

Who did that to you?

Conversational Tactics for Solicitation and Evasion in Referent Identification

HYOBIN WON

1 Introduction

This paper follows a referent-seeking journey in Korean conversation. The conversation dealt with in this paper occurs between two graduate students who are in different academic fields. The two participants discuss about what it is like to be in each of their spheres. CY, who studies engineering, grumbles about some stereotypes against people in his field and shares his humiliating experience regarding the topic. In the unfolding conversation, he tries to continue to narrate with placing the main focus on his emotional status towards the situation, yet at the same time does not expose any information about some referents. However, his effort is persistently challenged by his interlocutor, HB, who puts forth an effort to identify the referents that she assumes to be the core of the story. The conflicting conver-

sational aims motivate the two interlocutors to tactically manipulate their turn-in-talk. The conversation involves two major referents, 'the content of the bias' and 'the person who made insulting remarks'. By tracking the conversation chronologically, the paper delves into the strategies mobilized to solicit the referents and evade answering them.

2 Background

2.1 The principle of intersubjectivity and progressivity

Referential negotiation has been studied with respect to the organization of reference. Sacks and Schegloff (1979) observe two major preferences in their paper on personal references; intersubjectivity and progressivity. The principle of intersubjectivity is a preference for common ground secured by recognition of reference by the interlocutor. On the other hand, the principle of progressivity is sought by a desire to minimize interruption. When these two preferences are not concurrently satisfied, speakers mobilize organizational methods to integrate them. The studies in this vein usually focus on the occasions where the speaker of 'reference' is the one who pursues establishment of intersubjectivity, therefore, initiates a repair to improve recognizability of the reference. However, this is not the case for the current study. In the conversation in this paper, the recipient eagerly struggles to elicit the referent in preference to common ground over minimization, while the producer of reference tries to elude the persistent investigation in respect for progressivity. In this circumstance in which the two preferences are in conflict, the speakers exploit a number of conversational tactics in pursuit of accomplishing each of their goal.

2.2 Question design

Questioning is primarily conducted for obtaining information. However, questions can play further roles in interaction. Sack (1995a) claims that "As long as one is in the position of doing the questions, then in part they have control of the conversation." In order to elicit a preferred answer, i.e., to manage the interaction, speakers shape questions with great care and specify the form that answers should take. Question type is one of the significant features that can be maneuvered. For instance, while Wh-questions often seek a particular piece of information expected by its question word, yes/no polar questions provide only two options. When Wh-questions require a more specified answer, yes/no polar questions can press answerers into either yes or no. By imposing such constraints on answers, questions can be a powerful tool in controlling interaction

(Hayano, 2012). In this study, the referent-seeker manipulates question types skillfully as a means to solicit the exact answer from the interlocutor.

2.3 Response design

Responses are made in various fashions under restraints imposed by the questions. Additionally, respondents have to deal with complex environments where an inclination to build solidarity and a desire to be independent are intertwined. In order to manage these situational barriers, the type of answer is meticulously selected. While the most common and preferred type of response is ‘answer’, ‘non-answer’, such as I don’t know, is employed signaling disalignment with the question. For yes/no polar questions, the type-conforming answers (yes/no) are considered the default form, yet nonconforming responses are mobilized with certain conversational purpose. Repetitions, as a type of the nonconforming answers, ‘confirm’ rather than ‘affirm’ the proposition raised by the question, thereby asserting the respondent’s epistemic rights (Lee, 2012). Minimal repeats, on the other hand, exhibit distinct functions such as prompting a closure of the sequence (Kim, 2016). Transformative responses are another type that confirms a different question than was originally posed (Stivers, 2011). Through slight adjustments, they seek to alter the terms or agendas of the question, indicating difficulty of providing a direct answer. In the data used for this study, the producer of the reference mobilizes a variety of response types to successfully evade a barrage of the questions launched by the referent-seeker.

3 Data and methodology

The seven fragments analyzed for this study were extracted from a fifteen-minute long video-taped conversation between two graduate students of different genders. While the female participant is a year younger than the male participant, they have been close friends for over two years. Therefore, they have a great deal of shared background on which the negotiation in this study was able to be established. The identification seeks two major referents; a content referent and a person referent. The two referent-works are scrutinized through conversational analytic approach, focusing on the strategies applied by the participants for achieving their own conversational objective. The study neither concentrates on a particular linguistic form or function, nor deductively analyzes some patterns. Instead, through a chronological tracking, it examines the tactics one by one with reference to the timely and collaboratively maneuvered manners they are utilized in.

