

Overt Subjects Signaling Floor Shifts in Korean Discourse

Narah Lee[†]

University of Queensland

ABSTRACT

Despite ample literature on the frequent occurrence of subject omission in Korean, the discussion of subjects that are not omitted in utterances has not been fully developed. While some researchers have focused on emphasis and contrast as the main reasons for a subject not to be omitted, the current study addresses floor-shifting in spoken discourse as a primary motivation for a subject to be overt. With respect to shifts of the floor in discourse, I analyze occurrences of overt subjects in spoken Korean corpora and clarify the discursive roles of first- and second-person subjects that are overtly expressed. The analysis shows that overt subjects referring to the interlocutors of discourse function as an explicit sign of the intention to take or give the floor. The findings of this study extend our understanding of overt subjects in Korean by expanding our focus from subject omission in sentences by relating it to the speaker's stance toward the floor of discourse.

Keywords: floor shift, discourse organization, overt subject, first-person, second-person, spoken Korean

1. Introduction

While subject omission in Korean has been a popular topic in linguistics, especially in formal syntactic research, only a few studies have recognized the pragmatic implications of subject expression. Where an unexpressed subject is more frequently and commonly observed than an overtly expressed one, the overt subject can be considered more marked both in the form and in the meaning. Common accounts in the studies that examine the meaning of overt subjects include emphasis, contrast, and turn shifts (e.g. Jung, 2007; Kim, H., 1999; Kim, T., 2008; Kim, W., 1996; Lee, P., 1987; Lee, W., 1999; Oh, 2007). In particular, discussion about overt subjects related to turn and/or floor identification is relatively scarce, but when developed, there is much to be found intriguing in the pragmatic and

[†] Corresponding author: narah.lee@uq.edu.au



metapragmatic role of subject expression in connection with discourse organization.

The current study aims to shed more light on the understanding of overt subjects in Korean discourse by identifying them as a floor-shift marker beyond a grammatical element of a sentence. Unlike the majority of the literature that placed subject omission in the spotlight while discussing its syntactic algorithm, I focus on the pragmatic and discursive meaning of the subjects remaining un-omitted in the pro-drop language. In particular, while reviewing previous discussions on overt subjects in Korean discourse, I argue that an overt subject plays a significant role in signaling speaker's intention to take or hand over the floor in discourse.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses previous studies on subject expression in Korean, in comparison to the pragmatic research and discourse analysis of subject expression in other pro-drop languages. Section 3 introduces the data used for the current research, and the results dividing first-person subject as a floor-taking indicator and second-person subject as a floor-giving indicator are presented in Section 4 and Section 5, respectively. Section 6 summarizes the findings with a concluding remark.

2. From an Omitted Subject to a Floor-Shift Indicator

The fundamental premise shared by the previous studies on subject omission in Korean is that a subject is omitted when identifiable and recoverable from the context since it is 'given' information (e.g. Chang, 1996; Clancy, 1996; Kim, 1989; Kwon, 2012; Lee, 1989). According to the rationale of the recoverability or identifiability, then, a subject is overt because we would not be able to identify and recover what it would have been if omitted. However, as we will see in the examples in this paper, subjects are overt in many cases even when they could have been easily inferred what to be even if they were not overt. This means that a subject may be overt because of other reasons than being unidentifiable or irrecoverable.

Beyond the concepts of identifiability and recoverability, emphasis and contrast have been the key grounds where overt subjects are interpreted to have pragmatic reasons to appear 'redundantly' in maintaining the semantic meaning. For example, Kim (1996) argued that a subject needs to be overt to show its contrastive status to other referents in the context or to emphasize that the subject, not any other, is being the focus of the discourse. Jung (2007) also noted that a subject cannot

be omitted in Korean when being contrasted, expressing involvement of the subject in the discourse or showing the speaker's surprise. Similarly, Oh (2007) pointed out that Korean speakers use an overt subject in contrasting the speakers, as first-person subject, or the recipient, as second-person subject, or resolving ambiguity by overtly expressing the subject with presenting their conduct. As such, research on the pragmatic appreciation of overt subjects in Korean has developed into recognizing more diverse pragmatic factors surrounding the subject in the discourse.

What has further supplemented the literature is to lay the topic of overt subject in interaction and discourse organization.¹⁾ In specific, Oh (2007) analyzed that overt first- and second-person subjects appear to play a distinct role in exchanging turns and holding the floor in spoken Korean discourse. It is in fact not difficult to observe the 1sg pronoun *na* affixed with the topic marker *-nun*, i.e. *na-nun*, appearing in turn transitions where the speaker indicates the beginning of “a multiple-unit turn”, talking about him/herself and projecting to “effectively hold the floor” (Oh, 2007: 474). While Oh (2007) provides a crucial ground in extending the discussion of overt subject in Korean to a discourse level from a sentence by relating it to the exchanges of turns and the floor, it can be still stretched with a broader inclusion of overt subject as only the cases of overt subject appeared with *-nun* were analyzed as a turn/floor transition indicator in Oh (2007). As will be shown in the present analysis, I discover overt subjects affixed with various particles as well as no particle in turn/floor shifts.

Arguments correlating the occurrence of overt subjects with turn/floor shifts are put forward with respect to other pro-drop languages such as Japanese (e.g. Lee & Yonezawa, 2008), Spanish (e.g. Davidson, 1996; Travis & Cacoullos, 2012), and Javanese (e.g. Ewing, 2014). For example, Lee and Yonezawa (2008) identified examples in their Japanese corpus in which a speaker uses an overt first-person subject to communicate her commitment to taking the floor and an overt second-person subject to display her intention to hand over the floor. Davidson (1996: 561) analyzed that an overt first- or second-person subject in Spanish is “to signal a speaker's intention to take the floor for a full conversational turn”. Travis and Cacoullos (2012) also confirmed that the 1sg pronoun *yo* in Spanish, combined with cognitive verbs, appears more frequently in turn shifts than within a speaker turn.

1) As Oh (2007) acknowledged, there is no single account that can exhaustively explain what an overt subject does in Korean. Thus, consolidating more factors that may trigger a subject to be overt by extending the background of the discussion will help us understand the phenomenon better. Further, I argue that differently categorized pragmatic effects can simultaneously function as the reason a subject is overt than omitted, e.g. a contrastive overt subject used in turn-shift.

