

Conversational Functions of Korean Discourse Connective *Kulaykaciko**

Eunho Kim
(Korea University)

Kim, Eunho. (2015). Conversational Functions of Korean Discourse Connective *Kulaykaciko*. *Language Research*, 51.1, 41-67.

The aim of this paper is to examine the use of Korean discourse connective *kulaykaciko*, one of the discourse connectives frequently produced by participants in Korean conversation. By employing the methodological framework of discourse modality (Maynard, 1993), it investigates semantic, pragmatic and interpersonal functions of *kulaykaciko* in naturally occurring discourse. The analysis reveals that a single linguistic sign, *kulaykaciko* has multiple functions in discourse: it can express the “cause-result” relationship, provide further explanation related to the previous talk, manage turn-taking, and index politeness.

Keywords: Korean discourse connective *kulaykaciko*, discourse modality, discourse cohesion, speech action, turn-taking, politeness

1. Introduction

This study examines the use of Korean discourse connective *kulaykaciko*, one of the discourse connectives frequently produced by participants in Korean conversation. By employing the methodological framework of discourse modality (Maynard, 1993), it investigates semantic, pragmatic and interpersonal functions of *kulaykaciko* in naturally occurring discourse. This connective has not been specifically investigated, although several previous studies have referred to the workings of *kulaykaciko* as “a cause or a reason” (S-Y Kang, 2005). Korean grammarians’ and dictionaries’ characterization of *-e/a kaciko* is also a conjunctive phrase used for logically connecting cause/reason with the consequent/result (e.g. Korean language

* I am grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on an earlier version. All remaining errors and infelicities are my own.

dictionary for foreigners, 2006; Korean grammar for foreigners, 2006).

However, a cursory examination of Korean conversational data reveals that *kulaykaciko* frequently appears in a context where this “cause-result” relationship is not obviously present. For instance, while *kulaykaciko* is often produced for cause-result, leading to its commonly accepted characterization as a “causality,” it also occurs, on some occasions, to provide additional information about the previous utterances. Further, *kulaykaciko*, which is often produced in a free-standing format, works to resume the speaker’s prior talk, or to finish the ongoing turn.

This study explicates how the discursual context associated with each occurrence of this connective, when considered together, help to determine the specific ways in which *kulaykaciko* contributes to the development of conversation. Through a careful description of the workings of *kulaykaciko*, this study also reflects on the methodological issues involved in linguistic studies of interactional styles. Previous studies of Korean speakers’ use of discourse connectives have tended to adopt quantitative approaches in which analysts classify different types of linguistic items into different categories and count their frequencies (e.g., J-B Choi, 2007; S-R Lee, 2004; K-H Lim, 1994; H-S Shin, 1989). However, the classification of linguistic forms and their functions can be a precarious task. Close analysis of conversational interactions reveals that the same linguistic form can accomplish a number of different actions, and at the same time, that the same action can be accomplished by a number of different means (Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996).

In an effort to achieve a more appropriate characterization of *kulaykaciko*, this study will first explicate the issue of casualness in comparison with conjunction *kulayse*, and then continue on to examine the occurrence and distribution of *kulaykaciko* focusing on the sequential and global context in which it appears with attention being paid to following research questions.

1. Is *kulaykaciko* a simple informal form of *kulayse* which appears in spoken context? Is there any distinctive function of *kulaykaciko* in addition to being a simple informal variation of *kulayse*?
2. What semantic, pragmatic and interpersonal functions do *kulaykaciko* bring to the discourse?

2. Previous Literature

2.1. *Kulayse* and *Kulaykaciko* in Korean

A great number of previous studies dealing with connectives including *kulaykaciko* are based on the data analysis of made-up examples in the lack of showing clear discourse contexts where the target item is used. One apparent premise of these studies on this connective is the possibility of assigning a single overarching function to this connective. As already noted in the previous section, *kulayse* ‘so, therefore’ in Korean has been categorized as a conjunction which denotes ‘causality’ (Martin, 1993; H-M Sohn, 1999). Similar to *kulayse*, *kulaykaciko* has been proposed as a conjunctive which is a less formal and spoken form than *kulayse*. For example, K-H Lim (1994) proposed *-e/a kaciko* as an informal variation of *-e/ase*. He argued that in *-e/a kaciko* construction, its meaning of transitional verb *kacita* ‘possession’ is neutralized in the suffix. Due to this neutralization, *-e/a kaciko* form conveys semantic-pragmatic functions representing the speaker’s affective attitude towards proposition: information retention and emphasis, and word-searching. He additionally claimed that it is habitually used by young and less-educated speakers.

Other studies (e.g., K-H Bum, 2002; S-R Lee, 2004; K-H Lim, 1994) discussed *kulaykaciko* as compared with a conjunction *kulayse* in terms of formality: a colloquial form of *kulayse* which represents the relation of “cause-and-result,” as shown in (1).