4 Referent identification

4.1 What is that? (Content referent)

In line 1, CY begins his turn introducing a new topic. HB, who does not catch his idea immediately, throws a few questions to clarify it.

Fragment (1): Requesting exemplification / *I don't know* and prevaricating

- 1 CY: 한 번씩 보면은 약간 편견이 있잖아
han pen-ssik po-myen-un yakkhan phyenkyen-i iss-canh-a.
one time-each see-COND-TOP little bias-NOM exist-not-COM.not-IE
Once a while people have a few biases,
- 2 엔지니어링 학생들한테.
eyncinieling haksayng-tul-hanthey.
engineering student-PL-to
Against engineering students.
- 3 → HB: 어떤?=
ette-n?=
be.how-RL
Such as?
- 4 → CY: =모르겠어. (0.5) 그 뭔가 그런 게 있어 뭐가 (1.0)
=molu-keyss-e (0.5) ku mwen-ka kule-n key iss-e
mwen-ka (1.0)
not.know-CONJ-IE that something-NOM be.so-RL thing+NOM exist-IE
something-NOM
I don't know. There is something like that.
- 5 뭐 그 사람들이 한 번씩 (1.0)
mwe ku salam-tul-i han pen-ssik (1.0)
what that people-PL-NOM one time-each
Once a while
- 6 그냥 아무 생각 없이 우리한테 그렇게 얘기를 하는데
kunyang amwu sayngkak eps-i wuli-hanthey kulehkey yayki-lul ha-nunthey
just at.all thought not.have-ADV us-to like.that talk-ACC do-CIRCUM
people just say that without thinking
- 7 사실 듣는 입장에서는 좀 (1.0)
sasil tut-nun ipcang-eyse-nun com (1.0)
fact listen-RL position-from-TOP little
In fact, as a listener
- 8 마음-압- 마음에 안 들 때도 있거든.
maum-am- maum-ey an tul ttayto iss-ketun.
min-ma- mind-LOC not come.in-R time-also exist-INFO
Sometimes it is offensive.

In fragment (1-3), HB requires CY to provide clarification through 3 questions. The first question is asked as soon as the new topic is dragged into the conversation. By uttering *once a while, people have a few biases against engineering student*, he does not explicate what the *biases* are. Thereby, HB requests him to exemplify it through the first question, *such as?* (in line 3). However, CY does not yield an exact answer. Instead, he rapidly responds with a phrase *I don't know* resisting answering to HB's question (Weatherall, 2011). After a pause of 0.5 seconds, CY wraps up the reply with a somewhat prevaricating utterance, *there is something like*

that (line 4). Another second later, he resumes his turn but moves on to a different point involving his evaluation of the people's behavior. Through these strategies, CY reveals his unwillingness to focusing on the content of the *biases* itself and tries to shift HB's interest to his emotions.

However, HB does not give up there and asks the second question in fragment (2).

Fragment (2): Reshaping question / Transforming answer

- 9 → HB: 뭐라고 [하는데
mwe-lako [ha-nunthey
what-QT do-CIRCUM
What do they say?
- 10 → CY: [뭐라고 하나면은 뭐 (0.5)
[mwe-lako ha-nya-myen-un mwe (0.5)
what-QT do-Q-COND-TOP what
What they say is like,
- 11 뭐 그런 거 있잖아. 인터넷에 보면은 뭐
mwe kule-n ke iss-canh-a. intheney-s-ey po-myen-un mwe.
what be.so-RL thing exist-not-COM.not-IE internet-LOC see-COND-TOP what
You know, there is something like that. Online.
- 12 공대생 편견 뭐 이런 거 있거든.
kongtaysayng phyenkyen mwe ile-n ke iss-ketun.
engineering.student bais what be.so-RL exist-INFO
There are things like engineering student stereotypes.
- 13 HB: 응.
ung
yes
Yes.
- 14 CY: 알아?
al-a?
know-IE
Do you know that?
- 15 HB: 아니요?
ani-yo
no-POL
No.
- 16 → CY: hh.. 그런 게 있어
hh.. kule-n ke-y iss-e
hh.. be.so-RL thing+NOM exist-IE
hh.. There are such things.
- 17 → >근데 그런 거를< 내놓고 앞에서 얘기해 (0.3) 나한테
>kunthey kule-n ke-lul<. taynoh-ko aph-eyse yaykiha-y (0.3) na-
hanthey.
just be.so-RL thing-ACC outspoken-and front-LOC talk-IE (0.3) me-to.
But such things, they say outspokenly. To me.