The discussion around overt subjects without clear distinction between a turn and the floor, i.e. denoting them collectively or interchangeably, or with a focus only on turn-taking may have provided more inspirations to look at the phenomenon of subject expression differently from earlier studies. Yet, an analysis pinpointing the floor shift as an important context of expressing a subject will enable us to discern the characteristics of overt subjects in the discourse even further due to the distinctive qualities of a turn and the floor. As one of the most fundamental rules in conversation analysis, the rule of ‘one party at a time’ defines a turn (Schegloff, 1968: 1076), and as the mechanism of a conversation, ‘turn-taking’ explains how speakers avoid bumping into each other and successfully continue a conversation (Duncan, 1972; Goffman, 1955; Sacks et al., 1974; Yngve, 1970). Meanwhile, floor is more about topic of conversation and is similar to ‘discourse unit’ (Houtkoop & Mazeland, 1985) as Hayashi (1991) points out. Namely, floor refers to the orientation of a shared psychological awareness of what is being communicated. Since floor is identified as control over a conversation (Edelsky, 1981; Erickson, 1982; Goffman, 1976, 1981; Hayashi, 1987, 1991), a speaker can take a turn without holding the floor (Edelsky, 1981). In other words, while a turn is given to the second speaker, the cognitive attention can be still oriented towards the first speaker, who holds the floor. For example, an excerpt from our corpora shows the evident difference between turn-shifting and floor-shifting:

(1) [CallFriend 2: between two male friends with age difference]

- 1 Y: *kuntey ttan tey kamyen kukesto*
 but other place go.if that.also
- 2 *han sam sanyen isseya tway-yo.*
 about three three.year be should-HON
 ‘How (it) is going to be now. But, if (I) move to another place,
 it should take three or four years.’
- 3 O: *a, kulay?*
 ah so
 ‘Ah, is (that) so?’
- 4 Y: *yey, kulayse, (overlap)*
 yes so
 ‘Yes, so,’
- 5 O: (overlap) *palo mos kamun keya?*
 immediately cannot go that
 ‘Can (you) not move immediately?’

6 Y: *palo* *kal swu issnuntey*
 immediately go way be.but
 ‘(I) may go immediately, but’

Discussing moving to a new place for their work, the younger speaker (Y) and the older speaker (O) naturally exchange turns. While O takes turns in lines 3 and 5, it is hardly that he holds the floor where Y is leading and controlling the conversation with the topic he knows well. O’s two turns perform as support of Y’s utterances by confirming what is being said. Namely, O takes a turn without holding the floor.

I highlight the relevance of concentrating on the floor in how speakers keep or change the flow of the discourse in relation to the quality of the subject. As noted above, the floor is based on the speakers’ cognitive awareness of the discourse content and orientation. What is being said and where the conversation is going are led by the subject in each utterance, and by nature, the subject is what the utterance is about. In particular, the referential forms used as the subject referring to the speaker, personal pronouns in most cases unless omitted, designate the speaker in the instance of discourse and emphasize the subjectivity in language (Benveniste, 1971). As defined in Benveniste (1971: 224), subjectivity is the “capacity of the speaker to posit himself as “subject” and is determined by the linguistic status of “person””. When a first-person subject initiates an utterance, the utterance represents the speaker’s stance, and “the production of the utterance thus crucially involves subjectivity” (Ono & Thompson, 2003: 339).

While the subjectivity may differently apply to persons, especially depending on the verb of the utterance (Benveniste, 1971),²⁾ we will extend it to the second-person subject in our analysis where the cases are in the interrogative mood. In a question with a second-person subject, in which the interlocutor’s stance is asked, the speaker assigns the interlocutor as ‘subject’ and hands over the subjectivity of the utterance to them where they will answer to the questions with a first-person subject. Accordingly, the floor of the discourse, i.e. the speakers’ cognitive attention, in which subjectivity is presented in the form of the subject needs to be spotlighted in the survey of the pragmatic meaning of overt subjects. The current

2) Benveniste (1971: 228) illustrates that verbs of dispositions or mental operations, such as ‘feel’ or ‘believe’, change a proposition to a subjective utterance. For instance, sentences like ‘The weather is going to change’ is a true proposition whereas ‘I believe the weather is going to change’ is subjective. Also, ‘You suppose X’ is a way of repeating what ‘you’ had just said, i.e. ‘I suppose X’, so in this case, the subjectivity of the first-person is only reflected in the first-person.

study particularly argues that speakers tend to underline the subjectivity of their utterance by using an overt subject, and the overt subject plays a significant role to indicate the speaker's control over the floor of the discourse.

3. Data

Sejong Spoken Corpus, CallFriend Corpus, and some TV drama scripts were used as data sources to examine how speakers use first-person subjects (1stSBJ hereafter) and second-person subjects (2ndSBJ hereafter) in floor exchanges. 22 conversations from Sejong Spoken Corpus, six phone conversations from CallFriend Corpus and ten episodes of five TV dramas were taken for analysis. I focused only on the overt 1stSBJs and 2ndSBJs that appeared in complete utterances with a predicate, e.g. an incomplete sentence that began with a subject but did not finish with a predicate was excluded, to ensure consistency in categorizing an overt subject separately from an expression that refers to the speakers, such as the vocative case, and to confirm that the overt subject is used in floor shifts by observing the entire utterance including the predicate.

I analyzed conversations not only from the corpora recorded and transcribed of naturally occurring conversations and distributed by the Korean Government, i.e. Sejong Spoken Corpus and CallFriend Corpus, but also from TV drama scripts. Although both Sejong Spoken Corpus and CallFriend Corpus provide reliable and useful discourse data, they consist of conversations mainly among family members or friends, which is extended to much more diverse relationships and settings in TV drama scripts. In the extended diversity of discourse context, it was possible to discover more examples of overt subjects in floor-shifting. TV drama scripts are also recognised to have similar grammatical and stylistic appearances of utterances to naturally occurring conversations (Hong, 2014; Nariyama, 2004), and they become highly valuable resources of legitimate and plausible linguistic behaviors in discourse yet hard to be recorded and transcribed if in everyday conversations due to practical and legal limitations.

The excerpts are marked with their corpora from which they are taken, e.g. Sejong Spoken Corpus as 'Sejong #', CallFriend Corpus as 'CallFriend #' and ten TV drama episodes as 'Drama #'. The relationships between the interlocutors in each excerpt, such as family members, school/university friends, colleagues from work, are also marked as part of the discourse information. While a great number

of conversations were analyzed in the corpora, only a few most indicative examples of overt subjects in floor shifts that could represent many others in different types of discursive contexts are introduced here.

4. Taking the Floor, Signaled by An Overt First-Person Subject

In this section, we analyze overt 1stSBJs that appear in floor shifting where the speaker tries to change the topic or direction of the conversation toward themselves. Along with the use of overt 1stSBJ in floor-taking, particles affixed to the subject, verbs and speech acts are also taken into account as they contribute to expressing the speaker's intention in floor-taking although the analysis is limited. The intention of floor-taking is shown either when another speaker in the conversation is holding the floor or when the speaker wants to keep the floor while he/she is already the floor-holder.

