

Identifying units in interaction: Reactive tokens in Korean and English conversations

Richard F. Young and Jina Lee

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Reactive tokens are conversational resources by which a listener co-constructs a speaker's turn at talk. The resources that are available include the forms of the reactive tokens themselves, their duration, and their placement by the listener in the current speaker's turn. The present paper is a contrastive study of the use of these resources by Americans in English, and by Koreans in their native language and in English, and in it we show the ecological relationship between the resources that a language provides and their use in constructing active listenership. Although previous research on English has found listeners use reactive tokens to pass up the opportunity for a full turn at talk, we show that, in Korean, reactive tokens are often elicited by the current speaker and the listener is obligated to provide them. We present evidence that Korean bilinguals transfer some conversational resources from their native language when they take part in conversation in English.

KEYWORDS: Backchannel, conversation analysis, cross-cultural interaction, grammar, Korean, turn-taking

INTRODUCTION

Conversation is a process of speech exchange between two or more persons. The process is orderly and speakers take turns so that when more than one speaker talks at the same time, one soon ends and a single speaker holds the floor. Holding the floor is achieved by a single speaker when that speaker speaks and the other participants in the conversation choose not to take turns. The other participants, however, are not silent. A turn at talk is constructed not by a single speaker alone but is co-constructed by the other participants. Although the contribution of these participants is primarily to withhold their own turns, they also contribute to the turn in progress by means of vocalizations such as 'mm' or 'uhuh,' with words such as 'yeah,' 'okay,' and 'wow,' and also by gestural and positional cues including gaze, head movements such as nodding, and orientation of the upper body. Such behavior has long been a source of interest to scholars, first to communication theorists and later to conversation analysts.

These tokens of active listening were recognized early on by Malinowski (1923) as 'phatic communion,' a notion that was integrated by Jakobson (1960) into his functional model of communication between speaker and hearer, and it was within this theory of communication that Yngve (1970) developed the first extensive treatment. Yngve recognized the role of these tokens in maintaining an open channel of communication between speaker and hearer, and thus named them *backchannels*. More recent work in conversation analysis has stressed the role of backchannels as displays of active listenership. Schegloff (1982) recognized vocalizations such as 'uh huh' or lexical items such as 'yeah' as *continuers* whereby the listener exhibits understanding that the primary speaker should continue talking by passing up an opportunity to propose a full turn at talk. Other expressions such as 'oh wow' and 'gosh, really?' were also recognized by Schegloff as co-constructing discourse, but because these tokens have the added sense of expressing the listener's reactions to the current turn, he called them *assessments*.

In further work on ways in which listeners co-construct speakers' talk in languages other than English, researchers recognized that there are in fact many more ways of subcategorizing the same function. Clancy, Thompson, Suzuki and Tao (1996) in comparing tokens of active listenership in English, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese included backchannels, reactive expressions, collaborative finishes, repetitions, and resumptive openers in their study, all of which they subsumed under the heading of reactive tokens. Iwasaki (1997) found a similar range of expressions in English and Japanese, which he referred to as backchannels, but he made a further distinction among: (a) non-lexical backchannels, which are vocalic sounds that have little or no referential meaning, such as 'mhm'; (b) phrasal backchannels, which are typical expressions of acknowledgment and assessment, such as 'really?'; and (c) substantive backchannels, which are turns with referential content such as a repetition or a clarifying question. Maynard (1990) referred to listener responses and Gardner (1997, 2002) studied mono- and bi-syllabic response tokens and identified eight types: continuers ('mm hm'), acknowledgements ('yeah'), newsmarkers ('oh'), change of activity tokens ('alright'), assessments ('wow'), brief questions or repair, and collaborative completions.

Active participation in the turn in progress requires that a listener choose appropriate forms of lexical items or vocalizations, and that these forms be used at an appropriate moment during the turn in progress. The listener's choice of other forms or their use at other moments are very different actions from co-constructing the current speaker's turn. An interruption or competition for the conversational floor may result from a very small difference in the form of a reactive token or in the timing of its use. Bilinguals are often aware of the very different skills that are required to be an effective listener in two languages. In discussing the use of response tokens by Japanese–English bilinguals, LoCastro (1987) reports that native speakers of Japanese are frequently very aware of the use of *aizuchi* (verbal as well as non-verbal signs of active listenership) to indicate that they are following what is being

said. 'Some commented that they feel the weakness in their English language ability is their inability to use proper English *aizuchi*. . . . They will say to speak 'good' Japanese, one must use *aizuchi* such as *so desu ne*. To do otherwise is to be impolite to one's conversational partner' (Lo Castro 1987: 102). Indeed, Ohta (2001) has described explicit classroom instruction in the use of *aizuchi* for American students of Japanese.

Thus, developing a listener's skill in using reactive tokens is an important part of learning to be a conversationalist. In this paper we investigate the challenges that skillful use of reactive tokens poses for speakers from two different languacultures (Agar 1994), and the ways in which one group of speakers uses reactive tokens in conversations in a second language.

Previous research has shown that, in English, the forms and functions of these tokens are many, but for the present study we have narrowed our focus to those considered by Schegloff (1982) as continuers or assessments, and we have used Clancy et al.'s (1996) term *reactive tokens* to refer to them. We begin our description by discussing the forms that these tokens take in our English and Korean data, and present some quantitative analyses of the duration of individual tokens and their frequency of use. We then discuss the listener's placement of reactive tokens in the ongoing turn at talk and compare the factors that influence placement by American speakers of English and by Koreans. We conclude with a discussion of how Korean speakers of English as a second language differ in their use of reactive tokens from American native speakers.

REACTIVE TOKENS IN ENGLISH AND KOREAN

Our data come from eight conversations among females: four native speakers of Korean and four native speakers of American English. All the women were graduate students in their 20s at a university in the American Midwest, and did not know each other before participating in this study. The proficiency of the Korean women in English was advanced, as measured by the Test of Spoken English (Educational Testing Service 2003). Each of the participants watched the movie *Waterloo Bridge* (Franklin and LeRoy 1940) in a classroom on campus. Shortly afterwards, they met at the home of one of the investigators and were asked to discuss the movie. Eight conversational dyads were constructed: two monocultural dyads between Korean women, two between American women, and four cross-cultural dyads between a Korean and an American. The Korean women spoke their native language in conversations with other Koreans and the Americans spoke English, but in the cross-cultural dyads all participants spoke English. All eight conversations were videotaped and 13 minutes from each conversation were transcribed and analyzed.