- (1) pap-ul manh-i mek-ess-ta. kulayse bay-ka pwulu-ta
 rice-ACC a lot-ADV eat-PST-PLN therefore stomach-TOP full-PLN
 “I ate a lot. Therefore, I am full.” (formal)
- (2) pap-ul manh-i mek-ess-ta. kulaykaciko bay-ka pwulu-ta.
 rice-ACC a lot-ADV eat-PST-PLN KULAYKACIKO stomach-TOP
 full-PLN
 “I ate a lot. Therefore, I am full.” (less formal/colloquial)

In (1) and (2) each and all, the cause is stated in an independent sentence

and the result follows in a separate statement, the latter of which is initially marked by the conjunction *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko*. *Kulaykaciko* therefore is considered as a connective used for logically connecting cause/reason with the consequence/result that are found mostly in colloquial context.

In addition, Korean linguistics analyzed conjunctive verbal suffix *-e/a kaciko* excluding demonstrative *ku* in the framework of grammaticalization (S-R Lee 2004; H-O Sohn 2012). These studies mainly focused on investigation paths and mechanisms of grammaticalization in the endeavor of exploring propositional semantic meaning and syntactic realization (K-H Bum 2002; S-R Lee 2004; K-H Lim 1994). S-R Lee (2004) focused on examination of semantic changes and recategorization (Hopper, 1991) of *-e/a kaciko* construction. In the account of its grammaticalization process, S-R Lee maintained that *kulaykaciko* was developed as a discourse marker. Topicalization and topic shift are proposed as pragmatic functions of *kulaykaciko*. In a similar vein, both K-H Bum (2002) and H-O Sohn (2012) analogously claimed that *kulaykaciko* was developed as a discourse marker which indexes cause-result relationship through grammaticalization process.

Traditional accounts of the *-e/a kaciko* explained what the propositional meaning of *-e/a kaciko* or *kulaykaciko* is and how it came into being. However, its pragmatic and interpersonal functions in the discourse level have not been accounted for in depth, especially based on naturally occurring conversations. Using naturally occurring conversation data, this study examines the pragmatic and interactional functions of *kulaykaciko*.

2.2. *Kulaykaciko* as a discourse marker

Some of recent studies mainly focus on classifying *kulaykaciko*'s functions in discourse. (e.g. H-J Lee, 2003; S-Y Kang 2005). S-Y Kang (2005) undertook a comprehensive analysis of the semantic-pragmatic functions of *kulaykaciko* as a discourse marker by analyzing spoken corpus data. Agreeing with findings from previous studies, S-Y Kang claimed that discourse marker *kulaykaciko* serves as a device to express 'cause and result' as an informal form of *kulayse*. Another function she suggests is returning

to the original topic when interruption occurs during the utterance. In summary, S-Y Kang (2005) provided an important explanation by investigating pragmatic functions of *kulaykaciko*. The new interpretation proposed in this has made a contribution in several ways. First, as opposed to previous studies that rely upon made-up examples, S-Y Kang's work is based on a corpus of conversational data. Second, it examined the use of *kulaykaciko* in the level of discourse. However, this study solely relies on short pre-transcribed corpus data which cannot look at actual occurrence of conversation. More recently, Y-W Ha and J-Y Shin (2014) examined the distributions, the semantic functions, and the intonation patterns of *kulaykaciko* using spontaneous speech corpus. Focusing on intonational phrase patterns of *kulaykaciko*, they explained the ways in which *kulaykaciko* turned into a conjunction from a connective. Although this line of corpus-based research is insightful, their characterizations can lead one to overlook detailed organizational and interactional nature of the dialogues. Moreover, in analyzing the data previous studies did not actually show the detailed organizational and interactional nature of the dialogue. To fill this gap, this investigation will center on what action(s) *kulaykaciko* is recognizably performing in 'real-time' within the specificities of the sequential environment and the practices within which it is embedded.

3. Data and Methods

3.1. Data

In order to more deeply investigate *kulaykaciko* in Korean and to provide a more precise explanation of its functions in discourse, I have analyzed approximately nine hours of naturally occurring oral data. The spontaneous data consists of three television talk shows differentiated by their level of formality. The data was transcribed in Yale Romanization (H-M Sohn, 1999; p.2-3). The transcription conventions used in this study are adapted from those used in conversation analysis. The interlinear gloss

specifies either the meaning or the morphosyntactic category of each unit in the Korean utterance (see Appendix for the transcription conventions and morpheme-by-morpheme glosses). All instances of *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko* are coded and counted. In order to show a general picture of the data, Table 1 below illustrates a quantitative extent of the frequency and distribution of *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko* throughout speaker's utterance in three different talk shows.

Table 1. Frequency of *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko* in the current data set

Data (program)	<i>kulayse</i>	<i>kulaykaciko</i>	Ratio
<i>seypakhwi</i> ¹⁾			
episode (1)	22	10	2.2:1
2. episode (2)	17	9	1.8:1
3. episode (3)	19	16	1.1:1
<i>achimmatang</i> ²⁾			
4. episode (1)	31	12	2.5:1
5. episode (2)	28	11	2.5:1
6. episode (3)	12	8	1.5:1
<i>paykpwuntholon</i> ³⁾			
7. episode (1)	33	7	4.7:1
8. episode (2)	42	9	4.6:1
9. episode (3)	47	3	15.6:1

As we can see from the table, none of the datasets evidences an exclusive use of on form over the other -- evidence to the fact that discourse genre or social stratification formality alone is not a reliable predictor of *kulaykaciko*. The formal debate program does contain highly frequent use of *kulayse*. The debate program represents a formal general of public discourse, and as such, it is not surprising that participants employ *kulayse* more than *kulaykaciko*.

