseudo-tag question, Sun initiates her response in a [(repeat)-*i aniko*] format. The negation structure disconfirms the question by rejecting its entire proposition in an outright manner. If a response is given, for example, with a reversely polarized predicate repeat (e.g., *an patasseyo* “{I} didn’t get”), it still accepts the presupposition that the issue at hand is something that may well cause stress. By mobilizing the negation structure instead, Sun manages to take the entire issue of stress off the table. In the subsequent expansion projected by the connective *-ko* ‘and,’ Sun provides clarification regarding the reason for her frustration, which is presented as having nothing to do with the issue of stress.

Excerpt 15 illustrates a similar example in which a variant of the negation structure, [(repeat)-*i/ka anila*], is used. In the U.S., Lia and Nah are studying abroad in two different states. Lia goes to a university located in a city whereas Nah’s university is far from the city area. Prior to the excerpt, Nah complained about the food available on campus. Without knowing the surroundings of Nah’s university, Lia suggests Nah use off-campus restaurants.

(15) Campus

1 Lia: ceng kwichanh-umyen kunyang ↓ya: naka-se mwe sayntuwichi
 truly bothersome-if just hey go.out-and DM sandwich
 sa mek-umyen toy-ci mwe.
 buy eat-if become-COM DM

If it’s too bothersome, ↓hey:, {you} can just go out to get a sandwich.

2 mwe ha-[le ().
 what do-in.order.to
What for ().

3 Nah: [kule-n tey-ka eps-ketun. [yeki-nun.
 be.so-RL place-NM not.exist-INFO here-TOP
There's no such place {to get a sandwich}. Here.

4 Lia: [a eps-ni?
 oh not.exist-Q
Oh isn't there?

5 Nah: [e.
 yes
No.

6 Lia: [a. .h yeki-n nemwu manh(h)-a(h). [kulayse-
 oh here-TOP too many-INT so
Oh. .h There are too ma(h)ny(h) here. So-

7 Nah: [yeki-nun[:,
 here-TOP
Here::,

8 Lia: [e.
 yes
Yeah.

9 Nah: ttelecye iss-e[:.
 apart-INF exist-INT
{They're} far apart::

10 Lia: [a= kukka .h hakkyo (.) khaympesu-ka
 oh so school campus-NM
 ttak iss-na po-ci? (.) kunyang?
 right exist-Q see-COM just
Oh=so .h [I guess] there's just a campus, right? (.) Alone?

11 Nah: .h khaympesu-ka iss-nun key ani-la[:,
 campus-NM exist-RL thing be.not-CONN
-> .h {It}'s not that there's a campus but,

12 Lia: [°um.°
 mm
 °Mm.°

13 Nah: kukka- keki: kule-n umsikcem-tul-i iss-nun tey-se
 so there be.so-RL restaurant-PL-NM exist-RL place-from
 ttelecye iss-ci.
 apart-INF exist-COM
-> So- {It}'s far from where those restaurants are.

14 Lia: e::.

yes
Yeah: . .

-
- 1 Lia: 정 귀찮으면 그냥 ↓야: 나가서 뭐 샌드위치 사 먹으면 되지 뭐.
2 뭐 하[러 ().
3 Nah: [그런 데가 없거든. [여기는.
4 Lia: [아 없니?
5 Nah: [어.
6 Lia: [아. .h 여긴 너무 많(ㅎ)아(ㅎ). [그래서-
7 Nah: [여기는:[:,
8 Lia: [어.
9 Nah: 떨어져 있어[:.
10 Lia: [아=그까 .h 학교 (.) 캠퍼스가 딱 있나 보지? (.) 그냥?
11 Nah: -> .h 캠퍼스가 있는 게 아니라[:,
12 Lia: [°음.°
13 Nah: -> 그까- 거기: 그런 음식점들이 있는 데서 떨어져 있지.
14 Lia: 어::.