Examples of how the American listener JA uses reactive tokens in English to support the ongoing turn at talk of her American interlocutor AA are shown in Excerpt 1:

Excerpt 1: Actually I paint¹

- 127 JA: d'you like (0.4) that (.) are you like an art student
 128 or some[thing?]
 129 AA: [yeah] actually I'm I paint (0.3) and I do
 130 some drawing but painting's more my thing.
 131→ JA: [yeah.]
 132 AA: >[I have]n't really done much since high school< so,
 133→ JA: yeah.
 134 AA: I've really missed it.
 135→ JA: [mhm,]
 136 AA: [and] so it's it's really like fun for me it kinda
 137 brings me back (1.0) and I'm sure I forget how to do
 138 stuff so.
 139→ JA: [yeah.]
 140 AA: [that's]good.

In Excerpt 1, JA uses continuers 'yeah' at line 131, 'mhm' at lines 133 and 135, and again 'yeah' at line 139 to support AA's telling about her interest in painting. JA's placement of the continuers occurs very shortly after what Ford and Thompson (1996) have called complex transition relevance places, that is, places at which AA has indicated by means of intonation, syntax, and pragmatics that her turn is complete and transition to another speaker is possible. JA does not, however, take the opportunity for a full turn and although her continuers overlap AA's talk in lines 131/132, 135/136, and 139/140, AA does not apparently hear the overlaps as an attempt by JA to gain the conversational floor and in fact none of JA's response tokens is longer than 0.5 seconds.

Excerpt 2 illustrates the use of an assessment 'really' at line 409 by AA as supporting JA's extended turn in the same conversation:

Excerpt 2: What do they cost?

- 407 AA: so what do those things cost?
 408 JA: well ↑used about a hundred.
 409→ AA: real[ly.]
 410 JA: [but] I haven't I haven't even looked at new ones.

In Excerpt 2 AA's 'really' indicates her reaction to the cost of a darkroom enlarger but, as with the continuers in Excerpt 1, its placement and duration (0.34 seconds) are heard by JA as supportive of an increment to her turn in line 410.

The function of reactive tokens in Korean is similar to that in English. A listener displays attention to a speaker's ongoing turn by means of continuers like 음 [mhm] 'mhm' and 예 [yey] 'yeah' or assessments like 하 [-hh] 'wow' but neither participant recognizes in these reactive tokens an attempt to take a full turn. Excerpt 3 shows MK's use of 예 [yey] 'yeah' to sustain DK's ongoing turn:

Excerpt 3: My Mom's a Vivien Leigh fan²

- 3 DK: 저-는 (1.0) 엄마-[가:], (0.4) 비비안리 팬-[이]라서, 옛날에
cənŭn əmma-ka pipianli p^han ira sə yetnale
 I-NOM Mom-NOM Vivien Leigh fan because long time ago
 'Because my Mom is a Vivien Leigh fan. . .'
- 4→ MK: [예] [예]
yey yey
 yeah yeah
- 5 DK: 한국 -에서 영화극장 -인가, [그런]거-에서 몇 번 -을
hankuk-esə myəŋhwakŭkcaŋ-inka kŭrnkə-esə myət pən-ŭl
 Korea-in movie program-maybe, that sort-from many times-ACC
 'I must have seen this movie many times on the TV in Korea'
- 6→ MK: [예]
yey
 yeah
- 7 DK: 봤 -았-어요.
pwas'-əs'-əyo
 saw -TNS-FP

DK and MK are discussing the movie they have just watched, which stars Vivien Leigh, and DK tells MK, 'Because my Mom is a Vivien Leigh fan, I must have seen this movie many times on the TV in Korea.' MK supports DK's ongoing turn by means of continuers, which, as in English, are vocalizations of less than 0.5 seconds but which, as Kyu-hyun Kim (1999) has noted, appear to be placed before transition relevance places in DK's turn. In Excerpt 4 from the conversation between the other two Korean women, SK also supports EK's ongoing turn, but this time by means of an assessment stretched to overlap with the end of EK's turn in line 207. EK and SK are discussing where they can find cheap DVDs online and EK tells SK, 'Like DVDs there must be like ten thousand DVDs' and SK supports EK's turn with an assessment expressing surprise in line 208 lasting 1.10 seconds. The conversational support from her listener leads EK to increment her turn with 'like "Shrek" for example' in line 209:

Excerpt 4: Lots of DVDs

- 206 EK: 디비디 같은거 거기가 이게 뭐냐면, 디비디 올라온게
tiviti katŭnkə kəkika ike mwənyamyən tiviti ollaonke
 DVD sort of there that is DVD in there
 'Like DVDs there must be like ten thousand DVDs.'
- 207 십만개가 [넘어요].
sipmankæka nəməyo
 ten thousand more
- 208→ SK: [하::]
.hhh
 wow
- 209 EK: 까 슈렉 같은거.

k'a *shrek katũnkə*
 for example 'Shrek' like
 'Like "Shrek" for example.'

These four examples of the use of reactive tokens in English and Korean show that the task of learning to be an active listener in a second languaculture requires the development of skills in several areas. The questions that we address in this study specify the knowledge and skills that the second language learner must master. First, the forms of reactive tokens differ from one language to another and there are also formal distinctions between continuers and assessments. What are the differences? Second, a particular aspect of the form of reactive tokens is their duration and so, does the duration of reactive tokens in Korean differ from English? Third, when a variety of lengthy conversations has been examined, several previous studies (Hayashi 1988, 1996; Itoh 1995; Maynard 1986, 1990; Murata 1994; Tao and Thompson 1991; White 1989) have observed that reactive tokens are used more frequently in some languacultures than in others. Are there differences between the frequency of reactive tokens in English and Korean and, if so, do the Korean women maintain the same frequency in their conversations with Americans? Finally, the most intriguing question addresses the issue of placement of reactive tokens. We have seen in Excerpts 1 to 3 that placement of Korean reactive expressions during the turn in progress appears to differ from English. What does the listener orient to in the speaker's turn in order to insert a reactive token at the appropriate place? Do Korean listeners orient to different information from American listeners? And if so, what do the Koreans orient to when their interlocutor is speaking English?