In line 9, however, HB brings up the question again. This time, the previously short phrase, *such as*, is reformulated into a longer sentence, *what do they say?*, slightly elevating the level of burden. Thereby being urged by the second request, CY produces an utterance partially repeating HB's turn (line 10). It is noteworthy that CY's turn is launched in the middle of

HB's turn where TRP has not been reached. He initiates his turn repeating a part of HB's utterance, *what (mwelako)*, right after the part is verbalized by HB. The placement of the response insinuates that CY was under pressure to provide more information.

However, CY's modified answer in line 12-13 still does not offer a clear example of the *biases*. Rather, he employs 'the Internet' as the resource for the notion which HB is also familiar with. This tactic can be explained with respect to the concept of 'transformative answer'. According to Stivers (2011), 'transformative answer' is a type of answer that confirms a different question than was originally posed. Through slightly transforming the answer, CY presumes HB has encountered the content of the *biases* online before, which in turn removes the need for his further explanation. Under this expectation, CY treats HB's reactive token as a positive answer to his assumption (line 13-14). However, this turns out to be misguided in line 15. After the strategy has failed, CY produces an audible laughter for obscuring a loss of face (Warner-Garcia, 2014) and glosses over the turn saying *there are such things* (line 16). Then he rushes into the next utterance by compressing the beginning part *but such things* (line 17). He attempts to divert the focus from 'the content' of the *biases* to 'the manner' by which people express those. Here, CY adds *to me* as a turn-increment after 0.3 seconds so as to spotlight 'how he felt' (Kim, 2000).

However, persistent HB tries one more time to identify the *biases* in fragment (3).

Fragment (3): Reshaping question / Diverting focus

- 18 → HB: 뭐예요?=
mwe-yey-yo?=
what-COP-POD
What is that?
- 19 CY: =뭐 (0.5) 뭐 사회생활을 뭐 잘 못한다 아니면은 뭐
=mwe (0.5) mwe sahoisaynghwal-ul mwe cal moshanta ani-myen-un mwe
what what social.life-ACC what well be.bad-DC not-COND-TOP what
Well, (engineering students are) bad at social skills, or
- 20 대화를 잘 못한다 뭐 이런 얘기를
tayhwa-lul cal moshanta mwe ile-n yayki-lul
conversation-ACC well be.bad-DC what be.so-RL talk-ACC
bad at conversations, something like that,
- 21 HB: (([Laugh]))
- 22 CY: [앞에서 대놓고 대놓고 얘기해.
[aph-eyse taynoh- taynoh-ko yaykiha-y.
front-LOC outspoken- outspoken-and talk-IE
They say that outspokenly.

In line 18, as the third trial soliciting the same information, HB reshapes the question into more forthright words, *What is that?*. Thereupon after a

prefacing *mwe* (*well*) and 0.5 seconds of pause signaling hesitation, CY eventually answers to the question with two instances containing uncomplimentary assessment of engineering students (line 19-20). In line 21, HB launches a laughter as a reaction to the answer CY has provided. It frames the context as laughable and non-serious, and thereby, the face-threatening quality of the remarks is slightly concealed (Warner-Garcia, 2014). In line 22, CY finishes his turn repeating his own words in line 17 in order to re-orient the focus from the demeaning examples to the prior context.

4.2 Who is that? (Personal referent)

Having discovered the content of the biases, HB's interest turns to another curiosity. In line 23, she introduces a new reference, i.e., the agent of the malicious behavior into the conversation.