Based on Nah's informing that off-campus food is not easily accessible for her (lines 3 and 9), Lia makes a conjecture about the isolated location of Nah's university in line 10. In line 11, Nah provides disconfirmation initiated by the [repeat + negation] structure (*khaymphesuka issnun key anila:*, “{It}'s not that there's a campus but,”). Again, she places the whole proposition of the question as the complement of the negation structure, which in effect subverts the terms of the question. In the subsequent expansion in line 13, Nah describes the location of her university in her own terms, which reinforces her previous point in line 9, i.e., it is not necessarily an isolated place but only far from the off-campus restaurant area. Therefore, as in Excerpt 14, disconfirmation given in the negation structure nullifies the terms of questions and provides a space for clarification to be made in the respondent's own terms. Moreover, in both Excerpts 14 and 15, the questioners also accept the negation-prefaced disconfirmation without a pursuit of further accounts.

Heritage and Raymond (2012) have found that a very similar use of repetition with negation occurs in English conversation as well, as shown in Excerpt 16, which is an exchange between a doctor and a patient's mother.

(16) [Pediatric Visit] (Heritage & Raymond, 2012, p. 191)

1 Doc: Has he been coughing uh lot?
2 (0.2)
3 Mom: -> .hh Not uh lot.=h[h
4 Doc: [Mkay:?,
5 Mom: -> But it- it <sound:s:> deep.
6 (1.0)
7 Mom: -> An' with everything we (heard) on tee v(h)ee=hhhh
8 -> fwe got sca:re.f
9 Doc: Kay. (An fer i-) It sounds deep?
10 (.)
11 Mom: Mm hm.

Through a negated repetition in line 3, the mother prepares a platform for her expanded response, in which she presents another aspect of the child's cough symptoms that could not be addressed by directly answering the question (Heritage & Ramond, 2012). Heritage and Raymond (2012) also note that “[r]epetition in response design can be a vehicle for the incorporation of negation through which the terms of questions can be overturned. [...] This negation is used to launch a subsequent expansion which departs very substantially from the terms of the original question” (p. 190). The fact that their findings from English data show resemblances to my research, lends further support to the prevalence of the [repeat + negation] responses and a possible universality of their actions.

In summary, this section has examined the ways in which repetition and negation are incorporated into a response to a request for confirmation. By initiating a response in the [repeat + negation] form, the respondent marks his/her response as disconfirmation in an outright manner, specifically pointing out what part of the question is being denied. Concurrently, the

connective at the end of the negation structure projects an expansion of the response turn, which secures a place for the respondent to provide further clarification with much less constraints imposed by the question. Thus, the [repeat + negation] structure is an effective tool when a simple negative particle or a reversely polarized predicate repeat cannot achieve the scale or level of disconfirmation the respondent tries to convey. It has also been observed that disconfirmation, designed in this way, is often treated by the questioner as a “full” answer, which requires no further account.

5.4 Discussion

This chapter has shown the ways in which repetition is mobilized in disconfirmatory responses to requests for confirmation. As illustrated in Section 4.1, a minimal form of disconfirmation can be provided by repeating the predicate of a question in reversed polarity. It seems that this form of disconfirmation is selected over, for example, a simple negative particle, when 1) the question is negatively polarized, especially with pre-verbal negation, 2) the respondents try to calibrate the degree and scope of disconfirmation by adding adverbs, such as *acik* ‘yet’ and *pyello* ‘not particularly,’ and 3) the question conveys a high expectation for a confirmatory answer. A minimal repeat for disconfirmation, however, is not treated as a full answer in the sense that disconfirmation is considered as an action to be accounted for and is normally designed as such. Thus, disconfirmation with a minimal repeat, if not accompanied by the respondent’s voluntary elaboration, is often followed by the questioner’s overt or implicit pursuit of accounts.