FORMS OF REACTIVE TOKENS IN ENGLISH AND KOREAN

In the conversations between American women there are a limited number of forms that listeners use as continuers. 'Yeah' is by far the most frequent continuer in English and is spoken with a slight fall. Other continuers are 'mhm,' 'mm,' 'okay,' and 'uhuh.' Like 'yeah,' most English continuers are spoken with a slight falling tone but some, particularly 'mhm,' occur with continuing intonation as in line 200 in Excerpt 5:

Excerpt 5: It's a lot of work

198	AA:	yeah. (1.1) I don't think I- (.) I always wanted to
199		do it (.) earlier,
200→	JA:	mhm,
201	AA:	in (.) my college career. (0.5) but I'm glad I
202		didn't cuz it's a lot of w[ork.]
203	JA:	[yeah.]

The range of lexical items that was used by the American women to express assessments is broader, including 'cool,' 'oh no,' 'okay,' 'really,' 'right,' and 'wow,' as well as 'yeah' and 'okay' spoken with a rising tone. Many assessments in English can be prefixed by a newsmarker 'oh' to produce 'oh cool,' 'oh good,' 'oh no,' 'oh really,' and 'oh yeah' as in lines 257–258 in Excerpt 6:

Excerpt 6: I never get rid of books

- 253 AA: hadn't even had an exam yet. (0.7) and uhm, (1.0)
 254 you know I asked him so, (1.3) are you offering it
 255 next semester? he said I really don't know when,
 256 (0.7) it'll be offered again. so, (0.8) I still like
 257 that book. I ↑ never get [rid of books.]
 258→ JA: [oh really?]
 259 AA: it's like a,
 260→ JA: yeah,
 261 AA: perfect coffee table book.

The three most common Korean continuers are 음 [mhm] or 응 [ŋ] 'mhm,' 네 [ney] or 예 [yey] 'yeah,' and 아 [a(h)], 'uhuh.' With slight falling tone 예 [yey] functions as a continuer in lines 4 and 6 in Excerpt 3. Korean assessments include lexical expressions such as 맞아(요) [maca(yo)], 'yes right,' 그래(요)? [kŭræ(yo)] 'oh yeah?' and 정말(요)?, [cəŋmal(yo)] 'really?' Short non-lexical reactive tokens are also used as assessments including 하 [-hh] and 어머 [əmə] 'wow.' A stretched 하 [-hh] functions as an assessment in line 208 in Excerpt 4. Table 1 shows the Korean reactive tokens and their phonetic variants found in the two conversations between Korean women that we analyzed.

The duration of all reactive tokens (continuers and assessments taken together) in the conversations was measured to 1/100th of a second using the Praat computer program (Boersma and Weenink 2004). The counts and durations of reactive tokens produced by individual American and Korean listeners in monocultural conversations are reported in Table 2, as well as the

Table 1: Korean reactive tokens

Reactive token	Pronunciation	English gloss
예 / 예 / 네	yey/ey/ney	'uhuh' 'yeah' 'okay'
아 / 어	ah/ə	'uhuh' 'yeah' 'okay'
음 / 응	mhm/ŋ	'mhm' 'uhuh'
하 / 헤	-hh	'wow'
어머	əmə	'wow' 'oh'
그래(요)?	kŭræ(yo)	'oh yeah?'
마자(요)	maca(yo)	'yes right'
정말(요)?	cəŋmal(yo)	'really?'

Note: The suffix 요 [yo] is an honorific

combined results for the four Koreans and the four Americans. Table 2 shows that in the conversations between American women the median duration of reactive tokens from all four listeners was 0.39 seconds, and the median duration of the reactive tokens produced by listeners in the two conversations between Korean women was 0.50 seconds. A Mann-Whitney test showed that the median duration of Korean reactive tokens was significantly longer than English tokens ($W = 85787.0$, $p = 0.0000$). The longer duration of reactive tokens in Korean is consistent with the frequent stretching of vowels or sonorants in final syllables in Korean (Kyu-hyun Kim 1999). Honorific final particles also add to the duration of Korean reactive tokens but even monosyllabic tokens such as 음 [mhm], 예 [yey], 네 [ney], and 하 [·hh] can be lengthened by stretching the final vowel, sonorant, or in-breath.

FREQUENCY OF REACTIVE TOKENS IN ENGLISH AND KOREAN

Many studies of Japanese conversations have reported that Japanese listeners use reactive tokens in Japanese more often than Americans do in English conversations. One study of Chinese (Tao and Thompson 1991), however, found that English speakers make much more frequent use of reactive tokens than do Chinese speakers. In order to investigate possible languacultural differences in the present study we compared the counts of reactive tokens produced by the four Korean listeners in two 13-minute monocultural conversations with the number of reactive tokens produced by the four

Table 2: Counts and duration of reactive tokens in 13-minute monocultural conversations

Listener	Count	Duration of reactive tokens in seconds		
		Minimum	Median	Maximum
Americans				
BA	87	0.24	0.40	3.19
KA	63	0.28	0.37	1.25
AA	35	0.30	0.38	0.75
JA	57	0.29	0.41	0.68
Four Americans	242	0.24	0.39	3.19
Koreans				
EK	79	0.20	0.41	1.34
SK	42	0.21	0.62	2.40
DK	75	0.26	0.47	1.70
MK	90	0.20	0.50	1.70
Four Koreans	286	0.20	0.50	2.40

American listeners. The counts of tokens produced by each speaker are shown in the second column in Table 2. Koreans produced a median of 77 tokens in the two 13-minute conversations and Americans produced a median of 60 tokens in their two, but the apparent difference was not statistically significant ($W = 15.0, p = 0.4705$), perhaps because of the small data set.