In the following excerpt, the same conversation as (1) seen in Section 2, a speaker takes the floor from his collocutor in the context of two friends talking on the phone:

(2) [CallFriend 2: between two male friends with age difference]

- 1 O: *tekseng yeca tayhak-ey.*
 Tekseng women university-LOC
- 2 *e, kyoyang kwacengpwu-ey*
 um arts school-LOC
 'Tekseng Women's University. Yeah, at the School of Liberal Arts.'
- 3 Y: *yey.*
 yes.
 'Yes.'
- 4 O: *ku kyoyang kwacengpwu-ey*
 that arts school-LOC
- 5 *kulay sayngmwulhak kulay nwasse.*
 so biology so said
 'At the School of Liberal Arts, (they) said biology.'

- 6 Y: *a, kulemyenun mwe (pause) molukeysse-yo.*
 ah so.if what not.know-HON
 ‘Ah, if so, (I) don’t know.’
- 7 O: *tekseng ye, yetay kathumyen,*
 Tekseng wom women.university like.if
- 8 *sewul kathumyen kwaynchanhci siphuntay.*
 Seoul like.if okay.whether assume
 ‘If (it) is Tekseng Women’s University, if (it) is Seoul, (I)
 assume all right.’
- 9 Y: *yey.*
 yes
 ‘Yes.’
- 10 O: *ku, (overlap)*
 that
 ‘That,’
- 11 Y: (overlap) *na-nun, mwe, na-nun (pause)*
 1sg-TOP what 1sg-TOP
 12 *molukeysse-yo.*
 not.know-HON
 ‘I, well, I don’t know.
- 13 *cikum mwe ettehkey toyl ci. (cough)*
 now what how become whether
- 14 *kuntay ttan tey kamyen kukesto*
 but other place go.if that.also
- 15 *han sam sanyen isseya tway-yo.*
 about three three.year be should-HON
 How (it) is going to be now. But, if (I) move to another place,
 it should take three or four years.’
- 16 O: *a, kulay?*
 ah so
 ‘Ah, is (that) so?’
- 17 Y: *yey, kulayse, (overlap)*
 yes so
 ‘Yes, so,’
- 18 O: (overlap) *palo mos kamun keya?*
 immediately cannot go that
 ‘Can (you) not move immediately?’

- 19 Y: *palo kal swu issnuntay*
immediately go way be.but
- 20 *pheyiphe epsnuntay nwukao-lako kule-keysse-yo,*
paper not.have.but who come-QT so-MDL-HON
- 21 *ttan tey ka-ya, pheyiphe epsnuntay.*
other place go-CONN paper not.have.but
'(I) may go immediately, but who would have (me) if (I) don't
have papers.'

After coming across a newspaper advertisement for a lecturer position at a university, O, the older speaker, describes the position to Y, the younger speaker, who recently finished his PhD. Until line 8, O holds the floor, providing Y with information about the job opportunity, and Y backchannels with *yey* 'yes' (line 3) and *molukeysseyo* '(I) don't know' (line 6). When O tries to continue speaking with *ku* 'that' (line 10), Y interrupts overlapping with the overt 1stSBJ *na* 'I' (line 11), indicating his intention to take the floor. Y here repeats what was said earlier in line 6, 'I don't know', without delivering any new information; instead, by adding and repeating the 1sg pronoun *na* as the 1stSBJ in the utterance, he makes it clear that he wants to say something. He then adds his concerns that the process of employment will take time, even if he goes to another university (lines 14 and 15). While O takes two turns to confirm Y's statement (lines 16 and 18), Y remains the floor-holder and continues to talk about his current status (lines 19 to 21).

It is noticeable that the repetitive use of the 1stSBJ *na* for 'I don't know' in Y's utterance (line 11) strongly supports the speaker in taking the floor. When Y first says *molukeysseyo* '(I) don't know' in line 6, it expresses the speaker's hesitation or uncertainty in what he wants to say, which is also displayed by the use of discourse markers like *a* 'ah' or *mwe* 'well' as well as a pause in line 6. Thus, he lets O speak (lines 7 and 8) and simply backchannels with *yey* 'yes' in line 9. Conversely, when he says *nanun molukeysseyo* 'I don't know' with the overt 1stSBJ in line 11, he interrupts O who was beginning a sentence (line 10)³⁾ and explains why O's

3) The term 'interruption' is not intended to be distinguished from 'overlap', which is distinct in Sacks et al. (1974). The authors claim that 'overlap' occurs when speakers simultaneously speak by accident, whereas 'interruption' is done on purpose when the second speaker begins her turn during the first speaker's turn. However, as discussed in some studies (e.g. Bennett, 1981; Kang, 2017; Lee, 1999; Lim, 2001), it is sometimes unclear whether the first utterance is interrupted by the second or the first utterance just discontinues when the second begins. In the current analysis, I use 'interruption' to emphasize the speaker's intention to interrupt and 'overlap' to describe the simple co-occurrence of two different speakers' utterances.

suggestion may not be suitable for him. The use of *na* 'I' in line 11 explicitly shows the speaker's intention to change the flow of the discourse where his collocutor has been holding the floor as well as manifesting the subjectivity of his utterance that is about his thoughts on the matter discussed. The same utterance without an overt 1stSBJ, nor the contrast marker *-n*, in line 6 was rather weak in terms of expressing the speaker's initiative to lead the discourse, and it did not change the floor-holder as the other speaker continued what he was saying.

A similar pattern of an overt 1stSBJ used in floor-taking is found in Excerpt (3) below. The conversation involves four friends, among whom there are age differences. While discussing university culture, each speaker tries to take the floor by talking about their own experience and opinion about the topic. The occurrences of floor-taking with an overt 1stSBJ and overlaps are notably frequent, presumably for several reasons:

(3) [Sejong 9: between four male friends including seniors and juniors]

- 1 S1: *ceytayha-ko* *nanikka*,
 discharged-CONN afterward
 'After being discharged from the military service,'
- 2 S2: (unclear) *kwunki-ka* *ppacy-esse*, (unclear)
 discipline-SUB lost-CONN
 'Lost the military discipline,'
- 3 S1: *ceytay*, *ceytayhaki*,
 discharge discharge
- 4 *kwuntay* *tulekal* *ttay-nun*, *ung*, (overlap)
 army go.in time-TOP yes
 'Discharged, discharged, when beginning the military service,'
- 5 J1: (overlap) *na.twu* *tayhakmwunhwa* (overlap)
 1sg.also university.culture
 'I also (think) the university culture'
- 6 S1: (overlap)(unclear) *haykin* *haysscimanun*,
 do did.but
- 7 *ceytayhako* *nase*,
 discharged after
 'Although did so, after being discharged,'
- 8 J1: *kulay* *kackwu*, *ce-nun* *solcikhi* *wa* *kackwu*,
 so did.so 1sg-TOP frankly come did.so