Sections 4.2 and 4.3 have examined other types of disconfirmatory responses that deploy repetition using specific grammatical structures. When a respondent initiates his/her response

with repetition marked by a contrastive connective *-(nu)ntey*, s/he signals that the initial confirmation or disconfirmation would be contradicted in an expansion. Thus, the [repeat-*(nu)ntey*] format is used when the question, at least in some aspects, has to be confirmed, but the respondent cannot endorse the whole proposition or presupposition of the question. On the other hand, respondents use the [repeat with reversed polarity-*(nu)ntey*] format when the question cannot be confirmed in the way it is phrased but the respondent still seeks for oblique alignment with the questioner. While *-(nu)ntey*-marked repetition deals with a complex response to address the multiple layers of the issue at hand, repetition with a negation structure provides outright disconfirmation with further clarification. The negation structure allows the respondent to subvert the terms of questions so that the following clarification can be given on his/her terms.

Repetition mobilized in disconfirmatory responses has shown that it is a vehicle for the incorporation of different structures into the response (e.g., *-(nu)ntey*, negation, and other predicates used in minimal repeats). What is in common among these structures is that they tend to operate on the terms of questions, for example, by partially accepting them (e.g., [repeat-*(nu)ntey*]), partially rejecting them (e.g., [repeatRP-*(nu)ntey*]), or fully rejecting them (e.g., repeat with negation). Repetition mobilized in these structures specifically points to the part of the question that is being accepted or causing trouble on the respondent's end. In other words, repetition draws direct connection between the question and the response. In Stivers and Hayashi's (2010) research on "transformative answers," they examine a type of responses that answer questions obliquely by shifting some terms of the questions. There seems to be some overlap, then, between transformative answers and the repetitional disconfirmatory responses presented in this chapter, in that they both show the respondent's effort to work on the terms of

questions imposed on them. Unlike transformative answers, however, repetitional responses overtly indicate which part of the question is being targeted and operated on in the response.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

This dissertation has investigated repetitive utterances produced in response to yes/no polar questions in Korean conversation. In an effort to keep the initiating action constant, the questions were restricted to those that primarily request confirmation. Repetitive responses in such sequences can be categorized into two types: minimal repeats and non-minimal repeats. Minimal repeats are further categorized into predicate repeats and noun phrase repeats.

Chapter 3 has shown the ways in which minimal repeats are mobilized in affirmative responses. When the question is negatively polarized, minimal-repeat responses take the form of predicate repeats. On the other hand, minimal repeats in response to positive questions vary in types; they may be given in verbatim predicate repeats, predicate repeats with a modified ending, or noun phrase repeats. Minimal repeats in general promote a closure of the current sequence, with the respondent not elaborating further on the response. By doing so, the respondent signals that s/he has understood the question as a request for confirmation and that s/he will orient to it just as that. In other words, minimal repeats mark the turn as doing ‘nothing more than confirming.’ Therefore, even in the case of predicate repeats with a modified ending, the shift caused by the modification to the ending (e.g., epistemic downgrade; shift in deontic modality) is rarely oriented to or brought to the surface of the interaction by the participants.

Chapter 4 has examined non-minimal repeats in affirmative responses. Non-minimal repeats carry “extra” components that can be omitted without damaging the comprehensibility of the turn. The findings of this study have shown that these extra elements are not randomly

chosen but are closely related to what the response attempts to do beyond confirming the question. For instance, when the respondent projects further informing and elaboration about the issue at hand, the extra components in the non-minimal repeat tend to denote the topical issue. If non-minimal repeats are produced in response to a question loaded with the questioner's affective stance, such as disbelief, the extra elements are added to highlight the respondent's epistemic and/or affective stance. Compared to minimal repeats, non-minimal repeats tend to be followed by further talk from the respondent. Connectives are thus often incorporated into non-minimal repeats to project a turn expansion. In the space projected and secured by the use of a connective, the respondent has more room to manage the trajectory of talk.