PLACEMENT OF REACTIVE TOKENS IN ENGLISH

If the function of reactive tokens is to co-construct the current speaker's ongoing turn at talk, then the listener's placement of these tokens is crucial. If a reactive token is an indication that the listener passes up the opportunity to propose a full turn at talk, then the token must be uttered at or near a place in the current speaker's turn where a change of speaker is possible. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) proposed that such turn transition relevance places (TRPs) are cued by the completion or projected completion of a syntactic unit in the current speaker's talk. Ford and Thompson (1996: 143) defined an utterance to be syntactically complete 'if, in its discourse context, it could be interpreted as a complete clause, that is with an overt or directly recoverable predicate.' And they extended the types of cues to include the completion or projected completion of an intonational unit and the completion or projected completion of a conversational action within its sequential context, which they termed pragmatic completion. Because transition from one speaker to the next involves split-second timing, the listener must be able to project the termination of syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic units before they actually occur, a skill which is presumably learned by participating in a very large number of conversations.³ Projecting TRPs in second language conversations is more difficult than in the first language because second language speakers have participated in fewer conversations in the second language and because the construction of syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic units may differ from one language culture to another. This difficulty may lead to the phenomenon reported by even advanced speakers of a second language that they find it hard to get a word in edgewise in conversations with native speakers (Hayashi 1988).

In the two English conversations between American women that we analyzed, we can see evidence of both strategies: recognition by listeners that the speaker has arrived at a TRP in her turn, and the ability to project when a TRP is imminent. In Excerpt 7, JA places her reactive tokens at, or very shortly after, the completion of a turn-constructional unit in the ongoing turn, whereas Excerpts 8 and 9 show JA's ability to project a TRP. In Excerpt 7, JA is listening to AA tell a story about a friend of hers who has been called up to serve in the military. We follow Ford and Thompson (1996) in indicating the completion of a syntactic unit by '/' and of a pragmatic unit by

'>.' The boundary of an intonational contour is indicated by '.' for a falling tone or '?' for a rising tone.

Excerpt 7: That was the first time I met his wife

- 57 AA: so we had like a going-away party and
58 stuff./.>
- 59→ JA: yeah.
- 60 AA: yeah I think he'll be okay/ but (0.7) kinda scares me/
61 cuz he's a (0.5) he works with chemical weapons./.>
- 62→ JA: real[ly?]
- 63 AA: [so] (0.4) I'm like (.) [great you got] called
64 up./>
- 65 JA: [hhh] (0.4)
66→ yeah.
67 (1.1)
- 68 AA: well he's probably, (0.9)
- 69 JA: probably wouldn't be like (0.5) on the front lines/>
70 he'd be more like in, (0.4)
- 71 AA: I hope not./.> (.) [I don't know./>]
- 72→ JA: [yeah.]
- 73 AA: well you hope anyone's there./.>
- 74→ JA: mhm.
75 (0.5)
- 76 AA: I dunno/ I know uhm (1.3) he uhm (2.1) he said he'll
77 be in the US for a while/ like he's probably still
78 at: Fort McCo:y./.> (.) do[ing the (.)] and stuff./>
- 79→ JA: [oh yeah.]
- 80 AA: and then (0.6) he'll probably do some training here/
81 before he goes: (.) wherever./.>
- 82→ JA: [mhm.]
- 83 AA: [over]seas/. but, (1.0) he d- he had no idea where he's
84 going either./.> (0.6) he got our addresses to write us./.>
85 [I guess./>]
- 86→ JA: [yeah.]
- 87 AA: that was it./.> (1.2) kinda weird [y'know./.>] (0.4)
88 crazy week.>
- 89 JA: [hhhh]
90 yeah they don't tell anything./>
- 91 AA: right.
92 (1.3)
- 93 AA: and that was the first time I met his uhm (0.3) wife
94 too./>
- 95→ JA: oh yeah?
- 96 AA: cuz uhm (0.5) he and I used to date/ so,
97 (1.0)
- 98 JA: hhh [()]
99 AA: [but she seemed really nice./>]

- 100→ JA: yeah.
 101 AA: yeah.> (.) it was really nice meeting her./>
 102 (1.9)
 103→ JA: wo:w.

JA helps construct AA's story by means of continuers 'yeah' and 'mhm' in lines 59, 66, 72, 74, 79, 82, 86, and 100, and also by means of the assessments 'really?' in line 62, 'oh yeah?' in line 95, and she concludes with 'wow' in line 103 when she learns that AA used to date the soldier she is talking about and that AA had met the soldier's wife for the first time at his going-away party.

JA places each of her reactive tokens at, or very shortly after, the termination of a unit in AA's talk. In all cases, AA's turn terminates at a clause boundary and at the completion of a complete conversational action. In some cases such boundaries are followed by measurable pauses as in lines 65 and 92, but in most cases JA supplies a reactive token less than 0.2 seconds after the completion of AA's turn. Indeed in some cases JA's reactive tokens overlap with the continuation of AA's turn as we can observe in lines 62/63, 71/72, 78/79, and 85/86.

In almost all cases, JA's reactive tokens follow AA's falling tone, which completes an intonational unit in AA's talk. The exception is the continuer at line 82, which follows a slight rise at the end of AA's description of the military's plans for her friend: 'and then (0.6) he'll probably do some training here/before he goes: (.) wherever/,>.' Although AA's turn in line 81 is syntactically and pragmatically complete and thus JA's response token appears appropriately placed, AA in fact goes on to increment her turn by resolving some of the ambiguity in 'wherever' when she specifies 'overseas' with a falling tone in line 83. These examples of tokens of active listenership from Excerpt 7 show that JA places her reactive tokens at or very shortly after complex transition relevance places in AA's talk; that is, in these cases JA places her reactive tokens at simultaneous boundaries of syntactic, pragmatic, and intonational units (Ford and Thompson 1996). Excerpts 8 and 9, however, show that JA is also able to project the completion of a turn-constructual unit and to place her reactive token before the TRP in AA's turn:

Excerpt 8: Excerpt 5 revisited

- 198 AA: yeah./> (1.1) I don't think I- (.) I always wanted to
 199 do it (.) earlier/,>
 200 JA: mhm.
 201 AA: in (.) my college career./> (0.5) but I'm glad I
 202 didn't cuz it's a lot of w[ork/,>]
 203→ JA: [yeah.]