- 9 *uytocekulwu kyey sok phissipang-ul*
intentionally constantly PC.room-OBJ
- 10 *an kassess-eyo.* (pause)
not went-HON
'So, frankly, I came out and intentionally kept not going to the internet cafe.'
- 11 *kunyang camkkan ka-to,*
just shortly go-CONN
- 12 *kkeyim an hako, amwuthun.*
'Even if just stopped by, no games, anyway.'
- 13 J2: *kuntey, ci, kuntey* (laugh)
but but
- 14 *solcikhi malha-yse,*
frankly speak-CONN
- 15 (laugh) *ku ttay yecaay-tul-ul cwuchwukulo,*
that time girl-PL-OBJ centering
- 16 *ne-ka kulayss-canha,* (laugh)
2sg-SUB said-CFM
- 17 *cinhuy-ka* (unclear) *ay-tul-i* (unclear) *nikka,*
Cinhuy-SUB kid-PL-SUB because
- 18 *namcaay-tul-i ohily,* (unclear) *kaci* (unclear)
boy-PL-SUB together
- 19 *mal-lakwu nolkeya,*
not-QT play.will
'But, but, you said that Cinhuy said girls are (unclear), so boys stopped (unclear) from going and played,'
- 20 J1: *ce-nun cham wuskin ke-y, icey cincca,* (unclear)
1sg-TOP really funny thing-SUB now really
- 21 *khaymphesu* (unclear) *uy cengcheyseng-i wancenhi*
campus of identity-SUB totally
- 22 *epsecyepelin ke kathay-yo. kunikkan thukhi* (overlap)
disappear that seem-HON thus especially
'I find it funny that, now really, the identity of campus (unclear) seems to have totally disappeared. That is, especially,'
- 23 S1: (overlap) *kulen, kulen yayki-nun,*
such such talk-TOP

- ‘That, that kind of talk,’
- 24 S2: (unclear) *kwanchalhan ke kathay. ung*,
observed that seem yes
‘It is likely to observe (unclear). Yes,’
- 25 S1: *ku yayki-mun, kulehci, kunikka*, (laugh)
that story-TOP right so
- 26 *ceytayhako nase*, (laugh)
discharged after
‘That means, so, that is, after being discharged from the army,’
- 27 *ceytay, ku, yeypiyektul-i*,
discharge that the.discharged-SUB
- 28 *cwulo hanun yayki-ka mwenya-myen*,
mainly do story-SUB what.be-COND
‘discharged, what the discharged usually say is that’
- 29 *nukkeyecinun kes cwungey hana-ka, wa, cincca*,
feel thing among one-SUB EXC really
‘one of the things that (we) feel is, wow, really,
- 30 *manhi pyenhaysse. ay-tul sayngkak-i manhi pyenhayss-ko*,
much changed kid-PL thought-SUB much changed-CONN
- 31 *noli mwunhwa-ka manhi pyenhayss-ko*,
game culture-SUB much changed-CONN
- 32 *ung*, (unclear) *kunikka*,
yes thus
‘(it) changed so much. People’s thoughts have changed a lot,
the entertaining culture has changed a lot, yes, that is,’
- 33 (unclear) *a, yeysnalhako taluta ilen key*
EXC past.with different such thing
- 34 *issci. mal sayonghanun ke*,
be. word use that
- 35 *taneto manhi thullyessta* (unclear) *kwu kuleci*, (unclear)
word.also much changed that right
‘ah, it is different from the past. The way of using words,
vocabularies were also different. That, right’
- 36 J2: (unclear) *cengmal* (unclear) *nanun*
really 1sg-TOP

- 37 *kwuntay kasstawa-se,*
 army discharged-CONN
- 38 *kwuntay kasstaokwu nase,*
 army discharge dafter
- 39 *maymal phissipang kanikka,*
 everyday PC.room go-CONN
 ‘For real, because **I** go to the internet cafe every day after being
 discharged from the military service,’
- 40 S2: *a, mace mace.*
 EXC right right
 ‘Ah, right, right.’
- 41 S1: (unclear) *nay-ka iphakhal ttayman hay-to,*
 1sg-SUB enter time.only do-CONN
 ‘When **I** first entered (the university),
- 42 *nay-ka ttak tulewassul ttay,*
 1sg-SUB just came.in time
 when **I** just got in,’

When given university culture as the discussion topic, each speaker in (3) tries to take the floor to talk about the changes they have experienced since being discharged from the military service. The speakers keep interrupting and making overlaps, some of which include utterances with overt 1stSBJs while they try to share their opinion or personal experiences. In specific, in the expression of their opinion, the speakers used predicates like ‘to be funny (line 20)’ and ‘to seem (line 22)’ appeared with an overt 1stSBJ, and predicates describing past acts like ‘came back (line 37)’ and ‘got in (line 42)’ were found with overt 1stSBJs in floor-taking.

his utterances from his previous turn in line 5 where he began with the overt 1stSBJ *na*. This time, after making his intention to take the floor clearly with the overt 1stSBJ and the connective *kulay kackwu*, he is not interrupted and continues by saying that he did not go to the internet café (lines 9 to 12). J2 takes the next turn and recalls an event that occurred among the friends (lines 13 to 19).⁴⁾ The next turn, taken by J1, proves that J1 still holds the floor after J2's utterance in lines 13 – 19, as J1 develops the discussion based on his own experience of refraining from going to the internet café, which he concludes to a general tendency within the university culture (lines 20 – 22), once more using *ce* as 1stSBJ.

While J1 keeps the floor by generalizing the university culture, S1 interrupts him by saying *kulen yaykinun* 'That kind of talk' (line 23),⁵⁾ and S2 adds his comment in line 24, which supports S1's judgement on J1's utterance.⁶⁾ S1 then reclaims the floor, without overt 1stSBJ, and talks about the changes they all experienced after being discharged from the army (lines 25 – 35). Since J1 is interrupted by S1 and criticized about the way he led to a conclusion by both S1 and S2, J1 does not attempt to take the floor back and the floor is naturally given to S1, which can be a reason of no overt 1stSBJ used by S1. After a long description from S1, J2 takes a turn and says that he has been going to the internet café every day following his discharge from the army (lines 36 to 39). S2 agrees with J2, using *mace* 'Right' (line 40). S1 then takes the floor again and recalls when he entered the university (lines 41 and 42). In his utterance, S1 repeats the same clause 'when I entered the university', using *na* as a 1stSBJ in both. The first clause with *na* signals S1's intention to take the floor, and once his intention is confirmed and agreed by no interruption made, he echoes the first clause with *na* and actually begins the story. A similar pattern was observed in Y's repeated use of *na* in his floor-taking in (2).