1) "Three Wheels" (SBS)

2) "Morning Garden" (KBS)

3) "100 Minute Debate" (MBC)

3.2. Method

In order to explore the function of *kulaykaciko* in all aspects of communication including semantic and pragmatic as well as interpersonal aspects, “discourse modality” (Lakoff, 1972; Lyons, 1981; Maynard, 1993) is utilized as a theoretical framework. According to Maynard (1993), discourse modality refers to “information that does not or only minimally conveys objective propositional message content. It conveys the subjective information of speaker, e.g., emotional, mental or psychological attitude toward the message content, the speech act itself or toward his or her interlocutor in discourse.” (p. 38)

More specifically, Maynard (1993) introduces four major aspects to characterize this discourse modality: (1) discourse cohesion, (2) speech action declaration and qualification (3) participatory control, (4) interactional appeal. Although these four domains are not mutually exclusive, it is useful to separate accepts of discourse modality into four categories to explicate functions of linguistic items such. Following Brown and Yule’s (1983), Maynard explains that (1) discourse cohesion includes not only the cohesion realized by specific relationships between two items within the text, but also implies that the text is coherent with respect to the “general” discourse structure. In analyzing certain linguistic resources in the framework of discourse modality, (2) qualification of speech actions also becomes essential. In reality, speakers use every available strategy to achieve the goals of interaction. In order to reach the sufficient interpretation of discourse, one should identify speaker’s social action itself and by integrating that information into the comprehension of the propositional meaning. (3) participatory control is a sequentially defined structure in which more than two conversational participants take turns filling in a structural slot of speaker turns. The concept of conditionally relevant adjacency pairs (Have, 2007) may operate in such a way as to encourage the speaker to respond to the speech action initiated by the co-participant. Finally, (4) interactional appeal is concerned with the interactant’s feelings and attitudes toward the speaker. The aspect of the personal emotion refers to the speaker’s emotional attitude toward the content and toward

the partner (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1983).

In summary, by employing the framework of discourse modality, this study focuses on exploring non-referential meaning, i.e., emotionally expressive, personal and interpersonal, meanings of the focal item *kulaykaciko*. It maintains that although connectives *kulaykaciko* may occur where logical relations exist in terms of truth conditional semantics, their essential function is to express the speaker's personal voices as reflected in all aspect of communication including semantic and pragmatic as well as interpersonal aspects.

4. Data analysis

Table 2 summarizes the findings of this investigation, to be dealt with in detail in this paper. Mapped against the individual components of the framework of discourse modality (column 1) are listed the corresponding applications to *kulaykaciko* (column 2).

Table 2. *kulaykaciko* in the framework of discourse modality⁴⁾

Dimensions of discourse modality (Maynard 1993)	Application of <i>kulaykaciko</i> to the framework of discourse modality
1) Discourse Cohesion	Concept of Causality
2) Speech Action	Giving additional explanation
3) Participatory Control	Turn-initial / Turn final position
4) Interactional Appeal	Politeness (Mitigation of FTA)

In the following section, I will present findings from qualitative analysis of the data. A qualitative analysis will illuminate the pragmatic and interpersonal functions they have and what pragmatic meaning this connectives index.

4) This classification is based on a prior analysis of all of the *kulaykaciko*-utterances found in the data.

4.1. Discourse Cohesion of *kulaykaciko*: Concept of Causality

As mentioned earlier, the causal function of *kulaykaciko* has often been discussed in contrast with *kulayse*. Although the characterizations between *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko* be differ in emphasis placed on the other level of discourse modality, they share the fundamental view that both of them occur following a cause-expressing proposition and preceding a result-presenting proposition. Finding from previous studies that *kulaykaciko* as a logical connector representing the relation of “cause-and-result” is also confirmed in some occasions of the present data set. The following Extract 1 (*kulayse*) and Extract 2 (*kulaykaciko*) show the cases in point. In Extract 1, a talk show host and a guest, an actor K, talks about K’s and other actors’ roles in a drama.

Extract 1: leading role (from *seypakhwi*)

- 01 K: yimiswuk ssi-ka ku yiswunsin-ul ha-myense
 Lee Misuk VOC-TOP that ACC do while
 “Ms. Lee Misuk, when she was acting in Yiswunsin”
- 02 C: ney ney
 Yes yes
 “Yes, yes.”
- 03 K: ponin-i mayn chem-ey cwuinkong-in
 one’s own-TOP very first-at main character
- 04 cwul al-ko sepoy-lul pat-ass-tay-yo.
 know-CONN cast-ACC receive-PST-QT-POL
 “She thought that she is picked as a leading role at first.”
- 05 kuntey kulen yayki-ha-myense motun
 but that kind talk-do-while every
- 06 chwulyenca-ka ta cwuinkong-in cwul al-ass-tay-yo
 actor-TOP all main character think-PST-QT-POL

“But while we talked about it, we found that all the other actors thought the same way as Ms. Lee.”