Excerpt 9: Cool books

- 253 AA: hadn't even had an exam yet./> (0.7) and uhm, (1.0)
 254 you know I asked him so, (1.3) are you offering it

reactive tokens in our data thus confirms Schegloff's (1982: 81) original observation that reactive tokens in English are ways in which the recipient exhibits understanding that the primary speaker should continue talking by 'passing up an opportunity to propose a full turn at talk' at a TRP. As we will see, however, the placement and function of reactive tokens in Korean differ markedly from English.

PLACEMENT OF REACTIVE TOKENS IN KOREAN

Within the TRP framework formulated by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) and elaborated by Ford and Thompson (1996), reactive tokens are understood as ways in which recipients choose to indicate that they do not wish to avail themselves of the opportunity for a full turn. This theory of the function of reactive tokens was developed for English, but in Korean, Kyu-hyun Kim (1999) has identified different functions for reactive tokens when they are not placed at TRPs, and Tanaka (1999, 2000) has found similar differences between placement of Japanese reactive tokens and English. Both authors have identified the process of agglutination in Korean and Japanese as providing resources for conversationalists that are not available in English.

Korean has agglutinative word morphology and a predicate-final word order, resulting in syntactic units that end with a series of verb-final suffixes. Processes of agglutination in Korean influence the construction of nouns and verbs. Because Korean has scrambled word order and often allows null subject and null object constructions, position in the clause is no indication of the Case of an NP, and Case must be overtly marked by a postposed particle. Depending on the postposed morphemes, an NP has different syntactic roles as subject, object, or an adjunct. Agglutination in the noun and noun phrase creates strings of post-head morphemes that represent Case (nominative, accusative, genitive, locative, instrumental, or vocative) and changes of a word class, among other functions.⁴ Examples of agglutination in Korean NPs are shown in Excerpt 10:

Excerpt 10: Agglutination in Korean NPs

EK: 거기 -서 옵션-으로 열개-를 빌려-보-면
kəki -sə opsyəion-ŭro yəlagæ-reul pilyə-bo-myən
 there-LOC option-INS ten-ACC rent-see-CND
 'If we choose the option to rent ten of them online, ...'

In this excerpt EK is talking about renting a DVD online, and she says 'If we choose the option to rent ten of them online.' This is accomplished by three head nouns: 'there = online,' 'option,' and 'ten (of the DVDs),' followed by a serial verb. The process of agglutination in the verb creates similar strings of post-head morphemes. Excerpt 11 gives examples of verbal agglutination in Korean:

Excerpt 11: Agglutination in Korean verbs

EK: 보-고-싶-었-는데, 보-니까
 po-ko-sip-ət-nūnte, po-nik'a
 see-CNC-want-TNS-CNJ, search-CNJ
 'I wanted to see it, but when I tried to select it . . .'

In this excerpt EK is talking about a movie that she wanted to watch on the in-flight entertainment system during her flight from Chicago to Seoul. She wanted to see the movie *Lilo and Stitch*, but when she tried to select it she couldn't because the movie had just been shown and was no longer available. The English gloss of Excerpt 11 is 'I wanted to see it, but when I tried to select it . . .' in which EK uses two verbal complexes. In the first verb, both the subject 'I' and the object '*Lilo and Stitch*' of the verb 'see' are omitted, and EK's utterance begins with a serial verb in which two verb stems are joined by the concatenating particle *고* [ko], and the serial verb is then inflected for past tense and a final conjunctive verbal suffix. The English gloss of the six-syllable word *보고싶었는데* [pokosipətnūnte] is roughly 'I wanted to see, but.' The second verbal complex again has *보* [po] 'search' as a verbal stem with the final conjunctive suffix *니까* [nik'a] 'but when.'⁵

These typological differences between Korean and English provide interactional resources for Korean conversationalists that differ from those available in a language characterized by mixed word morphology like English, and we observe these in the placement of reactive tokens in Korean and the challenge that such placement poses to the notion of a turn-constructional unit. As we have seen, according to Ford and Thompson (1996: 143), a syntactic unit in English is projectably complete when it is 'a complete clause, that is with an overt or directly recoverable predicate.' Unlike English, however, languages with agglutinative word morphology like Korean and Japanese have different notions of syntactic completion points. Kyu-hyun Kim (1999: 427) has recognized that 'in Korean conversations, unit boundaries are often formed while a turn is underway, that is, before a TRP is reached.' Kyu-hyun Kim goes on to elucidate the interactional resources that are available at intra-turn unit boundaries as follows:

These intra-turn unit boundaries are formed in such a way that the primary speaker, i.e., the speaker of the turn in progress, produces the end of a unit with continuing or slightly upward intonation and pauses in the middle of a turn. The speaker's continuing or rising intonation solicits a brief response from the recipient, usually in the form of acknowledgement tokens such as *yey/ney* or *ung*. (Kyu-hyun Kim 1999: 427)

Thus intra-turn unit boundaries are interactionally sensitive sites where a listener's co-construction of the current speaker's turn in progress may be solicited. An intra-turn unit boundary occurs *before* the current speaker indicates, or the recipient projects, that a full turn may be taken by another speaker. The notions of a turn-constructional unit and a transition relevance

place in the current turn at talk are just as applicable to Korean as they are to English, but they are resources that speakers use to effect transition from one full turn to another. Intra-turn unit boundaries, on the other hand, are places in the current turn where the speaker elicits and the recipient may provide a reactive token. Although the recipient need not co-construct the current speaker's turn by providing a reactive token, Kyu-hyun Kim (1999: 440) argues that the current speaker's solicitation of a response 'may organize the participation structure in such a way as to impose an interactional burden on the recipient.'