Fragment (4): Changing question type / Shifting target

- 23 → HB: 누가 그래요? 공대생 아닌 사람들이?
 nwu-ka kulay-yo? kongtaysayng ani-n salam-tul-i?
 who-NOM be.so-POL? engineering.student not-PL people-PL-NOM
 Who do that? People who are not engineering students?
- 24 → CY: >뭐 근데 사실< 여기 와서도 나한테 그렇게- (0.5)
 >mwe kuntey sasil< yeki wa-se-to na-hanthey kulehkey- (0.5)
 what but fact here come-and-also me-to like.that-
 Well, but, in fact, after I got here, to me, like that-
- 25 나보고 그런 게 아니고 (0.3) 공대생 전반적으로 얘기를 하는데,
 na-poko kule-n ke-y ani-ko (0.3) kongtaysayng cenpancek-ulo
 yayki-lul ha-nuntye,
 me-to be.so-RL thing+NOM not-and engineering.student over.all-by
 talk-ACC do-CIRCUM
 It's not (they) targeted me, (they) talked about engineering students in general but,
- 26 그걸 내 앞에서 그렇게 얘기를 했었어.
 kukel nay aph-eyse kulehkey yayki-lul hayss-ess-
 that.thing+ACC my front-LOC like.that talk-ACC do-PST-IE
 (they) said that in my face.
- 27 HB: 아 기분 나쁘겠다.
 a kipwun nappu-keyss-ta.
 a mood bad-CONJ-DC
 Ah, that must feel awful.
- 28 CY: 기분 나빴지,
 kipwun napp-ass-ci,
 mood bad-PST-COM
 I felt bad.
- 29 HB: 응.
 ung.
 yes
 Yes.

HB's question is divided into two parts; an interrogative question (*Who do that?*) and a tag question consisting of a noun clause followed by the nominative particle *i* (*People who are not engineering students?*) (line 23).

The second part transforms the whole question from a *Wh-* question to a yes/no polar question. While a *Wh-* question seeks a certain type of answer expected by its question word (in this case, *who*), a yes/no polar question, on the other hand, provides only two choices. Additionally, the agenda set by the polar question, ‘a group’, is less specific than ‘a person’ required by the *Wh-* question. Therefore, the question form shifting lightens the burden of being too specific, but at the same time, presses CY into the limited options, *yes* or *no*. (Hayano, 2012).

As he did in the previous conversation, however, CY manages to elude HB’s question. In line 24, his turn begins with a prefacing hedging marker *mwe* (*well*) and the discourse marker *kuntey* (*but*) signaling forthcoming disalignment with the preceding context (Kim & Suh, 2010). The first part of the turn *in fact, after I got here, to me, like that-* is followed by a 0.5 seconds of pause and resumes after an initiation of a repair (line 24-25). Through the repair, CY restructures the prior utterance to differentiate the two entities, ‘himself’ and ‘people in the field’, and by doing so, excludes himself from the humiliating circumstance. In line 26, CY ends his turn reciting the fact that it happened ‘in his presence’. Thereupon, HB displays an empathic evaluation affiliating with CY, and this is, in turn, appreciated by him with a repeat (line 27-28). CY seems to have succeeded to elude answering HB’s question along with the closure of the sequence.

In fragment (5), however, the second trial is implemented.

Fragment (5): Seeking clues / Minimal repeat and Shifting topic

- 30 → HB: 누가- 공대생 아닌 사람이 그렸어요?
 nwu-ka- kongtaysayng ani-n salam-I kulay-ss-eyo?
 who-NOM, engineering.student not-PL people-NOM do.so-PST-POL?
 Who- Did someone who is not an engineering student do that?
- 31 CY: 그렸지.
 kulay-ss-ci.
 do.so-PST-COM
 (S/he) did.
- 32 → HB: 누구야 한국인이예요?
 nwukwu-ya hankwukin-i-eyyo?
 who-IE Korean-COP-POL?
 Who is that, Korean?
- 33 CY: 그렇지 뭐 미국 애들은 얘기 그런 거 잘 안 하잖아.
 kuleh-ci mwe mikwuk ay-tul-un yayki kulen ke cal an
 ha-canh-a.
 do.so-COM what America kid-PL-CST talk be.so-PL thing well not
 do-not-COM.not-IE
 Sure, Americans don’t talk about that.
- 34 HB: 그렇지 그렇지 미국 애들은 잘 안 하지.
 kuleh-ci kuleh-ci mikwuk aytulun cal an ha-ci.
 do.so-COM do.so-COM America kid-PL-CST well not do-COM
 Right, right, Americans don’t.