- 07 Y: a sepyo-lul tuleka-myense
cast-ACC go in-while
“Ah, when they were picked up.”
- 08 K: ney. ta susulo sayngkakha-l ttay-nun
yes every self think-when-ATTR when-NOM
“Yes, everyone thinks oneself…….”
- 09 → Y: kulayse
therefore
“So, (that is why)
- 10 K: yey ((laughter))
yes
“Yes, ((laughter))”
- 11 Y: a tweykey hwarye, ta cwuyen-kup-tul-ieyyo.
very fancy every main character level PL-COP:POL
“The cast list of the drama is so good. Everyone deserves to be a lead actor”

From line 1 to 8 K tells a story how all the actors in that drama presumed themselves as a leading role by telling an anecdote about another actor Lee. In response to K’s utterance, the show host C summarizes K’s story and provide the reason for the drama’s all-star cast. In giving such a reason, C employed *kulayse* in line 9. The cause is stated in the previous utterance (lines 1-8) and the result follows after (line 11), the latter of which is initially marked by the conjunction *kulayse*. The reason of every actor’s misunderstanding is followed by the consequent result of such a good casting. Excerpt 1 demonstrates a clear case of *kulayse* indicating cause-result relationship.

Extract 2 below shows the ways in which *kulaykaciko* is used in the same context as *kulayse* discussed in Extract 1, i.e. marking cause-result

relationship. In this excerpt, an actress Y talks about her own experience mostly in narrative style. Throughout the extract, she describes how she dressed up like a daughter of a wealthy family.

Extract 2: a daughter of a wealthy family (from *achimmatang*)

- 01 Y: turama-lul ha-kwu yang son-ey
drama-ACC do-CONN both hand-at
- 02 icye katuk uysang-ul tul-kwu tto
DM same attire-ACC hold-CONN also
- 03 cey-ka os-ul ip-ess-ten yekhal-i
I:POL-TOP cloth-ACC wear-PST-RTS role-TOP
- 04 pwucas-cip ttal-i-ess-eyo.
rich house daughter-COP-PST-POL
“After I filmed, I had my hands full with my attire and my character in the drama was a daughter of wealthy family.”
- 05 → kulaykacikwu os-twu kuleh-key
KULAYKACIKO cloth also
- 06 cengkalha-key ip-kwu icye
like that-ADV neat-ADV wear-CONN DM
- 07 cip-ul ka-kwu itss-ess-nuntey
house-ACC go-CONN PROG-PST-but
“So, I dressed up elegantly and was on my way home.”

In Y’s story, her character in the drama as a daughter of wealthy family is described as a sufficient condition for being nicely dressed up. Note that she connects the part of utterances represents cause and the result by *kulaykaciko* (line 5). Just as the use of *kulayse* in Extract 1, the cause is stated in the previous utterance (lines 1-4) and the result follows after (lines 5-7), the latter of which is initially marked by the conjunction *kulaykaciko*.

What are the discourse contexts relevant for interpreting these two cases in Extract 1 and 2? If I express two utterances connected by *kulayse* and *kulaykaciko* as X and Y, there is a causal connection identifiable in propositions X and Y in this situation. Therefore, *kulaykaciko* in this case can be analyzed as a logical connector representing the relation of cause and result. This can be represented in the following Figure 1.

X	<i>kulaykaciko</i>	Y
CAUSE		RESULT

Figure 1. *kulaykaciko* as a logical connector.

4.2. Speech Action Declaration and Qualification of *kulaykaciko*: giving additional explanation explication

In the dimension of speech act in discourse modality (Maynard, 1993), the relationship between X and Y is different from what I characterized as cause and result in the section above. In this case, what follows *kulaykaciko* is not “result” corresponding to the “cause”. Instead, it functions as a bridge connecting preceding and the subsequent segments, which are separated by a big chunk of expanded turns between them, as illustrated in the following Extract 3 and Extract 4. In Extract 3, C, an actor, is telling an anecdote that he hit his counterpart actress too hard when he were filming.

Extract 3 “My hands are feet.” (from *seypakhwi*)

- 01 C: tola-po-nikka a nemwuto tangtangha-key
return-see-CONN very much commanding-ADV
- 02 wuttwuk se-iss-nuntey eyeki kasum po-nikka
towering stand-PROG-CIRCUM here chest see-CONN
- 03 peleh-key meng-i
dark blue-ADV bruise-TOP
“When I turned back towards her” “She was standing so com-

mandingly, but when
I looked at her chest, it was seriously bruised.”

- 04 Y: aikwu
“Awww...”
- 05 K: yenki yelceng-i taytanha-si-n-ke-ya.
acting passion-TOP great-HON-ATTR-thing-PLN
“She has so much passion in acting.”
- 06 C: kulay:: ce-ka son-i tto pal-i-lase
and I:HON-TOP hand-TOP also feet-TOP: because-CONN
“And.. My hands are big as much as feet.”
- 07 all: ((laughter))
- 08 Y: son-i pal-ilase
hand-TOP feet-TOP: because-CONN
“Because my hands are feet,”
- 09 C: ney. son-i pal.
yes hand-TOP feet
“Yes, hands are feet.”
- 10 Y: ney, cikum son-i koyngcanghi
yes now hand-TOP very
“Yes, your hands are very”
- 11 K: ce pota te khe-yo.
I:POL than more big-POL
“Your hands are bigger than those of mine.”
- 12 Y: sonkalak-uy kwulkki-ka e cincca.
finger-GEN thickness-TOP really
“Thickness of your finegers is really“
- 13 oymo-hako talu-se-yo. son-i.
appearance-CONN different-HON-POL hand-TOP
“Your hands are very different from your appearance.”

