Stancetaking in Korean Conversation:Using the *Maliy*a Construction to Accomplish Intersubjectivity

Hyunjung An
University of Hawaii at Manoa

1   Introduction

Previous studies of reported speech have focused on its grammatical forms, but in recent years its function and the speakers' interactional motivation for its use have been discussed. In the storytelling sequence, reported speech can display the speakers' attitude toward the repeated utterance while retelling the story (Holt and Clift 2006). Direct reported speech cites the statement uttered exactly as it is, whereas indirect speech denotes the speaker's perspective or attitude towards his/her statement (Li 1986, as cited in Holt and Clift 2006). *Maliya* used only in indirect quotative constructions conveys the speaker's attitude or stance, and it often appears as *-tan maliya, -nyan maliya,* and *-lan maliya,* combining with sentence enders like declarative (*ta-*), interrogative (*nya-*), and imperative (*la-*).

Korean *maliya* consists of *mal* (words), *i* (copular), and *ya* (sentence ender). *Mal* (words) has gradually lost its lexical meaning while undergoing

grammaticalization. Hsieh (2012:489) reported that the Kavalan verb *zin* "say" in Austronesian languages has lost its verbal meaning and grammaticalized into a pragmatic marker, which indicates "the speakers' commitment to the source of information," and coveys the speaker's "attitude and belief" (as cited in Ahn and Yap 2014:303). Similar to the Kavalan verb *zin*, Korean *maliya* is also used as a pragmatic marker, displaying the speaker's stance or attitude.

M. K. Kim (2011) claimed that the *malita* construction (combined with declarative sentence ender, *ta*) has an effect of asking confirmation on the reconstructed utterance from the addressee's perspective as well as emphasizing the utterances from the speaker's perspective. According to M. K. Ahn (2012) and Ahn and Yap (2013), the discourse marker *maliya* has been used as a complementizer or an emphatic marker with an additional function of eliciting the addressee's involvement in the conversation.

Both *malita* and *maliya* have the function of placing an emphasis on what the interlocutor utters. Ahn and Yap (2013) explained an additional function of *maliya* as constructing common ground between the speaker and addressee, carried out by the final particle *ya,* which functions as a common ground marker (Seo 2010). However, building common ground between co-participants is a complicated process, which essentially involves a series of interactive negotiations of the interlocutors' stances in a sequence of conversation. This means that the joint construction of stance between the speakers needs to look into not only the characteristics of the specific grammatical or lexical devices (common ground marker, *ya*), but also the interactional process of stance taking and interactional motivation behind such shared stance (Kärkkäinen 2006). "Stance is more than the context-free connotations of words or sentences. The missing ingredients can only be formed by contextualizing the utterance, defined as the situated realization of language use" (Du Bois 2007:146). Since previous research has examined the *maliya* construction on a macro-level of talk, the current study attempts to fill the gap through a micro-analysis of the *maliya* construction in naturally-occurring conversation to identify how the speakers achieve a shared stance in moment-by-moment interactions. From a conversation analysis (CA) perspective, intersubjectivity between two participants is constructed on a turn-by-turn basis (Heritage 1984), which appears to provide an appropriate analytical framework to analyze the process of establishing common ground between co-participants. Thus, this study examines how the stance marker *maliya* is deployed to negotiate their stances, which results in the intersubjectivity between two interlocutors in a naturally-occurring conversation.

2 Data and Method

The data for the current study was obtained through the Korean Telephone Conversation Speech corpus provided by the Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC, Ko et al 2003). The participants were native Korean speakers who lived in either the U.S.A. or Canada. Two participants' spontaneous conversation on the phone was recorded with their consent for research purposes. A total of 137 instances of the *maliya* constructions were identified in 60 telephone conversations in the present study. This study aims to identify the function of *maliya* in a natural conversation through an employment of a conversation analytic approach.

In section 3, the use of the literal meaning of *maliya* will be briefly introduced, and in section 4, *maliya* as an epistemic marker via quoting what the speaker stated in the preceding turn will be discussed. In section 5, the use of *maliya* to take an affiliative stance when quoting the other party's talk will be examined, followed by the opposite cases of *maliya* to mark a disaffiliative stance without quotation in section 6.