- 35 → CY: 그랬었어 근데 뭐-
 kulay-ss-ess-e kuntey mwe-
 be.so-PST-PST-IE but what
 It was like that. But well..

In line 30, HB technically repeats the first question with a minimal modification. But this time, after verbalizing *nwuka* (*who*), she initiates a repair and employs a complete yes/no polar question in order to solicit the answer more efficiently given the same rationale stated above. CY, prompted by the second question, provides an affirming answer in a minimal form of predicate repeat, *kulayssci* (line 31). Kim (2016) claims that “minimal repeats in response to yes/no polar questions tend to promote a closure of the current sequence, with the respondents not elaborating further on the response.” Considering CY has been trying to escape from the chain of referent pursuing, he seeks to close the sequence and forestall any further comment from HB by deploying the minimal repeat.

Meanwhile, after completing the first mission, HB goes on to the next question looking for another instructive clue for the referent, i.e. ‘nationality’ (line 32). HB initiates the question with a *Wh-* question, *who is that*, but this is immediately followed by a yes/no polar question. Here it can be construed that the *Wh-* question is positioned to preface the yes/no question to mitigate the assertiveness potentially triggered by a barrage of ‘pressing’ polar questions. This time, CY willingly expresses affirmation to the yes/no polar question with a nonconforming type of answer (non-yes/no), *kulehci* (*sure*), and adds the reason why the answer is obvious (line 33). HB, who has secured the second clue, displays agreement by repeating the preceding turn immediately showing her affiliation (line 34). However, in line 35, CY employs a predicate with past tense markers, *kulayssesse* (*it was like that*) and the discourse marker *kente* (*but*) as an attempt to not only wind up the referent work, but change the topic.

In fragment (6), persevering HB approaches to the referent with a different strategy.

Fragment (6): Conciliating / Shifting target

- 36 → HB: 누구예요 내가 때려 줄게.
 nwukwu-y-eyyo nay-ka ttayly-e cwu-lkey.
 who-COP-POL I-NOM hit-INF give-will
 Who is that? I will beat them up.
- 37 → CY: (smile) hhh >아무튼 근데 그때 이제 <그런 얘기 했는데 (0.5) 그때 막 (1.0)
 (smile) hhh >amwuthun kuntey kuttay icey< kule-n yayki ha-yss-nuntey (0.5)
 kuttay mak (1.0)
 hhh any.way by.the.way that.time now be.so-RL talk do-PST-CIRCUM
 that.time just
 (smile) hhh Anyway, by the way, they talked about that, at that time.

- 38 → 내::가 듣기에는 (0.3) 되게 나를 그런 식으로. 우리를 그런 식으로 얘기하길래
 nay::-ka tut-ki-ey-nun (0.3) toykey na-lul kule-n sik-ulo- wuli-lul kule-n
 sik-ulo yaykiha-killay
 I-NOM listen-NM-LOC-TOP very I-ACC be.so-RL way-by we-ACC be.so-RL
 way-by talk-because
 As I understood, they were talking about me, about us, like that,
- 39 >나는 사실 그 자리에서< 좀 기분이 나빠가지구.
 >na-nun sasil ku cali-eyse< com kipwun-i napp-akacikwu.
 I-TOP fact that seat-LOC little mood-NOM bad-because
 I felt offended at the moment.
- 40 HB: 응.
 ung.
 yes
 Yes.

In line 36, as the third trial, HB re-issues the reference in a *Wh-* question form and adds another comment, *I will beat them up*. By applying this new tactic, she displays her affiliation to conciliate CY, implying she could even confer a favor for him, yet in a playful tone. However, CY, who is not persuaded, smoothly slips it over with a faint smile and an audible out-breath (line 37) and initiates his turn with the topic shifters, *am-wuthun* (anyway) and *kuntey* (by the way) with noticeably compressing the beginning part. Then he turns back to the topic that was on hold due to a few interruptions and resumes describing ‘what happened’. It is notable that in line 38, a repair is initiated as an attempt to divert the focus from ‘himself’ to ‘the group he belongs to’ (*about me* → *about us*). This insinuates that CY consciously disassociates himself from being a ‘victim’ of the misconception by repeatedly replacing ‘himself’ with ‘the group’. Then, in the end, he explicitly reveals the offended feelings re-situating ‘his affective status’ on top of the topic.