- 14 son-un kanghotong-i-eyo.
hand-ATTR Mr.Hodong Kang-COP-POL
“Your hands are Kang Hodong.”
- 15 → C: kulaykacko ike-lul wumkyecap-nuntey,
KULAYKACIKO this thing-ACC grab-CIRCUM
- 16 yeki-ka ta peleh-key meng-i tun ke-yeyyo.
here-TOP all dark blue-ADV bruise-TOP thing-POL
“So, I grabbed her collar and I saw her chest is bruised seriously.”
- 17 R: kucho, kucho.
right right
“Right, right.”

In the first part (lines 1-3), C provides a punch line of the story. Responding to K’s positive assessment about the story in line 5, C adds a comment about how badly he made the actress get a bruise by describing how his hand is big like feet (line 6). Starting from line 6, a side sequence regarding the size of hand continues until line 14. When the side sequence comes to close (line 14), C returns to the previous topic of the bruise and adds how he seized the actress. Note that this turn begins with the target item *kulaykaciko* in line 15. After producing *kulaykaciko* (line 15), C gives further information he wants to add.

In other words, the information provided by C following *kulaykaciko* in his turns provides supporting evidence to the previous point when such additional elaboration is felt necessary. In the situation depicted in Extract 3, the [X. *kulaykaciko* Y] relationship in the sense we identified in Segment 1 and 2 is not recognizable. What follows *kulaykaciko* is not, therefore, the “result” corresponding to the “cause”: rather it is a piece of information added to further substantiate the story that B has just provide in his affirmation. In this case, a relevant conversational move X is already made and that the speaker wishes to provide further information.

Extract 4 shows the same care of the use of *kulaykaciko* in more formal setting. This extract comes from a TV debate program *paykpwuntholon*. In this segment, discussants talk about bankruptcy of General Motors.

Extract 4: GM's crisis (from *paykwuntholon*)

- 01 S: kuleh-supnita. GM-to cikum mwunce-ka manhi
like that-DEF also now problem-TOP a lot
- 02 sengkye-kaciko cikum GM-to
happen-CONN now also
- 03 ton-ul pilli-ki elyep-supnita
money-ACC rent-NML difficult-DEF
“Yes. GM also has a lot of problems now. GM is also having a
hard time to get a loan.”
- 04 kulayse mikwuk cengpwu-ey ipaykosipek dalle-lul
so US government at 250 million dollar-ACC
- 05 pillye-dal-lako kuleh-key yocheng-ul
rent-request-QT like that-ADV request-ACC
- 06 hay-ss-supnita mwunce-ka GM-man
do-PST-DEF problem-TOP only
- 07 ani-ko talun hweysa-tul-to munce-ka
not-CONN different company-PL-also problem-TOP

manhi sayngky-ess-supnita.
a lot happen-PST-DEF
“So, they asked US government to lend them 250 million dollars.
But it is not just a problem for GM but also other companies
have a lot of problems.”
- 08 → kulaykaciko etten hweysa-nun hay-cwu-ko,
KULAYKACIKO some company-ATTR do-give-CONN
- 09 etten hweysa-nun an hay-cwu-nunya
some company-ATTR not do-give-Q
- 10 kukey cikum kun mwunce-ka tway-ss-supnita
that thing now big problem-TOP become-PST-DEF
“So, to lend loans or not is a big problem for the government
now.”

In the first part of the segment S, one of the discussants, explains the current circumstance of GM that the company is in crisis as they are having a difficulty in lending some money from banks and even from the government (lines 1-7). After presenting background information about the problem, S moves on to the larger issue. The beginning of this further complication begins with *kulaykaciko* in line 8. When *kulaykaciko* is used, we can witness again that a relevant conversational move X is already made and that the speaker wishes to provide further information. To sum up, *kulaykaciko* serves as a bridge connecting the claim and further explication as shown in the following Figure 2.

X	<i>kulaykaciko</i>	Y
Main story		Further explication

Figure 2. *kulaykaciko* prior to further explication.

As the diagram illustrates, the utterance in segment X is further supported by segment Y, which serves as background information to the segment.

4.3. Participatory Control of *kulaykaciko*

In the discussion on discourse modality, Maynard (1993) proposes the dimension of participatory control in analyzing linguistic resources. As a specific method for analyzing participatory control, Maynard adopts the notion of turn-taking from conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974). The research of turn-taking in prerequisite and fundamental in the study of talk-in-interaction in the sense that turn-taking can clarify the principles that govern the sequential organization of conversation as a type of situated social action. Furthermore, it can reveal many grammatical aspect of discourse (Schegloff, 2007). *kulaykaciko* also can bracket different level of discourse organization in terms of participatory control.