3 Verbal Meaning of *Maliya*

Drawn from the basic meaning or function of *malita*, *maliya* can be used for the speaker to emphasize what he/she says, and can be roughly translated as "what I am saying is~", or "I am referring to~". Meanwhile, from the addressee's perspective, *maliya* is deployed to verify what he/she hears in the prior turn. Extract 1 below shows an example in which the addressee invites the speaker to confirm his utterance with the verbal meaning of *maliya* embedded. The extract is organized in a series of questions and answers, and the *maliya* construction is one of the questions employed in this segment ("*hyengi tonul ponay cwuntan maliya?*", line 6) to make a request for an explicit or preferred answer to confirm the information, dealing with trouble in understanding. *Maliya* used in a polarity question asks further clarification on the previous utterance to accomplish intersubjectivity. Hence, one party positions the other party as a more knowledgeable one who can confirm the information. In this case, *maliya* can be roughly translated as "Is this what you are saying that~? Are you referring to~", holding its literal meaning.

```
Extract1. [ko_5109, 3:20-3:50]
   01. Ho:    hh. ani, hyeng-i( )  ponay  cwu-nun  ton  sse-yo.
             hh. dm  brother-nom  send  give-rl  money  use-pol
             'I am using the money my brother sent'.
   02. Ri: -> hyeng-i     ton-to     ponay   cwe?
             brother-nom  money-too  send    give:ie
             'Does your brother send you money?'
```

```
03. Ho:    ( )apeci-hanthey, emeni-hantheynun kuke
           father-from      mother-from-top  that
04.        patassu-ki    nemwu kulen ke    kath-ase::.(0.8)
           receive-noml  very  such  thing seem-because
05.        ilcali cap-ul  ttay-kkaci-man (1.2)
           job    get-re  time-until-only
           'Until I have a job, I feel so sorry to receive money from my parents.'
06. Ri: -> (0.5)hyeng-i ton-ul    ponay  cwun-ta-n  maliya?=
            brother-nom money-ac send   give-dc-rl  maliya
           'Is this your saying that your brother sends you money?'
07. Ho:    =yey.=
           yes
            'Yes.'
08. Ri:    =moll-ass↑-ney.
            don't know-pst-fr
           'I did not know.'
09. Ho:    mekko   sa-l     mankhum-yo (1.0)  pap-un
           eat:and live-rl  extent-pol        food-nom
10.        mek-eya    toy-l    kes   ani-[laugh]
           eat-necess become-rl thing neg
           'As much money as I need to survive. I have to eat, at least.'
11. Ri:    [laugh] ↑ya:: hyengi        tto   kulen
                    voc  brother-nom   also  such
12.        tey-ka      iss-ess-e?
           aspect-nom  exist-pst-ie
           'Wow, was he so supportive as that?'
13. Ho:    hh  way-yo, ku Texas-eyse hyeng-   hyeng    ton
           hh  why-pol dm Texas-at   brother  brother  money
           manhi  hh ppay  ss-ess-nuntey. (laugh)
           a lot  hh take  use-pst-circum
           'Why not? I used much of my brother's money when living in Texas.'
```

Ho and Ri are talking about Ho's elder brother. In the previous talk, Ri states that Ho's brother has started learning how to play the piano. In response to this news, Ho deprecates himself in comparison with his brother, who is enthusiastic about his work and hobbies. By contrast, Ho says that he has been unemployed receiving financial aid from his brother (line 1). Ri asks polar questions in order to check her understanding (line 2), because she was not aware of his attentiveness, as evidenced in line 11 and 12, stating, "*hyengi tto kulen tey-ka iss-ess-e?*" In response to Ri's question in line 2 ("*hyengi tonto ponay cwe?*"), the preferred answer is likely to be yes or no, but Ho elaborates his answer providing accounts for receiving money from his brother, because he feels apologetic toward his parents (line 3,4,5). Ho's dispreferred answer elicits Ri's polarity question of the *maliya* construction, "*hyengi tonto ponay cwuntan maliya?*" to request a clarification (line 6).