In fragment (7), CY finally confides the referent.

Fragment (7): Narrowing down options / providing cues instead of answer

- 41 → HB: 누구야 누구 [일학년 때 있던-]
 nwukwu-ya nwukwu [ilhaknyen ttay] iss-te-n
 who-IE who freshmen that.time exist-RT-RL
 Who is that? Who. (Someone) who was a 1st-year (student)?
- 42 CY: [너가 그때] 너가 안 좋아하는 애들이 개네들
 [ne-ka kuttay] ne-ka an cohaha-nun ay-tul-i kyayney-tul
 you-NOM that.time you-NOM not like-RL kid-PL-NOM the.kids-PL
 You at that time. The kids you don’t like.
- 43 → HB: 누구요 개네? 개네?
 nwukwuyo kyayney? kyayney?
 who-POL the.kids the.kids
 Who do you mean? Those kids? Those kids?
- 44 CY: 어 아니 그 (0.5) 그 있잖아 개네 (0.3) 신입생들 작년 신입생들
 e ani ku (0.5) ku iss-canh-a kyayney (0.3) sinipsayng-tul caknyen sinipsayngtul
 yes no the exist-not-COM.not-IE the.kids new.student-PL last.year new.student-PL
 Yes, yes, well, you know, the new students from last year.

- 45 → HB: 아 여자애들=
a yeca-ay-tul?
a woman-kid-PL
Oh, the girls?
- 46 → CY: =어 그래가지고 (0.5) 그래서-
=e kulay-kaciko (0.5) kulayse-
yes be.so-because so
Yes, anyway, so-
- 47 → HB: 그 말한 애 혹시 개예요? (0.3) 개? (0.3) 개 사건 많은 애?
ku malha-n ay hoksi kyay-y-eyyo? (0.3) kyay? (0.3) kyay saken manh-un ay?
the tell-RL kid by.any.chance the.kid-COP-POL? the.kid that incident many-RL kid
Is that kid you mean THE kid? The kid? The kid with many troubles?
- 48 CY: 어 맞아.
e mac-e.
yes be.right-IE
Yes, right.
- 49 HB: 내가 말했죠 오빠. 개는 안 될 애라고.
nay-ka malha-yss-cyo oppa. kyay-nun an toy-l ay-lako.
I-NOM tell-PST-COM.POL older.brother the.kid-TOP not be-RL kid-QT
I told you, Oppa. She was never going to be good.
- 50 CY: 나는 사실 그::때부터 개에 대한:: 생각은 그랬었지.
na-nun sasil ku::ttay-pwuthe kyay-ey tayha-n:: sayngkak-un kula-yss-ess-ci.
I-TOP fact that.time-from the.kid-LOC toward-RL idea-TOP be.so-PST-PST-COM
Actually, my impression of her has been like that since then.

In line 41, HB tries to narrow down the options eliciting ‘school year’ as a new clue. CY, however, does not answer to the question straightforward, instead, provides different information which turns out to be based on the two speakers shared background (line 42). Also, while he introduces the new information, CY modifies the subject to a plural form (*the kids*) implying the referent is not a single person. HB only vaguely catches the clue and requests clarification repeating the new form of the reference *kyayney* (*the kids*) twice (line 43). In line 44, CY gives another hint that delineates critical characteristics of a certain group (*the new students from last year*). Thereupon, HB grasps the hint and asks confirmation for another category, ‘gender’, to minutely refine her presumption (line 45). However, after a short confirming answer, CY attempts to turn back on the track, which is signaled by *kulaykaciko* (*anyway*) (line 46). The topic shifting *so-* is yet cut off by HB’s interruption with the second confirmation seeking question and this is specified by elaboration of a specific person, *the kid with many troubles?* (line 47). In line 48, eventually, CY confides the referent to HB through the signal of affirmation, *e mace* (*yes, right*). Having achieved the goal, HB exhibits her assessment of ‘the person’ so as to resonate with CY’s affective stance (line 49). After the mutual understanding is attained through HB’s affiliation, CY discards what he has been trying to continue, yet displays his evaluation aligning with HB.