In her work on turn-taking in Japanese conversation, Tanaka (1999, 2000) comes to recognize similar distinctions to Kyu-hyun Kim between syntactic boundaries within the turn and at turn-constructive unit boundaries. In so doing, Tanaka distinguishes between analytical syntax 'based on the analysis of written texts and with a focus on the sentence' and conversational syntax, which is 'syntax as oriented to by participants in conversation' (Tanaka 1999: 67). The completion of a syntactic unit is, according to Tanaka, a place where no further talk is syntactically projected when considered within its prior context. Because Japanese, like Korean, shows a high degree of agglutination in the verb, completion of an analytical syntactic unit can occur in the middle of a string of agglutinated suffixes on the verb. Completion of a conversational syntactic unit, however takes intonation into account and excludes places that fall within an agglutinated segment, unless there is a prosodic break of some kind at that place. Although Tanaka's research does not focus on placement of reactive tokens, there is a parallel between her analysis of analytical syntactic completion points in Japanese and Kyu-hyun Kim's identification of intra-turn unit boundaries in Korean. Intra-turn unit boundaries in Korean, however, appear to differ from analytic syntactic completion points in Japanese because Korean boundaries can be accompanied by prosodic features such as a sound stretch, slight rising pitch, or a prosodic break, whereas Tanaka (1999) specifically excludes prosody from her identification of analytic syntactic completion points in Japanese.

It thus appears that, because of the phenomenon of agglutination in their languages, both Korean and Japanese conversationalists recognize unit boundaries within the current turn at talk that differ from the TRPs that have been identified in English. These boundaries are interactional resources for Korean speakers where reactive tokens are elicited by the current speaker and may be supplied by the recipient. Excerpt 12 shows placement of a reactive token in Korean at just such a boundary:

Excerpt 12: Placement of reactive tokens at an intra-turn unit boundary within an agglutinated serial verb

- 54 DK: 똑-같은 줄거리 계속 보여-[주-르-꺼-니까는],
d'ok-katŭn culkəri kye::sok poyə- cu -l-k'ə-nik'anŭn,
 exactly-same story continuously show-let-TNS-MD-CNC
 'And they'll show exactly the same story over and over again'

55→ MK: [예 예]
yey yey

In this excerpt, DK and MK are discussing the movie *Waterloo Bridge*, which they have just seen together. The movie was made in 1940 and DK comments that old movies often have the same stories and the only differences between one movie and another are the settings and the actors. The English gloss of line 54 is 'And they'll show exactly the same story over and over again.' DK solicits MK to co-construct her turn in several ways. She does so by means of the long sound stretch in the middle of 'continuously' 계::속 [kye::sok]. At the same time as she utters the stretched vowel, DK also fixes her gaze securely on MK just two beats ahead of MK's reactive token. MK agrees and co-constructs DK's turn by initiating her reactive token 예 예 [yey yey] immediately after the verb stem and before the series of four agglutinative suffixes. The intra-turn unit boundary at the end of a verb stem in line 54 corresponds to Tanaka's analytical syntactic completion point, but in this example the intra-turn unit boundary is preceded by gaze and sound stretch, all of which allow MK to project the boundary and thus cue insertion of her reactive token.

Examples of listeners' placement of reactive tokens at intra-turn unit boundaries abound in the conversations between Koreans. In Excerpt 13, SK says 'That kind of black-and-white movie I didn't see though,' and EK initiates her reactive token 음 [mhm] immediately after the head noun 'black-and-white movie' and simultaneously with the onset of the accusative morpheme 를 [rül]:

Excerpt 13: Placement of a reactive token at an intra-turn unit boundary in an NP

4 SK: 그런(,), 흑백영화 -[를:] 안-봤-는데,
kŭrən hŭkpækyəŋhwa-rŭ:l an-pwas'-nŭnte
kind (,), black-and-white movie-ACC not-see-CNJ,
'That kind of black-and-white movie I didn't see though.'

5→ EK: [음]
mhm

In Excerpt 14, DK places her reactive token 예 [yey] after the verb stem and overlapping a word-final conjunctive suffix. MK and DK are comparing the movie they have just watched with *Gone with the Wind*. Although Vivien Leigh stars in both movies, MK says, 'It seems that we shouldn't compare them' because *Gone with the Wind* is such a masterpiece and *Waterloo Bridge* is not. In Korean, this involves coordinating 'we compare' and 'does not seem like' and the conjunctive suffix 구 [ku] acts as a conjunct coordinating the two clauses. As in previous examples, the intra-turn unit boundary in MK's turn is also signaled by the sound stretch on 구: [ku:] and her slightly rising tone.

Excerpt 14: Placement of a reactive token at an intra-turn unit boundary overlapping a verb-final conjunctive suffix⁶

72 MK: 비교 -하면 안-될 -꺼 -갈 -거 [ㅏ:],

pikyo -hamyən an-töl-k'ə -kat-ku:
 compare-CNJ NEG-AUX -seems -like-CNJ];
 'It seems we shouldn't compare them.'

73→ DK: [에]
yey

Our observation that slightly rising tone and sound stretch combine to indicate intra-turn unit boundaries in Korean confirms Kyu-hyun Kim's (1999) finding. These are resources that the current speaker uses to solicit a reactive token from the listener, and thus co-construction of the turn in progress. Although we have observed in Excerpt 9 that slightly rising tone may elicit a reactive token in English, the functions of sound stretch in Korean and English differ. Whereas sound stretch in English may indicate that a speaker wishes to hold the floor, a sound stretch in Korean invites a listener to co-construct the turn in progress by means of a reactive token.

The prosodic cue of slightly rising tone on a stretched vowel occurs in Korean both at intra-turn unit boundaries and also at boundaries of conversational syntactic units; that is, at places where participants orient to the completion of a clause. Excerpt 15 shows SK co-constructing EK's turn at two conversational syntactic boundaries indicated by the termination of complete clauses and simultaneous prosodic cues:

Excerpt 15: Prosodic cues for placement of reactive tokens at a conversational syntactic boundary

- 148 EK: 한국-에 있을 때::,=
hankuk-e is' t'æ::,
 Korea-in COPULAwhen
 'When I was in Korea.'
- 149→ SK: =음
mhm
- 150 EK: 투니버스-에서 h 가끔씩 틀어줬 -는[데, ·hh]
tunibus -esə h kak'ŭms'ik t^hŭlæcwət-nŭnde,
 Toonibus-on sometimes show-CNJ
 'they sometimes showed it on the Toonibus channel.'
- 151→ SK: [아:]
ah:

Before Extract 15, EK and SK had been discussing a Japanese animated cartoon called *Bonomono*. EK told SK that she thought SK would enjoy *Bonomono*, to which SK replied that she had never seen it. EK continues, 'You don't know it? It's a cartoon called *Bonomono*. You must have been in America when it came out.' In line 148, EK starts her next turn with 'When I was in Korea,' and at the boundary of this clause, the stretched vowel 때 [t'æ::] uttered with slightly rising tone elicits the latched continuer from SK in line 149. At which point EK continues, 'They sometimes showed it on the Toonibus Cable TV channel,'

ending on a slight rising tone and eliciting a further reactive token from SK at the clausal boundary. SK's placement of reactive tokens in lines 149 and 151 is thus similar to placement of reactive tokens in English at complex transition relevance places. What differentiates them is the prosodic cue of slightly rising tone on a stretched vowel.