The discourse in (3) displays consecutive attempts of floor-taking that accompany instances of the use of an overt 1stSBJ. Not all the overt 1stSBJs in (3), namely,

4) While an overt 2ndSBJ *neka* is used in J2's utterance in lines 16 to 19, it is not included in the analysis due to the lack of clear transcriptions of the utterances and accordingly insufficient information provided to analyze the speaker's utterances.

5) Lim (2001) categorizes this kind of interruption as a 'floor-taking' interruption. In this case, a speaker interrupts another speaker who says something incoherent or who speaks for too long. By interrupting, the speaker ends the first speaker's turn and takes the floor for him/herself, as S1 takes the floor from J1.

6) This is an example of a 'favorable interruption' (Bennett, 1981), 'rapport-type interruption' (Goldberg, 1990) and a 'co-construction' of discourse (Lee, 1999). This interruption is to support the former speaker to keep the floor, and we do not observe an overt 1stSBJ in S2's utterance.

J1's *na* (line 5), J1's *ce* (lines 8 and 20), J2's *na* (line 36), and S1's *na* (line 42), are essential to maintaining the utterances' meanings. Rather, they expressly show the speakers' purpose to take the floor, and it is endorsed by some of their occurrences in repetition or overlap, which can be also seen as signaling the speakers' willingness to draw attention to their utterances from others.⁷⁾ Some (e.g. J1's *ce* in lines 8 and 20) successfully take the floor and the speaker of the overt 1stSBJ focuses the discourse on himself, whereas others (e.g. J1's *na* in line 5) fail to take the floor. Since the discourse in (3) is a talk for which a discussion topic was provided, one can observe competition for taking and holding the floor. Such a talk in a form of discussion is supposed to be a field on which speakers voice their opinions more competitively than every day informal conversations, so floor-taking may be seen more frequently and more aggressively than in other private discourses, as shown in this excerpt. What is noteworthy is that S1 as senior to J1 remains as the floor-holder while J1 tried floor-taking three times with overt 1stSBJ for all the attempts whereas S1 took his turns for six times and used overt 1stSBJ for only one time because he does not need to claim the floor that is already held by him. The topic of university culture was given to all speakers in the discourse, but there was one speaker who appears to hold the floor throughout the discourse.

In the current section, overt 1stSBJs were analyzed as a sign of floor-taking. We do not conclude that the use of overt 1stSBJs guarantees the change of the floor-holder in a discourse. The speakers may succeed in floor-taking as they intended, or they could just use an overt 1stSBJ as a convenient turn-taking device. This is argued based on the hypothesis that the speakers are aware of an overt 1stSBJ as a manifestation of floor-taking or floor-holding intention, not simply taking it as the subject of the utterance. Perceiving the subjectivity that an overt 1stSBJ innately conveys as well as the semantic redundancy in many cases, the discourse participants understand the use of overt 1stSBJ as a pragmatic gesture to signal that the speaker wants to have the control over the content and direction of the talk. As such, the transition of perspective to seeing an overt subject as an indicator of the speaker's intention toward the discourse control provides us much more implications in understanding an overt subject that could have been recoverable or identifiable even if not overt.

7) See Tannen (1987) and Edelsky (1981) for further discussions on the interactional functions of repetition and overlap, respectively, in relation to floor-taking.

5. Giving the Floor, Signaled by An Overt Second-Person Subject

Similar to the cases of the overt 1stSBJ, speakers are found to utilize overt 2ndSBJs as explicit gestures of shifting the floor-holder status from themselves or another speaker to a particular participant in the discourse. Contrast markers such as *-(mu)n* affixed to the overt 2ndSBJ are also found to help signalling the shift of the floor from the speaker to the interlocutor. As noted in Section 2, the subjectivity is given to the second-person by an overt 2ndSBJ in questions while the floor is requested to be taken.

Excerpt (4) provides a clear example of using an overt 2ndSBJ as a marker of giving the floor. While the speakers are discussing a recent event, the speaker who utters the overt 2ndSBJ asks another speaker ‘Why did you do that a little while ago?’, as follows:

(4) [Drama 5: between two high school students]

- 1 M: *mwe-nya, ike-y?* (breath) *ueyk.*
 what-Q this-SUB EXC
 ‘What is this? Ew.’
- 2 F: *aseython-iya. pontu mwutunke ike-llo ciwe.*
 acetone-COP bond stuck.thing this-INST remove
 ‘It is acetone. Remove the glue on (you) with this.’
- 3 M: *ike-llo pontu-ka ciwecye?*
 this-INST bond-SUB removed
 ‘Glue is removed with this?’
- 4 F: *e. kuntey, pakswuha.*
 yes but Pak Swuha
- 5 *ne akka way kulenkeya?*
 2sg before why so.did
 ‘Yes. By the way, Pak Swuha. Why did you do that a little while ago?’
- 6 *way ssangkho nollinunke cholul chye?*
 why Ssangkho bullying.thing intervene
 Why did (you) intervene in bullying Ssangkho?’
- 7 M: *ssangkho nollinunkeyesse? na-n mollassnuntey.*
 Ssangkho bullying.thing.was 1sg-TOP not.knew.but
 ‘Was (it) bullying Ssangkho? I didn’t know.’

- 8 F: *ppengchisiney. al-ko kulenke-canha.*
 lying know-CONN so.did-CFM
 '(You) are lying. (You) knew and did that.'
- 9 M: *mollassta-nikka. e? cincca ciweciney?*
 not.know-CFM EXC really removed
 '(I) didn't know, (I) said. Oh, (it) is really removed, isn't (it)?'

There is tension between the male speaker (M) and the female speaker (F), in which F tries to give M the floor, and M tries to refuse. When F asks why M interrupted her friends while they were bullying a classmate *Ssangkho*, F adds a semantically 'redundant' overt 2ndSBJ *ne* 'you' (line 5), which was also seen in the previous section in the examples of overt 1stSBJs that could be unexpressed without changing the meanings of the utterances. F attempts to give M the floor by asking a question after drawing M's attention, considering the use of *kuntey* 'by the way' in the beginning of her utterance in line 4 and the immediate use of M's name *Pak Swuha* to address him. In order to change the flow of the conversation from talking about the glue on his hand (lines 1 to 3) to what happened to M earlier (line 5), F explicitly asks 'Why did you do that?' using the overt 2ndSBJ *ne*, along with the connective *kuntey* 'by the way', and expects M to answer her question about his intention. In response to her attempt to give him the floor, M accepts, saying *nan mollassmuntey* 'I didn't know' (line 7).