Note how Ri forms the polar question in line 6 when her candidate understanding was rejected to seek confirmation in her first attempt (line 2). She quotes the word she uttered in line 2, and asks an additional question employing a sentence ender, *maliya*. It can be roughly translated as "Is this your

saying that your brother sends you money?". Compare the following two sentences:

```
02  Ri: hyengi tonto ponay cwe?
06  Ri: hyengi tonul ponay cwuntan maliya?
```

Cwuntan maliya is an indirect quotative construction in which *-nun* or *-n* (*cwuntan* is an abbreviated form of *cwntanun* in colloquial speech) modifies the noun, *mal* (words). Hence, *-cwuntan maliya* has a function of repeating her previous turn by quoting herself, urging Ho to design a type-conforming answer as Ri requests in her polarity question. This can be easily understood as, "I am repeating my question, because your previous answer did not affirm my candidate understanding. This time, I urge you to confirm whether my understanding is correct or not." After Ho's explicit confirmation saying "*yey*" in line 7, Ri finally states "*mollassney*", which indicates her change of the state from not knowing to knowing in line 8. Thus, the *maliya* construction in extract 1 reiterates the speaker's question via self-quotation with its verbal meaning embedded, and places a constraint on the design of the recipient's upcoming answer to receive an explicit or preferred answer for seeking confirmation.

4   Epistemic stance marker to accomplish intersubjectivity via self-quotation

This section will examine the *maliya* construction not as a question, but as a statement with its verbal meaning lost, quoting the speaker him/herself. *Maliya* is used only in indirect reported speech, which is often related with the current speaker's point of view (Leech and Short 1981, as cited in Holt and Clift 2006). The known reason for the use of reported speech is the speaker's attempt to "reduce personal responsibility," notifying that there is a gap between what he uttered and what he actually heard. "He splits himself off from the content of the words by expressing that their speaker is not he himself or not he himself in a serious way". (Goffman 1974:512). In contrast, when using the *maliya* construction, translated as, "I am saying that~" or "What I am saying is that~", the speaker exhibits that he is an informant who can claim his epistemic authority, marking his sturdy stance. Inasmuch as the *maliya* construction also quotes the words of the speaker himself, he plays three roles, i.e. animator, author, and principal concurrently (Goffman 1981).

Hence, *maliya* basically functions as confirming the propositional content of the speaker's utterance exerting his authority. A speaker can affirm whether the propositional content of the statement is precise or not, placing

him/herself in a higher epistemic status than an addressee. *Maliya* occurs when the speaker urges the recipient to share the epistemic stance, reproducing the utterance by quoting his/her own statement mentioned in the preceding turn. Thus, *maliya* has an effect of underscoring the speaker's utterance through repetition to accomplish intersubjectivity when there is an epistemic gap between co-participants.

In extract 2, Ara, who can claim epistemic authority, restates her previous utterance using *maliya*, urging Bin to share her epistemic stance when she has trouble in understanding.

```
Extract2. [ko_4548, 1:35-2:17]
   01. Ara:   kil-ul     kil-ul    kaluchye cweya tway,
              road-ac    road-ac   teach    must
   02.        °wuli-nun. chonnom-i-lase↑°. (1.0)
               we-top    bumpkins-cop-because
              'You should give us direction, because we are bumpkins'.
   03. Bin:   kunikka ollao-nun   kil-i     mwenyamyen
              I mean, come up-rl  road-nom  what.it.is
   04.        third-hako, 3-ka-hako (0.7), ku taumey six
              third-com   3-avenue-com     the next  six
   05.    -> hako-ka olla wa,    wi-[ccokulo, mith-eysepwuthe
              com-nom come up:ie up-toward   bottom-from
              'I mean, the avenue that takes you up here is, Third, Third Avenue,
              and Sixth will take you up here, come upward from the bottom'.
   06. Ara:                       [kulenikka
                                   You mean,
   07.        sam-ka-lanun key,   sam pen  avenue ya?
              3-avenue-so:called  3rd      avenue q
   08.        [sam avenue  e, e.
               3   avenue  uh-huh.
              'You mean,  Third means Third Avenue? Is that Third avenue? OK'
   09. Bin:   [e,    third. third  avenue-na  animyen   six ha-
               right,third  third  avenue-or  neg-cond  six com
   10.    -> kulenikka  wilo     ollawa.
               I mean     upward   come up:ie
              'Third, Third Avenue or Sixth, or take Sixth, I mean, come up the road.'
   11. Ara:  um.   kukey mwusun soli-ya, [six, six avenue?
             well that  what   sound-q   six, six avenue?
             Well, what do you mean? Sixth, Sixth Avenue?
   12. Bin:                              [ani kulenikka] kil-i
                                          dm  i mean     road-nom
   13.        yeki-nun ilpangthonghayng-i-[canha Manhattan-i
              here-top one way-cop-you know      manhattan-nom
   14.        kulenikka,
              I mean,
              'Well, I mean, the road here is one-way as you know, since this is
              Manhattan.'
   15. Ara:                               [e.e    a    sam-,
                                           I see  ah   3
   16.        kulenikka third avenue na six avenue
              I mean    third avenue or six avenue
              'I see. Third Avenue, or Sixth Avenue.'
```

```
17. Bin: ->kulenikka olla on-ta-n  mali[ya, kulenikka twul
            I mean,   come up-dc-rl maliya   i mean    two
18.         cwungey amwukena tha-ko-senun
            out of  whatever take-and-after
```
'I mean, come up the road, maliya. I mean, take either one.'
```
19. Ara:                              [e,e,e, al-ass-e.
                                       uh-huh know-pst-ie
```
'Uh-huh. I got it.'