Chapter 5 has analyzed repetitional responses for disconfirmation. As a dispreferred action, disconfirmation is normally accompanied by delays, mitigations, prefaces, and accounts (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). Therefore, if disconfirmation is given in minimal repeat form, it tends to be treated as an insufficient response to the question, just as a response with a simple negative particle. The rest of the chapter has thus examined disconfirmatory responses given in a non-minimal manner by incorporating certain grammatical structures. The contrastive connective *-(nu)ntey* is deployed when the question cannot be fully confirmed or disconfirmed. When the respondent is to confirm the question but not to endorse the entire terms and presuppositions embedded in the questions, a response in a [repeat-*(nu)ntey*] form is utilized. On the contrary, when the question, as is, has to be disconfirmed but the respondent finds a converging point between his/her position and the questioner's, a response is provided in a [repeat with a reverse polarity-*(nu)ntey*] form. Repetition is also used with the negation structure [-*i/ka aniko* ' {it} is not - but?'] or its variants in such a way that the respondent not simply disconfirms the question but nullifies the terms of the question as a whole.

6.2 Implications of the Study

6.2.1 Interplay of Form and Function

The analyses of this dissertation have developed upon a preliminary observation that terse responses tend to be followed by turn transitions whereas lengthier responses tend to get expanded even further beyond the initial turn constructional unit (TCU). Further analyses have revealed that the respondents, quite naturally, carry out more actions in longer turns, going beyond what has initially been requested by the question. What is interesting about this observation is that the simplicity or complexity of the response's action is already partly projected in its initial form.

The interplay between form and function, or action, is not a new notion. Studies on question designs, for example, have revealed that the way a question is formulated conveys the questioner's epistemic stance towards the matter inquired about (Hayano, 2013; Heritage, 2008, 2010). One of the simplest examples would be that a tag question (e.g., "The weather is nice today, isn't it?") shows the questioner's stronger epistemic stance and greater expectation for an agreeing answer than a polar question (e.g., "Is the weather nice today?").

More directly related to this study would be the findings from S. Lee's (2015) research, in which two forms of affirmative responses to polar questions in Korean conversation have been investigated with reference to their respective actions and orientation to the prior question. She finds that those questions not overtly marked with interrogative endings ("unmarked questions" in her terms) tend to be answered with unexpanded responses (i.e., a 'yes' alone), whereas questions with overt interrogative endings ("interrogative questions" in her terms) tend to be answered with expanded responses (i.e., 'yes' followed by additional components). She thus

concludes that unexpanded answers “treat the question as simply seeking (re-)confirmation” while expanded answers address “the inferred purpose or intention behind the question” (S. Lee, 2015, p. 21).

Thus, S. Lee’s (2015) study and this dissertation have found very similar patterns with respect to the relationship between the response form and its orientation to the prior question, even though the types of the investigated responses differ in the two studies (i.e., type-conforming responses vs. repetitive responses). This then not only reinforces the validity of the findings from this dissertation, but also speaks to the strong correlation between form and function for certain interactional phenomena, including responses.

6.2.2 Type Conformity

The findings of this dissertation also have an implication on the notion of type conformity. Type conformity is a significant concept in CA research and a powerful mechanism in actual interaction. Raymond’s (2003) seminal work convincingly shows that the most preferred, unproblematic answers in response to yes/no questions are the ‘type-conforming’ yes/no answers. The type-conforming answers indicate the respondent’s acceptance of the terms of questions, and tend to enhance sequence closure accordingly. Contrarily, non-type-conforming responses signal trouble with the terms of questions on the respondent’s end, possibly resulting in sequence expansion.

However, the patterns repeatedly illustrated in this dissertation have shown that the sequential development subsequent to repetitive responses varies by the form of the response. That is, minimal repeats tend to show similar sequential development patterns as type-conforming responses, promoting sequence closure and a turn transition. This suggests that

repetitional responses are not a uniform group of responses that can be lumped together under the rubric of non-type-conforming responses, even though it indeed seems that repetition, be it minimal or non-minimal in form, is generally related to the respondent's exertion of agency over the issue at hand. At least in response to questions that request confirmation, repetitional responses given in a minimal form show similar qualities as type-conforming responses.

Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) raise a similar question based on their findings from response turns in various sequences. They have investigated responses in four different types of sequences: information-seeking sequences with wh-questions ("question-word interrogatives (QWIs)" in their terms), informing sequences, assessment sequences, and request-for-action sequences. Their findings show that what is considered an unproblematic response takes different forms depending on the type of the question and the sequence. For instance, while responses in phrasal forms would be unproblematic for Specifying QWIs that "seek single, specific pieces of information," the same type of responses would be insufficient for Telling QWIs that "seek extended responses" (Thompson et al., 2015, p. 20). Thus, they ask the question of whether the notion of type conformity can be uniformly applied across questions and sequences.

Similarly, the findings of this dissertation suggest finer distinctions to be made for repetitional responses, which in turn will reveal the need to fine-tune some of the important concepts in the field, such as type conformity.

6.3 Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of this study suggest several possible lines of inquiry for future research. As the first attempt to scrutinize repetitional responses in Korean conversation, certain labels or

categories (e.g., minimal/non-minimal; predicate repeats; noun phrase repeats) were chosen and repeatedly used to advance the analyses. However, further research may find more categories or improved ways to classify the target turns. In addition, research on the interplay between repetition and prosody has seen fruitful results in other languages (Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 1996; Curl, 2004; Curl, Local, & Walker, 2006). Further research on how prosody plays a role in repetitional responses in Korean conversation would be an interesting development built on this study. Lastly, the current study limited the target sequence to those initiated by confirmation-request questions. Further investigation on repetitional responses in a variety of sequences would contribute to our understanding of repetitional responses in general.

APPENDIX A
TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[The point where overlapping talk starts
]	The point where overlapping talk ends
=	Contiguous utterances (no break or gap)
(0.2)	Length of silence in tenths of a second
(.)	Micropause; hearably a silence but not readily measurable
.	Falling, or final intonation; not necessarily the end of a sentence
?	Rising intonation; not necessarily a question
,	Continuing intonation
¿	A rise stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark
:	Sound stretch
-	Cut-off or self-interruption
<u>word</u>	Underlining indicates some form of stress or emphasis
WOrd	Upper case indicates especially loud talk
◦ ◦	Portions quieter than the surrounding talk
_:	Inflected falling intonation contour
⋮	Inflected rising intonation contour
↑ ↓	Sharper rise or down in pitch than would be indicated by combination of colons and underlining
< >	A stretch of talk is markedly slow or drawn out
> <	Compressed or rushed talk
hh	Laughter, or hearable exhalation or aspiration (outbreaths); the more “h”s, the more aspiration
.hh	Hearable inhalation or inbreath
(())	Transcriber’s commentary, description of events
(word)	Uncertainty on the transcriber’s part
()	Something is being said, but no hearing could be achieved

APPENDIX B
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE KOREAN GLOSS

AC	Accusative	INT	Intimate speech level
ADV	Adverbial suffix	NM	Nominative
APP	Apperceptive	NOM	Nominalizer
CIRCUM	Circumstantial	PAS	Passive
COM	Committal	PL	Plural suffix
CONN	Connective	PN	Proper noun
CORREL	Correlative	POL	Polite speech level
DC	Declarative suffix	PRS	Prospective
DM	Discourse marker	PST	Past suffix
EX	Exclamation	Q	Interrogative
HEARSAY	Hearsay marker	QT	Quotative particle
HON	Honorific	RL	Relativizer
IM	Imperative	RT	Retrospective
IN	Indicative	SH	Subject Honorific
INF	Infinitive	TOP	Topic marker
INFO	Informing	TRANS	Transferentive

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolden, G. (2009). Beyond answering: Repeat-prefaced responses in conversation. *Communication Monographs*, 76(2), 121-143.
- Bolden, G. (2010). 'Articulating the unsaid' via and-prefaced formulations of others' talk. *Discourse Studies*, 12(1), 5-32.
- Brown, P. (1998). Conversational structure and language acquisition: The role of repetition in Tzeltal adult and child speech. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(2), 197-221.
- Clayman, S. E. (2002). Sequence and solidarity. In E. J. Lawler & S. R. Thye (Eds.), *Advances in group processes: Group cohesion, trust, and solidarity* (pp. 229-253). Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Clayman, S. E. (2013). Turn-constructive units and the transition-relevance place. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 150-166). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curl, T. S. (2004). 'Repetition repairs': The relationship of phonetic structure and sequence organisation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & C. E. Ford (Eds.), *Sound patterns in interaction* (pp. 273-299). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Curl, T. S., Local, J. K., & Walker, G. (2006). Repetition and the prosody-pragmatics interface. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(10), 1721-1751.