Rather than taking the floor actively, M refuses the floor by expressing his 'having not known' in contrast to F's suspect that he knew what was happening. In fact, he deliberately intervened F and her friends bullying *Ssangkho* and is lying that he did not know, according to the prior situation to (4). M tries to not take the floor where he is asked to tell the truth and uses the overt 1stSBJ *nan* to take the floor ironically in order to end his turn as well as the floor while exhibiting the subjectivity of 'I' in 'not knowing'. That is, the overt 1stSBJ *na* with the contrast marker *-n* contrasts M's epistemic status to what is assumed by F, i.e. M knew that his friends were bullying *Ssangkho* and intervened. The contrast created by *nan* in 'I didn't know' exhibits M's intention to not take the floor and to avoid explaining why he intervened them as asked by F.⁸⁾ As F suspects him of lying

8) As noted in Section 2, overt subjects can have multiple pragmatic effects at the same time, and as seen in the example in the excerpt, it is hard to separate the effects as they collaborate in their meanings often times; such as the overt 1stSBJ being contrastive to what is assumed by the interlocutor, and the contrast underlines the overt 1stSBJ as a floor-shifting marker where the speaker tries to make a change in the floor.

(line 8), M repeats *mollasstanikka* ‘(I) said (I) didn’t know’, with no overt 1stSBJ this time because the sentence final *-tanikka* ‘already said’ entails that the same was said by the same speaker and tries to change the topic to something peripheral, i.e. acetone’s effectiveness at removing glue on his hand, which is interpreted as another form of refusing the floor (line 9).

Similarly, the two speakers in Excerpt (5) use overt 2ndSBJs when they seek to obtain information from each other by giving the floor:

(5) [Drama 10: between a father and his son]

- 1 F: *mwehale wa-senun*,
what.for come-CONN
- 2 *myech sikan-ul mwusun kosayng-iya?*
how.many hour-OBJ what hardship-COP
‘Why did (you) come and get into this hardship for hours?’
- 3 S: *apeci-n / Imenteys*
father-TOP this far.place.from
- 4 *cipey ettehkey olyeko*
home how come
- 5 *saypyek neysikkaci il-ul hayyo?*
morning four.until work-OBJ do-HON
‘How would you come home from this far after working until 4 am?’
- 6 F: *samsippwunman kitali-myen ches cha tanilke anya.*
thirty.minutes.only wait-COND first car run not
‘The first bus in the morning runs if (I) wait only thirty minutes.’
- 7 S: *tangcang kwantwu-seyyo.*
immediately quit-HON
- 8 *kuke hal cis mostway-yo.*
that to.do thing not.be-HON
‘Quit immediately. That is not something to do.’
- 9 F: (pause) *ne-n kutongan cipey*
2sg-TOP that.during home
- 10 *ettehkey kasse? panghakmata tayli*
how went break.every chauggeur
- 11 *alpahayss-tamyense.*

part.time.did-QT

‘How did you go home for that time? (You) have been a part-time night chauffeur for every break, (I) heard.’

- 12 S: *cip kunche khol kitalyessta kassc-yo.*
home near call wait went-HON
‘(I) waited for a call going near home and went.’

The son (S) visits his father (F)’s workplace late at night. F says that S should not have come to help him because his work is long and difficult (lines 1 and 2). S then asks how F came back home after finishing work at four in the morning when there is no public transportation; to pose this question, S uses *apecin* (‘father’ + the topic marker *-n*)⁹) as the 2ndSBJ (lines 3 to 5). As F answers that he waited for the first bus in the morning (line 6), S asks him to quit the job immediately since the work is too hard (lines 7 and 8). F then pauses and asks how S came back home from his job as a *tayli* (‘lit. deputy; substitute’) ‘night chauffeur’, using *nen* (*ne* + the topic marker *-n*) as the 2ndSBJ (lines 9 to 11). After answering his son’s question, F likely realized, during the pause, that his son has been in the same situation, i.e. finishing work late and having no public transportation to return home. F then gives S the floor, so that his son can talk about himself.

The two speakers’ use of overt 2ndSBJs with the topic marker *-(n)un*, namely, S’s use of *apecin* (line 3) and F’s use of *nen* (line 9), creates contrast between the speakers’ stances.¹⁰) Along with the contrast between the two speakers, the overt 2ndSBJs affixed with *-(n)un* also contribute to organizing discourse structure in the form of floor shifts. More generally, speakers can take or yield the floor with the topic marker *-(n)un* affixed to the 1stSBJ or 2ndSBJ, particularly in the manner of ‘As for ME’ and ‘How about YOU?’, which demonstrates the contrast in subjectivity of the two interlocutors. At the same time, the discourse displays a symmetrical structure with respect to the two speakers that are modified by *-(n)un*, as in (5). By giving each other the floor, F and S are motivated to obtain information from the other, which in the case of (5) is a desire to know how the other returns home after work. When asked to take the floor, both F and S respond

9) Depending on the final consonant of a noun, the topic marker *-(n)un* changes its form, i.e. a noun with a final consonant is affixed with *-un*, and a noun without a final consonant, like *apeci* ‘father’ in (5), is affixed with *-nun*. In speech, *-nun* is often shortened to *-n*.

10) The topic marker *-(n)un* is understood to contrast the noun to which it is affixed with another entity in the discourse (Jung, 2007; Kim, 1996; Oh, 2007).

with their answers (lines 4 and 8, respectively), thus the floor-giving attempts are successful.

It is not always the case that the floor is passed over to the interlocutor when a speaker uses an overt 2ndSBJ although the collocutor may have interpreted it as a floor-giving act. For instance, the speakers in Excerpt (6) below give turns to their collocutors using overt 2ndSBJs, and the collocutors proceed their utterances as if they are now the floor-takers. However, the speakers of the overt 2ndSBJs take the floor back and continue talking about what they were going to say:

(6) [Drama 4: between two female friends]

- 1 A: *kotingttay* *alapokin* *hayssciman*,
 high.school.time notice did.but
- 2 *cincca* *mwusewun* *ay* *aninya?*
 really scary kid not
 ‘(I) noticed at high school, but isn’t (she) really scary?’
- 3 *namca* *cal* *mwul-ese* *hanpangey*
 man well catch-CONN once.at
- 4 *insayng* *yekcen* *han* *ke* *anya.*
 life chage do that not
 It is that (she) met a rich man and changed her life at once.
- 5 *tokhata,* *tokhay.*
 headstrong headstrong
 (‘She) is headstrong.’
- 6 B: *icwungseng* *ccenta.*
 duplicity serious
 ‘The duplicity is ridiculous.’
- 7 A: *kuchi?*
 so
 ‘Isn’t (it)?’
- 8 B: *ne* *maliya,* *tauni* *kyelhonsik* *ka-sen*
 2sg saying Taun wedding go-CONN
- 9 *pwulewe* *nanliteni,* *seyuncwu-nun* *way* *yokhay?*
 jealous fuss-CONN Se Yuncwu-TOP why criticize
 ‘(I) mean you, why do (you) criticize Se Yuncwu while (you)
 were so jealous at Taun’s wedding?’