Bin is a graduate student living in New York. Ara and their mutual friends are planning to visit Bin's place while travelling in New York. As Ara is a stranger in New York (line 2), trouble in mutual understanding is often identified while Bin is giving directions. This is evidenced by their frequent use of "*kulenikka*"(line 3, 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 17), which is often used as a repair initiator (Kim and Suh 1994, as cited in H.S, Kim 2013). First, Ara is confused with the name of the road in line 7 (3가 can refer to either the Third Street or the Third Avenue in Korean). Bin confirms that 3가 is the Third Avenue (line 9), and continues her turn repeating her previous utterance (line 5), stating "*wilo ollawa*"(line 10). Then, the direction of the road is another source of trouble. When Bin told her to come upward, Ara initiates repair and requires further clarification stating, "*kukey mwusun soliya*?", which indicates a problem in her understanding (line 11). Note how Bin repairs by making the trouble source more accessible to Ara to construct the shared epistemic stance with Ara. After providing accounts explaining the one-way traffic system in Manhattan (line 12, 13), Bin quotes herself and repeats what she said in the previous turn (line 4-5, 9-10) using *maliya, "kulenikka third avenue na six avenue kulenikka olla ontan maliya"* (line 16-17). This can be interpreted as "As I said before, I explain this to you again. I bet you understand what I am saying now." When the speaker repairs the preceding turn, quoted speech does not occur in English, but it does in Korean as seen in this extract. The following illustrates how *maliya* is used via the quotation of the speaker's preceding turn.

```
04-05  Bin: third-hako, 3-ka-hako ku taumey six hako-ka olla
            wa.
09-10  Bin: e, third. third avenue-na animyen six ha-
            kulenikka wilo ollawa.
16-17  Bin: kulenikka third avenue na six avenue. kulenikka
            olla ontan maliya.
```

Bin's quoted restatement using *maliya* and explanation about the Manhattan traffic system finally leads to intersubjectivity between the two interlocutors, as evidenced by Ara's utterance, "*e e e, alasse*". (line 19).

Extract 3 below shows that the speaker reformulates his prior statement using *maliya* with additional explanation that is critical to construct intersubjectivity between two conversational co-participants. Prior to extract 3, Jae was complaining to his sister, Hye that he had to spend a lot of money on rent, movement, and travelling.

```
Extract3. [ko_5343, 12:17-12:42]
  01. Jae:   tto     cha-kkaci tto   ton     tule kasseyo, tto.
             again   car-even  again money   spend          again
             'I also had to spend money even on a car.'.
  02. Hye:   cha?(0.2) way?  way?
             car       why   why
             'Car? Why? Why?'
  03. Jae: ->ai,  cha samman  ochen mail tha-ss-canha¿.
             well car 30,000  5,000 mile ride-pst-you know
  04. Hye:   e(1.0) °ku[lemyenun°]
             OK,       then
             'OK, then….'
  05. Jae: ->          [samman ochen  mail-i-myen khillo-lo
                        30,000 5,000  mile-cop-if kilo-into
  06.      ->oman     khillo-la-n maliya.
             50,000   kilo-dc-rl  maliya
             '35,000 miles are equivalent to 50,000 kilometers, maliya'
  07. Hye:   (0.5) ha:::::, manh::::i:::::to tha-ss-ta.
                   Oh, my!  a lot            ride-pst-dc
  08.        oman     khillo?
             50,000   kilo
             'Oh, my, you've driven so far, 50,000 kilometers?'.
  09. Jae:   ung,    oman    khillo nemci.
             Yes     50,000  kilo   exceed
             'Yes, more than 50,000 kilometers'
```