5 Conclusion

The study has thoroughly examined a course of referential negotiation following the flow of the conversation sequentially. The data used for this study is distinctive in that the one who seeks for common ground is not the speaker of the reference, but his interlocutor. This deviant role assignment created an intriguing situation where the two speakers have to confront each other pursuing opposing conversational goals. In the unfolding conversation, the both speakers utilized varying approaches to attain their own aim.

First, the referent-seeking participant, HB, tactically manages questions gradually closing in on the answer. She controls length, lexical components and type of the questions to reshape them suitable to each location. In the content referent work, she reformulates the same question twice; a short phrase, *such as*, into a longer sentence, *what do they say?*, then again, into more forthright words, *What is that?*. In the negotiation for the second referent, question types are mainly maneuvered. *Wh-* questions are shifted to yes/no polar questions not only to reduce the burden of providing a specific answer but to urge the interlocutor into two options (yes/no). Additionally, a *Wh-* question is also employed as a preface to a yes/no question as an effort to alleviate the forceful tone possibly generated by consecutive polar questions. The speaker also interrogates her interlocutor by raising clues one by one to narrow down the options. She even tries to conciliate him with display of affiliation. The referent-seeker, HB, eventually succeeds to identify the referents after all the adjustments and manipulations.

Next, the reference-producer, CY, as well mobilizes various techniques to efficiently evade giving the answers. Throughout the course of the conversation, this participant consistently diverts the focus from the referents to his affective status. Therefore, topic-shifting attempts are frequently observed at the end of the sequences. The discourse markers *kuntey* (*but*) and *amwuthun* (*anyway*) are the major devices employed for this function. The speaker actively exploits response types to elude referent-seeking questions. A non-answer *I don't know* is a method to resist answering along with glossing over (i.e. *there is something like that*). Minimal repeats are utilized to prompt a closure of the sequence and prevent further questions from the interlocutor. Transformative responses are another type of means deployed to avoid providing a direct answer by adjusting the terms of the question. The speaker also persistently differentiates 'himself' and the 'the group' to disassociate himself from the demeaning situation. Until the last moment, he exerts great efforts to escape from the

referent investigation, in the end, however, succumbs to the pressure and confides the referents.

This study followed the chronological tracking approach to scrutinize each strategy with regard to the organization of turn-in-talk. Since it is not the type of study in which a certain linguistic form or function is focused, it is not plausible to extract some patterns as a result. Nevertheless, through the close examination on timely organized sequences, it was observed that how speakers manipulate various tactics in the situations where the preference for intersubjectivity and progressivity and the desire to establish solidarity and to be independent are intricately entangled.

6 References

- Ford, C. E. and Fox, B. A. 1996. Interactional Motivations for Reference Formulation: He Had. This Guy Had, a Beautiful, Thirty-two O:lds, in B. Fox (ed) *Studies in Anaphora*, 145-68.
- Hayano, K. 2012. Question design in conversation, In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (Jack Sidnell, Tanya Stivers, eds.), Oxford, U.K., Wiley-Blackwell, 395-414.
- Heritage, J. 2007. Intersubjectivity and Progressivity in Person (and Place) Reference, in N.J. Enfield and T. Stivers (eds) *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kim, K. H. 2000. Turn Constructional Practice in Korean Conversation - Organization of Turn Increments, *Language Research*, 37(4), 885-922.
- Kim, K. H. & Suh, K. H. 2010. The Sentence-Ending Suffix - Ketun in Korean Conversation with Reference to -Nuntey : Sequence Organization and Management of Epistemic Rights. *Discourse and Cognition*, 17(3), 1-38.
- Kim, S. Y. 2016. Repetitional Responses in Korean Conversation, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Lee, S. H., 2012. Response design in conversation, In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (Jack Sidnell, Tanya Stivers, eds.), Oxford, U.K., Wiley-Blackwell, 415-432.
- Sacks, H. and Schegloff, E.A. 1979. Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and Their Interaction, in G. Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, 15-21.
- Stivers, T. & Hayashi, M. 2010. Transformative answers: One way to resist a question's constraints. *Language in Society*, 39(1), 1-25.
- Warner-Garcia, S. 2014. Laughing when nothing's funny: the pragmatic use of coping laughter in the negotiation of conversational disagreement. *Pragmatics* 24(1), 157-80.