The following Extract 5 shows how participatory control is managed by the use of *kulaykaciko*. This segment is from TV “info-tainment” program *achimatang*. Participants’ conversation in this segment is also devel-

oped in a narrative style. The main speaker H tells an anecdote about his first attempt to make a cup of drip coffee.

Extract 5: drip coffee (from *achimatang*)

- 01 H: khepi-yo. ilay-ss-teni ccom ittaka
 coffee-POL like this-PST-RETRO-as a little afterward
- 02 alkhol laympu kathun ke-lang,
 alcohol lamp like thing-and: CONN
- 03 ippun pyeng-ul hana kacta cwu-te-lako.
 pretty bottle-ACC one and: CONN give-RETRO-QT
- 04 ttukewun mwul-hako kuleteni ttak ike-l
 hot water-and: CONN then DM this-ACC
- 05 kac-ko o-nun ke-yeyyo.
 have:and come-ATTR thing-POL
 “I said ‘a cup of coffee please’ then the server brought something like an alcohol lamp and a pretty bottle of hot water. Then the server brought these.”
- 06 S: e, cikcep naylye mek-na?
 directly down eat-Q
 “Oh, Should you make coffee by yourself?”
- 07 → H: e. kulaykacko wuli chinkwu-tul-i
 KULAYKACIKO we friend-PL-TOP
 “Yes. So my friends…….”
- 08 all: ((laughter))
- 09 H: kuntey alkhol laympu-lul pul-ul
 but alcohol lamp-ACC fire-ACC
- 10 cipyeh-noh-ko ka-ss-killay alkhol laympu-ey
 burn-left-CONN go-PST-as alcohol lamp-at

- 11 mwul-i iss-nuntey ku-ke-l mak
 water-TOP exist-CIRCUM that thing-ACC DM
- 12 kkulh-i-te-lako.
 end-COP-RETRO-QT
 “By the way, the server made fire on the lamp and my friends
 boiled water in the lamp.”

When H finish to provide background of the story in line 5, S breaks in and projects a question in line 6. In response to it, H answers S’s question by taking a turn with *kulaykaciko*. In this case, there is no interactional environment where H’s *e* in line 7 is interpreted as an exclusive answer to a question. This *e* is a filler which signals that H is ready to take a speaking turn. Instead, *kulaykaciko* in the same line (7) along with *e* marks the speaker’s claim of turn as an initial point of a unit of discourse. This utterance with *kulaykaciko* also constitutes the second pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair (Schegloff, 2007).

The following Extract 6 is another example which shows multiple discourse functions of *kulaykaciko*. Here, C, a Korean actor talks about Hollywood actor Kirk Douglas as his “wannabe”.

Extract 6: folded forehead (from *seypakhwi*)

- 01 C: ce-to pisushan kyengwu-ka iss-ess-eyo.
 I:HON-also similar case-TOP exist-PST-POL
 “A similar situations also happened to me.”
- 02 ney. yeki pain paywu-ka iss-ess-eyo.
 yes here furrowed actor-TOP exist-PST-POL
 “Yes, there was an actor who has wrinkles here.”
- 03 Y: keku tekullasu?
 “Kirk Douglas?”
- 04 → ney, kulaykacko kyeysok cwunghakkyo-ttay
 yes KULAYKACIKO always middle school-when

05 ileh-key cep-ko tanye-ss-eyo.
 like that-ADV fold-CONN attend-PST-POL
 “Yes, so I always folded my forehead like this when I was in
 middle school.”

In the beginning of the segment, C depicts the appearance of his “wannabe” actor as a background information (lines 1-2). The talk show host Y recognizes the actor C described and provides a candidate name of the actor in rising intonation in line 3. In response to Y’s understanding check, C provides confirmation in line 5 by saying *ney*. Notice that *ney* given by C provides evidence that his utterance provides a unified block of information.

(line 4). Right after this confirmation, C continues his utterance by projecting *kulaykaciko* in line 5. This turn using *kulaykaciko* provides supplementary explanatory information that he used to fold his jar to make him look like Kirk Douglas. In terms of discourse organization, *kulaykaciko* is used to mark the initial point of a unit of discourse which constitutes the second pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair.

From the data analysis above, *kulaykaciko* is best understood to have multiple functions simultaneously. *kulaykaciko* here marks not only the speaker’s claim of turn, but also constitutes the second pair part of a question-answer adjacency pair: it functions to provide explanation in response to the partner’s move. This use of *kulaykaciko* can be illustrated as the following Figure 3.

[Turn 1] Speaker 1:	Story telling	Original sequence
[Turn 2] Speaker 2:	Question	Side sequence
[Turn 3] Speaker 1:	Minimal response + <i>kulaykaciko</i>	Original sequence

Figure 3. *kulaykaciko* in turn-initial position.

Kulaykaciko is also used at the end of the turn to signal that the speaker is willing to yield the turn to another participant. The following Extract 7 demonstrates *kulaykaciko*’s use for signaling possible completion points.

In this example, a comedian T tells a story about what motivates him to make a guest appearance in an entertainment show.