Jae states that he had to pay extra money on his car (line 1), and Hye asks the reason (line 2). Note how Hye responds to Jae's account that he has driven his car for 3,500 miles. In line 4, Hye says "*e*" first, and continues her turn after a long pause (1.0), adding, "*kulemyenun*" in a distinctively soft voice, which means that she needs time to process information. That is, Hye's response to Jae's account demonstrates that she needs time to convert miles to kilometers with which she is familiar. Acknowledging Hye's delayed response, Jae's next turn (line 5-6), overlapping with Hye's turn, is designed for the recipient to come to understanding with ease (Sacks and Schegloff 1974). Jae recycles part of his prior turn ("*cha samman ochen mail thasscanha*" line 3) and reformulates it including converting information using *maliya* ("*samman ochen mailimyen khillolo oman khillolan maliya*" line 5-6), which evokes the recipient's immediate response (line 7).

```
  03  Jae: ai, cha samman ochen mail tha-ss-canha¿.
  05  Jae: samman ochen mail-i-myen khillo-lo oman khillo-lan
           maliya.
```

Hye finally displays her understanding with a big surprise employing prosodic resources such as high pitch, elongation and loud voice (line 7).

5 Marking an affiliative stance to accomplish intersubjectivity via quoting others

This section will focus on the instances of quoting a counterpart speaker, not a speaker himself. As a result of quoting other's talk, a speaker attempts to construct intersubjectivity between interlocutors, displaying an affiliative stance toward the other party. In extract 4 below, Hye and Min are talking about a member of Hye's host family, Randy.

```
Extract4. [ko_6735, 12:07-12:30]
   01. Min:   toykey chincelhakey mal-ul   ha-nun kes
             very   kindly        words-ac do-rl  thing
   02.       kathtelako.     kulay ttak    tule
             seem-I noticed  so    exactly listen-conn
   03.       pw-ass-teni    al-keyss-tela::.
             see-pst-evid   know-dct:re-I noticed
             'It seemed that he speaks so kindly, so I could see how kind he is'.
   04. Hye:  ung. ung. kwaynchanh-un kes    kathay.
             Uh huh    nice-rl        thing  seem-ie
   05.       °ung°. cal   mann-ass-e.=
              right. well  meet-pst-ie
             'Uh-huh. He seems nice. It is good to have him as my host family.
   06. Min:  =cengmal yeca-ka    pok-i    nam-ass::-ney [laugh]
              really   woman-nom luck-nom exceed-pst-fr
             'His wife is really lucky'.
   07. Hye:  e.     cikum i     yeca-nun   umsik ha-l
             right  now    this  woman-top  food  do-rl
   08.       cwul-ul      molu-ke::tun.
             the way-ac   don't know-correl
             'Right, she can't cook well.'
   09. Min: -> tekwntana yeca-ka    umsik-to  mos  hanun-tey
             besides,  woman-nom food-too  neg  do-circum
   10.     -> maliya.(laugh)
             maliya
             'Besides, she is even poor at cooking, maliya'.
   11. Hye:  e.    umsik hanun- umsik hanun kes-ul    silhehay::
             right food  do-rl  food  do-rl thing-ac dislike:ie
   12.       (0.7). kulay, cwulo    incey ppallay kathun
                    so     usually  dm    laundry such
   13.       ke-l      ha-ki-n      ha-nuntey  kuhhkes-to
             thing-ac do-noml-top  do-circum  that-too
   14.       nanwese      ha-ci↑
             divide-conn  do-comm
             'Yeah, she hate- hates cooking. She does laundry, but shares the work
             with him'.
```