- De Ruiter, J. (2012). Questions are what they do. In J. De Ruiter (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 1-7). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28, 69-101.
- Enfield, N. J., Stivers, T., & Levinson, S. C. (2010). Question-response sequences in conversation across ten languages: An introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2615-2619.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 225-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006). *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status, and exclusion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Goodwin, C. (1987). Children's arguing. In S. Philips, S. Steele & C. Tanz (Eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective* (pp. 200-248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, E. N. (1978). Towards a theory of questions. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 17-43). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 395-414). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2003). Designing questions and setting agendas in the news interview. In P. Glenn, C. LeBaron & J. Mandelbaum (Eds.), *Studies in language and social interaction* (pp. 57-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heritage, J. (2008). Constructing and navigating epistemic landscapes. *The Journal of Studies in Contemporary Sociological Theory*, 2, 14-25.
- Heritage, J. (2010). Questioning in medicine. In A. F. Freed & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *'Why do you ask?': The function of questions in institutional discourse* (pp. 42-68). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In J. P. De Ruyter (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 179-192). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Sorjonen, M.-L. (1994). Constituting and maintaining activities across sequences: And-prefacing as a feature of question design. *Language in Society*, 23(1), 1-29.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Jakobson, R. (1966). Grammatical parallelism and its Russian facet. *Language*, 42, 398-429.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 181-199.

- Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens 'yeah' and 'mm hm'. *Papers in Linguistics*, 17(2), 197-216.
- Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johnstone, B. (1987). An introduction. *Text*, 7(3), 205-214.
- Keenan, E. (1977). Making it last: Repetition in children's discourse. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child discourse* (pp. 125-138). New York: Academic Press.
- Kim, H. (2002). The form and function of next-turn repetition in English Conversation. *Language Research*, 38(1), 51-81.
- Kim, H. R. S. (2013). Reshaping the response space with *kulenikka* in beginning to respond to questions in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 303-317.
- Kim, M. S. (2005). Evidentiality in achieving entitlement, objectivity, and detachment in Korean conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 87-108.
- Kim, M. S. (2013). Answering questions about the unquestionable in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 57, 138-157.
- Kim, S. H. (2015). Resisting the terms of polar questions through *ani* (no)-prefacing in Korean conversation. *Discourse Processes*, 52(4), 311-334.
- Kawanishi, Y. (1994). An analysis of interactional markers in Korean: A comparative study of *-canh-a(yo)* vs. *-ci(yo)*. *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 82-100.

- Kawanishi, Y., & Sohn, S.-O. (1993). Grammaticization of Korean negation: A semantic-pragmatic analysis of *canh-a(yo)*. In S. Kuno, J. Whitman, I.-H. Lee, J. Mailing & Y.-J. Kim (Eds.), *The fifth Harvard international symposium of Korean linguistics* (pp. 552–561). Cambridge, MA: The Harvard ISOKL Committee.
- Kiparsky, P. (1973). The role of linguistics in a theory of poetry. *Daedalus*, 102, 231-44.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Koshik, I. (2005). *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Köymen, B., & Kyratzis, A. (2014). Dialogic syntax and complement constructions in toddlers' peer interactions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25, 497-521.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2012). On the roles of repetition in language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(2), 195-210.
- Lee, H. S. (1999). A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the committal *-ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 243-275.
- Lee, H. S. (2015). Modality. In L. Brown & J. Yeon (Eds.), *The handbook of Korean linguistics* (pp. 249-268). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lee, S.-H. (2013). Response design in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 415-432). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Lee, S.-H. (2015). Two forms of affirmative responses to polar questions. *Discourse Processes*, 52, 21-46.