Extract 7: 1,500,000won (from *seypakhwi*)

- 01 T: ney, ha-cay-yo. awu na-n ha-ki silhta.
yes do-SUGG-POL I-TOP do-NML hate:PLN
- 02 ike ha-l kyelul-i anita cikum
this thing do-ATTR time-TOP not:PLN now
“Yes, he told me to do it together. Aww, I said “I don’t want to do. I don’t have time to do this.”
- 03 katu kaps ttaymey ike cikum ilhay-se
card bill because this thing now work-by
- 04 nayya toyki ttaymwun-ey na eyensup-hako
pay should because-at I practice-and: CONN
- 05 ile-l sikan-to eps-kwu, na cikum mwe::
this-ATTR time-also not exist-CONN I now DM
- 06 kulenikka sincenghwan-ssi-ka na-hantey;;
so Mr. Shin-VOC-TOP I-at
“Because I have to pay my card debt. I don’t have time to practice either. I am, I mean Mr. Shin told me that…….”
- 07 (3.0)
- 08 T: ((laughter)) paykosipman-won
1,500,000 won
- 09 te cwu-keyss-ta-lako
more give-will-PLN-QT
- 10 → kule-tela-kwu-yo. kulaykaciko:: ↓
like that-RETRO-CONN-POL KULAYKACIKO
“He will give me 1,500,000won more. He told me that…….”

- 11 (.3)
- 12 M: ahahahahaha: cincca-yo?
 really-POL
 “Really?”

From line 1 to 6, T describes how he refused his co-worker, Mr. Shin’s proposal at the first place. After a long pause of three seconds in line 7, the story reach the punch line that he finally accepted to make an appearance as Mr. Shin offered a big amount of money (line 8-10). Note that *kulaykaciko* o is employed at the end of T’s turn (line 10). *Kulaykaciko* may be interpreted as “that’s why” in this position, giving conclusive tone to the turn. *Kulaykaciko* here uttered with falling one implying the end of the turn. Here, the recognition of utterance-final elements in turn-final positions results in an exquisite ‘chaining’ of consecutive turns. (line 12)

kulaykaciko in this case, therefore, represent one out of several types of grammatical resources which can potentially be enlisted toward localizing turn-endings. Moreover, since *kulaykaciko* often occur as the last of a string of utterance-final elements and sometimes as the sole utterance-final element in a turn, they have particular salience in marking the end of a turn.

4.4. Interactional Appeal of *kulaykaciko*: Politeness

Kulaykaciko also signals speaker’s subjective attitude in the discourse. In the dimension of interactional appeal (Maynard, 1993), I recognize the aspects of politeness from the use of *kulaykaciko*. Politeness, according to the essential principles of the theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1987), is implied in a universal psychosocial concept of “face.” On the basis of Brown and Levinson’s model, certain acts are inherently face-threatening to the speaker’s or addressee’s face. According to this model, speakers and hearers in interactional contexts select from a number of strategies which could affect the production of such a face-threatening act (hereafter FTA) Face-threatening acts could range from simply direct proceeding, intensifying the severity of the FTA, mitigating the force of

F^TA, or choosing not to produce it at all. The following Extract 8 (reproduced from Extract 5) shows a case in point. This example can be re-analyzed in the perspective of speaker's subjective attitude projecting politeness.

Extract 8 (reproduced from Extract 5)

- 01 H: khepi-yo. ilay-ss-teni ccom ittaka
 coffee-POL like this-PST-RETRO-as a little afterward
- 02 alkhoh laympu kathun ke-lang,
 alcohol lamp like thing-and: CONN
- 03 ippun pyeng-ul hana kacta cwu-te-lako.
 pretty bottle-ACC one and: CONN give-RETRO-QT
- 04 ttukewun mwul-hako kuleteni ttak ike-l
 hot water-and: CONN then DM this-ACC
- 05 kac-ko o-nun ke-yeyyo.
 have:and come-ATTR thing-POL
 "I said 'a cup of coffee please' then the server brought something
 like an alcohol lamp and a pretty bottle of hot water. Then the
 server brought these."
- 06 S: e, cikcep naylye mek-na?
 directly down eat-Q
 "Oh, Should you make coffee by yourself?"
- 07 → H: e. kulaykacko wuli chinkwu-tul-i
 KULAYKACIKO we friend-PL-TOP
 "Yes. So my friends……."
- 08 all: ((laughter))
- 09 H: kuntey alkhoh laympu-lul pul-ul
 but alcohol lamp-ACC fire-ACC

- 10 cipye-noh-ko ka-ss-killay alkhol laympu-ey
burn-left-CONN go-PST-as alcohol lamp-at
- 11 mwul-i iss-nuntey ku-ke-l mak
water-TOP exist-CIRCUM that thing-ACC DM
- 12 kkuh-i-te-lako.
end-COP-RETRO-QT
“By the way, the server made fire on the lamp and my friends
boiled water in the lamp.”

As I mentioned in the analysis of Extract 5, in H’s answer *e* in line 7 is considered as filler or back channeling and cannot be regarded as a genuine “answer” to the S’s question in line 6. Specifically speaking, H’s utterance is interrupted by S’s question. In response to this interruption, H is successfully returns to on-going topic without threatening S’s positive face⁵⁾ (Brown and Levinson, 1987) by taking a subsequent turn which starts with filler *e* and connective *kulaykaciko*. This segment clearly shows that using *kulaykaciko* indexes politeness. Also, it demonstrates the ways in which participants negotiate interactions within the conversational encounter itself (van Dijk, 1977). By using *kulaykaciko*, an utterance essential devoid of face-threatening potential in its own right.