Min states that a member of Hye's host family, Randy, seems to be a very nice person based on her experience of listening to his voiced message on the phone (line 1, 2, 3). Hye assesses that she is fortunate to have a host family member like Randy (line 4,5), showing her affiliation with Min's statement. Min suddenly directs their collaborative assessment toward Randy's wife, saying, "*cengmal yecaka poki namass::ney*" (line 6), which is supported by the evidence that she is a clumsy cook as in line 7, 8. Note how Min shows her affiliative stance with Hye in line 9, 10. Min recycles part of Hye's prior turn with an employment of *maliya*, which resembles what Du Bois termed as diagraph, "the structure of the stance parallels" (Du Bois 2007:159).

```
07-08 Hye: e. cikum i yecanun umsik   hal cwulul moluke::tun.
           어. 지금   이 여자는   음식(을) 할 줄을    모르거::든
09-10 Min: tekwuntana yecaka  umsikto mos hanuntey maliya
           더군다나      여자가  음식도  못  하는데    말이야.
```

As shown above, Min responds to Hye in a very similar way, displaying her affiliative stance by switching particles (from *ul* to *to*), adding a connective (*tekwuntana*), and employing a sentence ender as *maliya*. The particle change from umsik (*ul*)[1] to *umsikto*, along with insertion of *tekwuntana* (besides) suggest that it is additional information that can validate Min's previous assessment toward Randy's wife. This can be understood as "I cannot agree with you more, because you are providing important evidence to support my assertion (*cengmal yecaka poki namassney*, line 6). Hence, the *maliya* construction in the extract 4 takes an affiliative stance by quoting the other party's talk, suggesting that what the speaker can say is already mentioned by the other party.

6 Marking a disaffilative stance to enforce intersubjectivity without quotation

In the previous section, the *maliya* construction is used to emphasize the information for the recipient to share the epistemic stance with a speaker by quoting the speaker himself, or display an affiliative stance with the counterpart speaker via quoting the other party's talk. Hence, the intersubjectivity is constructed in interaction between two participants by restating the preceding turn or sequence, which serves the common ground for co-participants to establish. In this section, *maliya* is used to urge the recipient to understand the speaker's utterance that was not shared between co-participants in the preceding turn or sequence. Thus, the speaker displays his/her strong stance urging the other party to solicit congruent understanding unilaterally even before

---

[1] Object particles, *–ul* and *–lul* are often omitted in Korean colloquial speech.

constructing common ground between co-participants. Extract 5 shows the example that the *maliya* construction requires the recipient to share the speaker's stance in a rather forceful way. In the previous talk, Jun talks to his sister Mia about the kindergarten that his child attends.

```
Extract5. [ko_5343, 8:04-8:15]
   01. Jun:   kuntey yeki-nun mwe kulen key   epse. (1.0)
              but    here-ac dm  such  thing non-exist:ie
   02.        mwucoken          camkkanman
              unconditionally   wait a minute
              'But here, there's nothing like that, not flexible at all. Wait a minute.'
   03. Mia:   °ung°.
              all right.
              'All right.'
   04. Jun:   camkkanman.  apeci-ka    sewul-eyse  fax-ponay-n
              wait a minute father-nom  seoul-from  fax-sent-rl
   05.        ke      kath-ketun↑.
              thing   seem-CORREL
              'Just a minute. It seems that father sent me a fax from Seoul'
   06. Mia:   °ung°.
              all right.
              'All right.'
   07. Jun:   ku nay-ka com issta      tasi  hal- a  ney-ka
              dm i-nom  a little later  again do  ah you-nom
   08.        com issta      tasi   hal-lay?
              a little later  again  do-vol
              'I will call you back later aga-, can you call me back later?'
   09. Mia:   (.)a:::i::: ike  kongccaintey     ike
                 Oh, no!  this free-cop-circum  this
   10.     -> kkunhu-myen  incey  kkuth-i-la-n    maliya.::::=
              hang up-cond  dm    end-cop-dc-rl   maliya
              'Oh, no! This is a free call, so once I hang up, that's it, maliya.'
   11. Jun:   =a  kulay       kulem kitalye¿.
               ah all right   then  wait:imp
   12. Mia:   e,       al-ass-e
              Uh huh  know-pst-ie
              'OK.'
              (1 minute later, they resume their talk on the phone)
```

While complaining about the kindergarten Jun's child attends (line 1), he abruptly tells Mia to hold the phone for a moment (line 2), informing her that he needs to receive a fax from his father (line 4, 5). Mia exhibits her willingness to wait for Jun (line 6), but he asks her to hang up the phone and call him back a little later (line 7, 8). Then, Mia pauses a little and initiates her turn with the negative interjection particle, *a::i::,* in a loud voice with elongation (line 9), implying a prelude to rejection. She deploys *maliya* to refuse Jun's request, providing a reason that their free conversation ends once

they hang up the phone (line 9, 10). The information that it is a free conversation for thirty minutes is new to Jun, because it was mentioned to Jun's wife in the beginning of the conversation, and Jun's wife suddenly put Mia's brother on the phone in the middle of talk.