REACTIVE TOKENS IN A SECOND LANGUAGE

This contrastive study of placement of reactive tokens in Korean and English conversations has highlighted the different interactional resources that Korean and English listeners draw upon to co-construct the speaker's turn in progress. Both Korean and English conversationalists recognize places in the current speaker's turn at which a transition between speakers may occur, and listeners in both languacultures may choose to continue the current speaker's turn by uttering a reactive token and, in doing so, pass up the opportunity for a full turn at talk. The agglutinative structure of word morphology in Korean, however, allows speakers and recipients to construct boundaries of interactional units that are very different from the boundaries that English speakers recognize and project in conversation. These intra-turn unit boundaries are places at which the current speaker obliges the recipient to co-construct the ongoing turn at talk, and at which a transition to another speaker is heard as an interruption. There are thus, in any Korean turn, more frequent opportunities for a listener to co-construct the speaker's turn than are available in English. As we have seen, the moments at which English listeners place their reactive tokens are overwhelmingly at transition relevance places, while Korean listeners may place their reactive tokens not only at conversational syntactic TRPs but also at intra-turn unit boundaries.

In the final part of this paper we investigate whether the strategies of active listenership used by Korean speakers of English as a second language are similar to, or different from, native speakers of American English, and discuss the challenges that skillful use of reactive tokens in a second language poses for bilingual listeners. We first compare the forms of reactive tokens that Koreans use in English with those of native speakers of American English, and then make quantitative comparisons of their duration and frequency. We conclude with an investigation of whether placement of English reactive tokens by Korean bilinguals shows any influence from the native languaculture.

In order to compare the forms of reactive tokens produced by Koreans and Americans, we examined the four dyadic cross-cultural conversations in English between Koreans and Americans. For all eight participants in these conversations 'yeah' and 'mhm' were the most common forms. In the four 13-minute cross-cultural conversations, the Americans produced 'yeah' or 'mhm' 178 times out of a total of 253 reactive tokens and the Koreans produced 225 out of a total of 314; thus for both groups, 'yeah' and 'mhm' represented about

70 percent of all reactive tokens. The distribution of forms, however, differed across the groups. In every conversation, the Koreans produced more 'mhm' than the Americans and the Koreans produced 'uh' or 'uhuh' more often than the Americans, while the Americans produced 'okay' and 'really?' much more often than the Koreans. The reason for the preference by Koreans for the English tokens 'yeah,' 'mhm,' and 'uh' may perhaps be attributed to the phonetic similarity between these English forms and the Korean response tokens 예 [yey], 음 [mhm], and 아 [ah]. Indeed the vowel in a Korean 'uh' or 'uhuh' is lower and less rounded than when the response is uttered by Americans.

Table 3 shows the counts and durations of response tokens produced by each listener in the four 13-minute cross-cultural dyadic conversations. Korean listeners apparently produced more reactive tokens than Americans did because they produced a median of 75 response tokens in each 13-minute conversation while American listeners produced a median of only 64.5, but, as we found when comparing the numbers of tokens in monocultural conversations, the apparent difference did not reach statistical significance ($W = 14.5$, $p = 0.3865$). Perhaps this is due in large measure to the difference between a single Korean and a single American speaker: MK produced 100 tokens, while AA produced only 41. Table 3 also shows that the median durations of English response tokens produced by both groups were identical at 0.38 seconds, which approximates the median duration of response tokens produced by Americans in monocultural conversations (0.39 seconds). A Mann-Whitney test found no significant difference between the groups ($W = 90276.0$, $p = 0.5704$). Readers will recall that response tokens in Korean

Table 3: Counts and duration of reactive tokens in 13-minute cross-cultural conversations

Listener	Count	Duration of reactive tokens in seconds		
		Minimum	Median	Maximum
Americans				
BA	64	0.26	0.39	1.16
KA	83	0.24	0.39	3.00
AA	41	0.25	0.38	0.80
JA	65	0.21	0.36	1.16
Four Americans	253	0.21	0.38	3.00
Koreans				
EK	64	0.20	0.40	1.24
SK	77	0.20	0.40	1.63
DK	73	0.23	0.35	0.99
MK	100	0.12	0.37	1.18
Four Koreans	314	0.12	0.38	1.63

were significantly longer than those produced in English, and thus it seems that it is the phonology of their native language, specifically the frequent stretching of vowels or sonorants in final syllables, that allows Korean listeners to produce relatively lengthy response tokens in Korean, a resource that is not available to them in English.

It is, however, in placement of reactive tokens in English that we find the Korean listeners influenced by the interactional structure of their native language. American listeners, as has been frequently remarked, place their reactive tokens overwhelmingly at, or slightly before, TRPs. The Korean listeners to an English turn do the same in many cases but certainly not in all. In Excerpt 16, the Korean participant MK asks JA, the American, about her plans after graduation, and MK co-constructs JA's answer with a series of reactive tokens at lines 105, 107, 109, 111, and 113. Boundaries of syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic units in JA's talk are indicated in the transcript.

Excerpt 16: I don't wanna be a teacher

- 101 MK: so what's yours what's yours uh career goal?
 102 JA: uhm (.) don't really have one right now/.> [hh]
 103 MK: [hh]
 104 JA: I kinda, (.) because mainly with English,
 105→ MK: m[m,]
 106 JA: [you] (.) become a teacher/.>
 107→ MK: mhm.
 108 JA: it's like,
 109→ MK: alright.
 110 JA: main the main=
 111→ MK: =right.=
 112 JA: =thing/.> but I don't really wanna do [that/,>]
 113→ MK: [mhm.]