- 10 A: *ya, kuk-en* (overlap)
 hey that-TOP
 ‘Hey, that is’
- 11 B: (overlap) *yayyamallo kkwum ilwun keci.*
 this.kid.really dream achieve that
 ‘She is the one who really made her dream come true.’
- 12 *ike-y ci nunglyekiko sillyek-ilaten ay-canha.*
 this-TOP her ability-CONN skill-QT kid-CFM
 (She) used to say that this is all her ability and skill.’
- 13 A: *hakin, kuttay-n hansimhay poyessmuntey,*
 right then-TOP pathetic looked.but
- 14 *yocumey-n ikesto nunglyek-ici.*
 nowadays-TOP this.also ability-COP
 ‘Right, (it) looked pathetic then, but it is also an ability now.’
- 15 (pause) *ya, ne kuntey,*
 hey 2sg but
- 16 *soinchanilang ettehkey twaysse?*
 So Inchan.with how became
 Hey, by the way, how did you end up with So Inchan?’
- 17 B: *ettehkey toykin mwe-l?*
 how became what-OBJ
 ‘What do (you) mean by how (I) ended up?’
- 18 A: *soinchan, onul mwutankyelkun hayss-ketun.*
 So Inchan today absent.without.notice did-CFM
 ‘So Inchan was absent at work without notice.’

Excerpt (6) depicts a conversation between two female friends, in which A criticizes their mutual friend, *Se Yuncwu*, for pursuing a life change since high school by attracting a rich man, which she has finally achieved (lines 1 – 5). B points out that A is criticizing only *Se Yuncwu* while envying another friend, *Taun*, who also married a rich man. A takes a turn to explain beginning with *ya kuku* ‘Hey, that is’ (line 10), but B interrupts and rebuts the assertion that *Se Yuncwu* actually possesses the skill and the ability to realize her dream (lines 11 and 12). B asks a question to A but does not wait for her to answer and makes an overlap in line 11. The rhetorical question proves that B did not intend to give A the floor with the expectation that A would answer. A only takes a short turn trying to

answer B's question in line 10, and she does not successfully take the floor. Instead, B becomes the floor-holder again as she finishes her utterance about her own thoughts without A's interruption.

After A agrees to what B says (lines 13 and 14), A uses *ne* as a 2ndSBJ with a discourse juncture *kuntey* 'by the way', which collectively function to change the flow of the discourse towards B. In addition, she addresses B using *ya* 'hey' in the beginning of the utterance and secures B's attention. After sending an unmistakable signal that she wants to talk about B now, A gives the floor to B in the form of a question, asking how things went between B and her boyfriend *So Inchan*. B takes a turn, but she gives the floor back to A by asking her to clarify the question (line 17). A then takes the floor and says that B's boyfriend, who is also A's co-worker, was absent from work (line 18). Considering the sentence-final *-ketun* in her utterance,¹¹⁾ A presumes that B does not know about her boyfriend's absence from work, but she first tries to confirm her presumption by asking about the state of their relationship in line 16.

When B's question 'What do (you) mean?' in line 17 confirms that there has been no change in the relationship, A explains why she asked the question, revealing that *So Inchan* is in trouble. In other words, A is likely to give B a turn by asking 'How did you end up with him?' on purpose, and she observes whether B is aware of her boyfriend's situation. As this is in the form of a genuine question, A would have expected that B would take the floor and respond with the information about the couple. If B does not know what happened to her boyfriend, as is the case in line 17, A can expect that B will return to her with a question, such as 'What do you mean?', so A can have the floor and share what she knows. Alternatively, if it turns out that B knows that her boyfriend is dealing with a problem and has been absent from work, A could expect B to take the floor and explain the reason that A does not know. Thus, the overt 2ndSBJ *ne* in A's question (line 15) does not simply indicate A's intention to give the floor to B; it is likely to be planned since the speaker gives the interlocutor a turn and then prepares for both floor-giving and floor-taking, depending on the interlocutor's response. It should be noted that this plan of floor-giving or floor-holding is possible based on the shared recognition of the use of an overt 2ndSBJ as a

11) The sentence-final *-ketun* is used when the speaker provides a piece of information that she thinks is a reason for what has been said previously in the discourse (Chae, 1998; Lee, 2002). That is, Speaker A presents her last sentence, 'So Inchan was absent at work today without notice', as the reason she asked the question 'How did you end up with So Inchan?' in her previous utterance.

floor-giving signal between the discourse participants.

6. Conclusion

The current study has discussed the use of overt 1stSBJs and 2ndSBJs in discourse organization, focusing on the speakers' negotiation for the floor. Floor-taking occurs when the lead or the focal point of discourse changes, and it needs to be associated with the nature of overt 1stSBJ. To be the floor-holder, speakers draw attention to themselves, and an overt 1stSBJ becomes an effective tool in doing so, since it innately relates subjectivity clarifying that the utterance is going to be about or oriented toward the speaker. It is, of course, possible for a speaker not to intend to take the floor while using an overt 1stSBJ, in which case that the speaker might simply respond to a previous utterance or series of utterances using an overt 1stSBJ without intending to take the control on the conversation. However, it is found that an utterance with an overt 1stSBJ outweighs an utterance with no overt 1stSBJ in terms of the emphasis on self-orientation.

Overt 2ndSBJs are used either in giving both a turn and the floor or in giving a turn while holding the floor. It is clearly observable in the former case that a speaker gives the floor to another speaker in the discourse, expecting that the interlocutor will take the floor and lead the discourse. In the process, the use of an overt 2ndSBJ presents the floor-giver's intention to hand over the attention of the discourse more explicitly than the case where there is no overt 2ndSBJ. As for the latter case, we find instances in which the speaker of an overt 2ndSBJ wants to give a turn to another speaker while expecting to keep the floor for themselves. Giving a turn with an overt 2ndSBJ could be seen like giving the floor as well to the interlocutor, but reflecting the longer-term context, it is found that the speaker is well prepared with the interlocutor's response and promptly take a turn to be the floor holder. For instance, speakers ask a question that they presume the interlocutor will have difficulty answering or to which the speaker can predict the answer, so they can quickly take a turn to respond to their interlocutor's answer, interrupt in many cases, and remain the floor-holder. Such floor-holding is analyzed as planned and delayed by giving the interlocutor a turn signaled with an overt 2ndSBJ.