In Mia's utterance, "*ike kongccaintey ike kkunhumyen incey kkuthilan maliya*", *-lan maliya* is a form used for indirect reported speech. Thus, the sentence preceding *-lan maliya* should be quoted, namely, it should be mentioned in the previous talk. Yet, the *maliya* construction in extract 5 does not quote any utterance in the preceding talk. Mia utters this information using *maliya* without any elaboration, even before building common ground with Jun in the previous sequence. With an elision of the sequence that can negotiate the stance between co-participants, Mia shows her strong and disaffiliative stance against Jun's request. She rejects Jun's request, urging him to share her stance in a straightforward way. Note that this is contradictory to the context frequently observed in daily conversation in Korean, where politeness is highly recommended, and the dispreferred responses are often delayed to mitigate disaffiliation as a part of a face-saving strategy (e.g. *kuntey* in final position, S.H., Kim and S. O., Sohn 2015). When compared to the stance marker, *-nun ke ani*, which argues the claim against the addressee's statement in an indirect way (M.S., Kim 2015), the *maliya* construction is used to respond to the addressee's assertion without delay, rebutting to it in a more direct way, urging the counterpart speaker to display his/her agreement. Hence, in response to Mia's strong refusal with an employment of *maliya*, Jun tells her to wait instead until he comes back (line 11).

7   Conclusion

The current study examined how the stance marker *maliya* establishes intersubjectivity between interlocutors in naturally-occurring conversation, employing a conversation analytic approach. The findings report that *maliya* portrays the speaker's epistemic, affiliative, and disaffiliative stance in different sequential contexts, attempting to accomplish intersubjectivity between co-participants. First, the interlocutor quotes his previous talk to solicit the other party's understanding, positioning him/herself in a higher epistemic stance. Secondly, the speaker attempts to establish intersubjectivity, marking an affiliative stance by citing the counterpart speaker's words in the preceding talk, and the preceding turn or sequence serves to negotiate common ground between co-participants. *Maliya* is also deployed to display the interlocutor's disaffiliative stance when quoting none of the previous turn. In this case, the speaker shows his disagreement with the counterpart speaker, urging him to share the speaker's stance unilaterally in the absence of negotiation. It is hoped that the current study contributes to the growing body of knowledge in Korean reported speech and stancetaking in social interactions.

References

Ahn, M. K. 2012. A pragmatic role of Korean maliya in discourse. *Tamhwawa Inci* 19(1):103-17.

Ahn, M. K., & Yap, F.H. 2013. Negotiating common ground in discourse: a diachronic and discourse analysis of maliya in Korean. *Language Sciences* 37:36–51.

Ahn, M. K., & Yap, F.H. 2014. On the development of Korean SAY evidentials and their extended pragmatic functions. *Diachronica* 31:299-336.

Du Bois, J. W. 2007. The stance triangle. In *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, ed. Robert Englebretson, 139–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Heritage, J. 1984. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holt, E., & Clift, R. (Eds.). 2006. *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Käkkäinen, E. 2006. Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk – An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 16(6):699-731

Kim, H. R. S. 2013. Reshaping the response space with kulenikka in beginning to respond to questions in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 57:303-17.

Kim, M. K. 2011. Malita kwusenguy mwunpephwawa hwayonghwa, *Kwukehak* 62:73-106.

Kim, M. S. 2015. Stancetaking in the face of incongruity in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83:57-72.

Kim, S. H., & Sohn, S. O. 2015. Grammar as an emergent response to interactional needs: A study of final kuntey 'but' in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83:73-90.

Ko, E. S., Han, N. R., Caravan, A., Zipperlen, G. 2003. Korean Telephone Conversation Speech. Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium.

Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization for turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696-735.

Seo, H. J. 2010. A study on the discourse marker 'malida' in Korean language education. *Bilingual Rese*arch 43:217-46.