- Levin, S. R. (1973). *Linguistic structures in poetry*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Maynard, D. W. (2013). Everyone and no one to turn to: Intellectual roots and contexts for conversation analysis. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 11-31). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Mikesell, L. (2010). Repetitional responses in frontotemporal dementia discourse: Asserting agency or demonstrating confusion? *Discourse Studies*, 12(4), 465-500.
- Mondana, L. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 32-56). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Noh, J. (2006). The emergence of intersubjectivity in Korean conversations: A study on the general noun construction, *-n-ke-ya*. *Senchengemwun*, 34, 61-114.
- Norrick, N. (1987). Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text*, 7, 245-64.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and unplanned discourse. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 51-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1983). *Acquiring conversational competence* (Vol. 9). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Park, J. S. (2008). *Negative yes/no question-answer sequences in conversation: Grammar, action, and sequence organization*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Park, Y.-Y. (1997). *A cross-linguistic study of the use of contrastive connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese conversation*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

- Park, Y.-Y. (1999). The Korean connective *nuntey* in conversational discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 191-218.
- Park, Y. (2009). *Analyzing medical discourse: The organization of doctor-patient interaction in Korean primary care settings*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage, (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2013). Preference. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 210-228). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939-967.
- Reiger, C. L. (2003). Repetitions as self-repair strategies in English and German conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 47-69.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1979). The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics 12: Discourse and syntax* (pp. 261-286). New York: Academic Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 70-85). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(1), 161-216.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When “others” initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 205-243.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Selting, M. (1996). Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called ‘astonished’ questions in repair initiation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies* (pp. 231-270). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimanoff, S., & Brunak, J. (1977). Repairs in planned and unplanned discourse. In E. O. Keenan & T. Bennett (Eds.), *Discourse across time and space* (pp. 123-167). Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Sohn, H-M. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, S.-O. (2003). On the emergence of intersubjectivity: An analysis of the sentence-final -*nikka* in Korean. In W. McClure (Ed.), *Proceedings of Japanese/Korean Linguistics 12* (pp. 52-63). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

- Sohn, S.-O. (2010). The role of frequency and prosody in the grammaticalization of Korean -*canh-*. In A. Van Linden, J.-C. Verstraete & K. Davidse (Eds.), *Formal Evidence in Grammaticalization Research* (pp. 245-274). Amsterdam & New York: John Benjamins.
- Sohn, S.-O. (2015). The emergence of utterance-final particles in Korean. In S. Hancil, A. Haselow & M. Post (Eds.), *Final particles* (pp. 181-196). Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sorjonen, M.-L. (1996). On repeats and responses in Finnish conversations. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 277-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steensig, J., & Drew, P. (2008). Introduction: Questioning and affiliation/disaffiliation in interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 10(1), 5-15.
- Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(2), 131-158.
- Stivers, T. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in American English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2772-2781.
- Stivers, T. (2011). Morality and question design: 'Of course' as contesting a presupposition of askability. In T. Stivers, L. Mondada & J. Steensig (Eds.), *The morality of knowledge in conversation* (pp. 82-106). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Enfield, N. J. (2010). A coding scheme for question-response sequences in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2620-2626.
- Stivers, T., & Hayashi, M. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society*, 39(1), 1-25.

- Stivers, T., & Rossano, F. (2010). Mobilizing response. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(1), 3-31.
- Suh, C.-S. (2006). *Korean grammar*. Hanyang University Press, Seoul.
- Tannen, D. (1987). Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. *Language*, 63(3), 574-605.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Thompson, S. A., Fox, B. A., & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2015). *Grammar in everyday talk: Building responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at “first and second sayings”. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 407-424.
- Yoon, K. E. (2010). Questions and responses in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2782-2798.
- Yun, E.-S., & Lee, Y.-H. (2007). Typological distributions of Korean interrogatives and their syntactic properties: A corpus-based classification and analysis. Paper presented at *the 12th Harvard Biennial International Symposium on Korean Linguistics at Harvard University*.