The use of person reference in interaction for attention-getting is argued in other

languages as discussed earlier in this paper. As Zheng (2020) identifies *qá mà* (1sg pronoun + topic marker) in Longxi Qiang, a Tibeto-Burman language, as a pragmatic marker of attention-getting developed from a referential term, the current study is an attempt to view the phenomenon of subjects remaining overt in Korean, where non-overt subjects appear more frequently, as a floor-shifting signal. In future research, more detailed analysis on the particles used with overt subject as well as the verbs of speech acts will strengthen the present discussion of overt subject as a floor-shifting marker. Further, the limitations that the dataset of the current study have and respective limitations in the analyses can be resolved by having more specific information in transcriptions.

References

- Bennett, A. (1981). Interruptions and the interpretation of conversation. *Discourse Processes* 4, 171-188.
- Benveniste, E. (1971). *Problems in general linguistics*. In M. E. Meek (Ed.), Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press.
- Chae, Y. H. (1998). *Tamhwaey ssuinun 'ketun'uy hwayongcek kinung* [The discourse modality marker 'ketun' in Korean]. *Korean Semantics*, 3, 159-177.
- Chang, S. -J. (1996). *Korean*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Clancy, P. M. (1996). Referential strategies and the co-construction of argument structure in Korean acquisition. In Barbara Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 33-68). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Davidson, B. (1996). 'Pragmatic weight' and Spanish subject pronouns: The pragmatic and discourse uses of 'tú' and 'yo' in spoken Madrid Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(4), 543-565.
- Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23(2), 283-293.
- Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society*, 10(3), 383-421.
- Erickson, F. (1982). Money tree, lasagna bush, salt and pepper: Social construction of topical cohesion in a conversation among Italian-Americans. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 43-70). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Ewing, M. C. (2014). Motivations for first and second person subject expression and ellipsis in Javanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 63, 48-62.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18, 213-231.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society*, 8, 257-311.

- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldberg, J. A. (1990). Interrupting the discourse on interruptions: An analysis in terms of relationally neutral, power- and rapport-oriented acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(6), 883-903.
- Hayashi, R. (1987). *A study of floor management of English and Japanese conversation*. (Ph.D. dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Hayashi, R. (1991). Floor structure of English and Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 16, 1-30.
- Hong, J. -S. (2014). User-centered Korean grammar encompassing the spoken and written language (written in Korean). *Emwunyenkwu* 42(1), 7-35.
- Houtkoop, H., & Harrie M. (1985). Turns and discourse units in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 595-619.
- Jung, Y. (2007). *Cwue saynglyakey tayhan soko* [A note on subject ellipsis]. *Journal of Language Sciences* 14(2), 101-120.
- Kang, S. -Y. (2017). *Tholontamhwaeyseyu mal kkietulkiye tayhan yenkwu* [A study on an intervention in CEDA discussion discourses]. *Korean Semantics*, 58, 89-124.
- Kim, H. (1989). Nominal reference in discourse: Introducing and tracking referents in Korean spoken narratives. In S. Kuno (Ed.), *Harvard studies in Korean linguistics* (Vol. III). Hanshin, Seoul.
- Kim, H. (1999). *Hankwuke tayhwasangeyseyu hwacawa chengcaey tayhan ciching phyohyen* [Referring Expressions for Speaker and Hearer in Korean Conversation]. *Discourse and Cognition*, 6(1), 73-100.
- Kim, T. (2008). *Subject and object markings in conversational Korean*. (Ph.D. dissertation). State University of New York at Buffalo, Ann Arbor.
- Kim, W. -S. (1996). *Supheyineyu cwue saynglyak: hankwuk.e cwue saynglyak.kwaui tayco pwunsekcek kwancemeyse* [Subject ellipsis in Spanish: Comparative study with Korean]. *Icwungenehakhoyci [Bilingual Research]* 13, 267-287.
- Kwon, J. -I. (2012). *Hankwuke Mwu-neplon [Theories in Korean Grammar]*. Taehaksa, Seoul.
- Lee, D. -Y., & Yonezawa, Y. (2008). The role of the overt expression of first and second person subject in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(4), 733-767.
- Lee, J. C. (2002). *Emalemi '-ketun'ey tayhan hwayongloncek yenkwu* [A pragmatic study on the final ending '-geodeun']. *Korean Language Education* 108, 263-282.
- Lee, P. -Y. (1987). *Hyentaykwukeuy 1, 2inching phyohyenyey tayhaye* [On the first and second person references in modern Korean]. *Kwanakemwunyenkwu [Kwanak Language and Literature Research]*, 12, 209-229.
- Lee, W. -P. (1989). *Referential choice in Korean discourse: Cognitive and social perspective*. (Ph.D. dissertation), University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Lee, W. -P. (1999). *Thokhusyoyeyseyu mal kkietulki: tamhwa kinungkwa sahocek yoin* [Interventions in talk shows: Discourse functions and social variables]. *Discourse and Cognition*, 6(2), 23-59.
- Lim, G. -H. (2001). *Kwuke tamhwaui kkietulki yuhyengye tayhan yenkwu* [Study of the interruption types in Korean discourse]. *The Journal of Linguistics Science*, 20, 321-351.

- Nariyama, S. (2004). Subject ellipsis in English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(2), 237-264.
- Oh, S. -Y. (2007). Overt reference to speaker and recipient in Korean. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 462-492.
- Ono, T., & Thompson, S. A. (2003). Japanese (w)tashi/ore/boku 'I': They're not just pronouns. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 14(4), 321-347.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-7095.
- Tannen, D. 1987. Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. *Language*, 63(3), 574-605.
- Travis, C. E., & Cacoullos, R. T. (2012). What do subject pronouns do in discourse? Cognitive, mechanical and constructional factors in variation. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 23(4), 711-748.
- Yngve, V. H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. The 6th regional meeting of the Chicago *Linguistic Society*, 567-578.
- Zheng, W. (2020). The first person singular pronoun topic as attention-getter in interaction: A study of *qá mà* in Longxi Qiang. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 156, 1-15.

Narah Lee

Associate Lecturer

School of Languages and Cultures

University of Queensland

St Lucia, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

E-mail: narah.lee@uq.edu.au

Received: July 20, 2021

Revised version received: August 23, 2021

Accepted: October 13, 2021