5. Conclusion

I have shown that a single linguistic sign, a Korean connective *kulaykaciko* has multiple functions in discourse. One function is primarily semantic in that *kulaykaciko* expresses the shared assumption that X is a sufficient cause / explanation for a possible result / consequence Y. *kulaykaciko*’s other functions contribute to several aspects of discourse modality (Maynard, 1993). The explanatory *kulaykaciko* signals a point in discourse where relevant explanation will begin. It signals that [X is already men-

5) Positive Face refers to one’s self-esteem, while negative face refers to one’s freedom to act (Foley, 1997).

tioned in discourse so I will now add an explanatory statement Y which is relevant to X]. This interpretation of *kulaykaciko* contributes to speech action declaration and qualification. *Kulaykaciko* signals the speaker's intention that the segment to follow will provide an explanation related to X. Using *kulaykaciko* can signal the personal emotion aspect of discourse modality. *Kulaykaciko* may be further used as a signal to claim a speaking turns especially when the speaker expresses the intention of providing information as relevant to the prior discourse. *Kulaykaciko* appearing at the end of the turn signals the end of the current turn, the speaker's wish to yield the turn. Finally, *kulaykaciko* indexes politeness.

In conversational discourse *kulaykaciko* has significant functions to bracket units of discourse not only on the textual semantic level but also on the level of interactional move, while coordinating textual meanings and interactional moves. Characteristics of *kulaykaciko* as observed here are perhaps best understood when we view language as a device for realizing the speaker's interactional concern at the particular juncture in the talk.

References

- 강소영. (2005). “구어 담화에서의 ‘그래 가지고’의 의미”, 『한국어어미학』, 16, 1-21.
- 백봉자. (2006). 『외국어로서의 한국어 문법사전』. 도서출판하우.
- 범금희. (2002). “{어 가지고}와 관련된 문법화 현상에 대하여 : {어 가지고}와 {어서}를 중심으로”, 『배달말』, 30, 23-40.
- 손혜옥. (2012). “‘가지다’ 구성의 문법화에 대한 공시적 분석”, 『한국어학』, 55, 207-238.
- 신현숙. (1989). “담화대용표지의 의미 연구 - {그래서/그러니까/그러나/그렇지만}을 대상으로”, 『국어학』, 19, 427-451.
- 이수련. (2004). “‘가지다’의 문법화 양상 연구”, 『새얼 어문논집』, 16, 239-263.
- 이희정. (2003). “한국어의 [그러]형 담화표지 기능 연구”. 석사학위논문, 연세대학교, 서울.
- 임규홍. (1994). “-어 가지고’에 대하여”, 『배달말』, 19, 49-80.
- 하영우, 신지영. (2014). “자유 발화 자료에 나타난 {그래가지고}의 접속 부사화”, 『한국어학』, 64, 195-223.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Choi, Boyun J. (2007). *A corpus-based discourse analysis of Korean discourse markers: An analysis of spoken and written use*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Foley, W. (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: An introduction*. Blackwell.
- Have, P. T. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Hopper, Paul J. (1991) On some principles of grammaticalization. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Bernd Heine (eds.). *Approaches to grammaticalization, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lakoff, Robin. (1972). The pragmatics of modality. *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 229-246.
- Lyons, John. (1981). *Language, meaning and context*. Suffolk: Fontana.
- Martin, Samuel. (1993). *A Reference Grammar of Korean: A Complete Guide to the Grammar and History of the Korean Language*. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Maynard, Senko. (1993) *Discourse Modality*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Ochs, Elinor and Bambi Schieffelin. (1983). *Acquisition of conversational competence*. London: Routledge, Kegan, & Paul.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel, A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson. (1996). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel, A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. (1974). A simplest sys-

- tematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, Ho-min. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London and New York: Longman.

[사전]

『외국인을 위한 한국어 문법』 (2005). 국립국어원: 커뮤니케이션북스.

Eunho Kim
The Research Institute of Language and Information
Korea University
145, Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 136-701, Korea
E-mail: kimeunho07@gmail.com

Received: February 26, 2015
Revised version received: April 16, 2015
Accepted: April 20, 2015

Appendix

Transcription conventions

(.5)	time pause
(.)	untimed micropause
:	prolongation of the immediately prior sound
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
?	rising intonation
↑	shift into higher pitch
↓	shift into lower pitch
(())	transcriber's additional explanations or descriptions

Morpheme-by-morpheme glosses

ACC:	Accusative	NML:	Nominalizer
ATTR:	Attributive	PL:	Plural suffix
CIRCUM:	Circumstantial	PNL:	Plain speech level
CONN:	Connective	POL:	Polite speech level
COP:	Copular	PST:	Past tense
DM:	Discourse marker	Q:	Question particle
HON:	Honorific	QT:	Quoatative particle
IE:	Informal ending	TOP:	Topic marker