The Korean listener MK's placement of her reactive tokens at lines 107 and 113 at or slightly before complex TRPs in JA's talk is similar to the placement that we have seen preferred by American native speakers. At lines 105 and 109, however, MK places her reactive tokens immediately after slightly rising intonation contours indicating that JA intends to continue her turn. This is not a place where MK can project the completion of a syntactic unit because, in line 104, JA has not even initiated a VP and, in line 108, JA provides no predicate for 'it's like.' We have noticed earlier in our analysis of the conversation in Excerpt 9 between the two Americans, JA and AA, that placement of a reactive token by Americans need not wait for syntactic or pragmatic completion, and may be cued by continuing intonation in the ongoing turn. In the case of four out of MK's five response tokens in this excerpt, therefore, her placement is similar to the placement of response tokens by Americans.

In line 111, however, MK's 'right' is placed in the middle of the NP 'the main thing,' placement which appears to be quite different from that of native speakers. Again, in this case, it is possible to argue that the placement of MK's response token indicates that she projects the complex TRP that JA reaches at the beginning of line 112. However, evidence from other parts of the cross-cultural conversations indicates that in this case and in others, Korean listeners' placement of their response tokens is cued by information quite different from what can be provided by an English TRP.

Excerpts 17–20 are taken from all four cross-cultural conversations and show placement by the Korean listeners of response tokens near conjuncts coordinating two grammatical constituents in the speaker's talk. The grammatical boundaries are indicated by '/' and the Korean listener's reactive token that we wish to focus on in each excerpt is highlighted by '→'.

Excerpt 17: A lot of them speak English

JA : there were like a lot of there were t- (.) nine other people from (.)
 Madison there/. so [a lot of them] speak [English/.]
 →MK: [oh:] [just] English yeah hhh

Excerpt 18: Taking your work home with you

AA: but I dunno/ if I really wanna do that anymore/ cuz it's (.) it's kinda
 case work/ like (.) it makes me think like of being a lawyer/
 and [taking your work home with you/.]
 →DK: [oh yeah.]

Excerpt 19: Being John Malkovich

BA : there's a: a portal into his brain/, so you can like become him/, (.) it's
 very very strange/. [the whole] movie's very very strange/,
 EK : oh, [okay.]
 BA : but [it's kind of,] strange and funny/, I just liked it/,
 →EK : [mhm,]

Excerpt 20: Lord of the Rings

KA : the elves they're all supposed to: represent like different cultures/,
 [or races/ or ↑ something/.]
 SK : [oh really? oh?] I didn't know/.=
 KA : =yeah/, and [I mean like,] the wars are different world wars/ and
 something like that/.
 →SK : [oh:]

What is remarkable about these four excerpts is that the Korean listeners place their reactive tokens immediately after the conjuncts 'so,' 'and,' and 'but' rather than at the boundary of the preceding clause. In Excerpt 17, the boundary of JA's turn-constructural unit falls after 'there' in 'there were nine other people from Madison there,' but MK delays her reactive token until after JA begins her

next unit with 'so.' Excerpt 18 shows similar placement. AA's turn is hearably complete after 'lawyer' in 'it makes me think like of being a lawyer' but DK's co-construction of her continuing turn does not come until after the next turn-constructional unit, 'and taking your work home with you,' is under way. In Excerpt 19, BA is describing to EK the plot of the movie *Being John Malkovich*, which BA says is 'very very strange' and it is at this complex TRP that EK places her first reactive token 'oh, okay.' When BA immediately repeats the same statement, however, saying the 'the whole movie's very very strange,' EK delays placing her second reactive token until after the beginning of the next turn-constructional unit 'but it's kind of strange and funny.' And in Excerpt 20, KA is telling SK about her interpretation of the movie *Lord of the Rings*, saying that the elves are 'supposed to represent like different cultures' and at this complex TRP, SK reacts with 'oh really? oh? I didn't know,' but KA immediately takes back the floor and begins another long turn. It is only after this turn is under way that SK places her reactive token and co-constructs KA's turn at talk.

In each of these four excerpts, two adjacent grammatical units are coordinated by a conjunct. The conjunct can be interpreted syntactically as the head of the conjunction phrase (Johannessen 1998), but in the monocultural conversations between Americans in our data, the syntactic unit boundary between the two is heard by listeners as at the termination of the first unit *before* the conjunct, and it is often accompanied by an intonational boundary and a pragmatic boundary.⁷ This is evident in Excerpt 2, reproduced here as Excerpt 21:

Excerpt 21: Excerpt 2 revisited

- 407 AA: so what do those things cost?
 408 JA: well ↑used about a hundred.
 409→ AA: real[ly.]
 410 JA: [but] I haven't I haven't even looked at new ones.

Placement by the American participant AA of 'really' in line 409 of Excerpt 21 follows the conclusion of JA's clause in line 408 and precedes the onset of the conjunct 'but' that heads the conjunction phrase in line 410. Placement by Korean bilinguals of response tokens immediately *following the conjunct* thus differs markedly from American listeners, and we can only speculate on the reasons for the different placements.

One reason may be that because they are non-native speakers of English and have not participated in as many English conversations as native speakers have, Korean bilinguals may process the talk of their American interlocutors slightly more slowly, and thus placement of their reactive tokens may be delayed by the extra processing time required. If this were the case, however, the onset of their reactive tokens would be noticeably delayed at all TRPs, and yet we find that this only happens in cases of coordination. Another possible

reason for placement by Koreans of the reactive token after the conjunct is that such placement is similar to Korean. In Excerpt 14 we saw that MK's sound stretch on the word-final conjunctive suffix $\bar{\text{ㄱ}}$: [ku:] together with her slightly rising tone was perceived as an intra-turn unit boundary by the Korean listener DK, who began her reactive token 예 [yey] during the sound stretch. Whether Korean listeners in English conversations perceive English conjuncts to be the current speaker's solicitation of a response and thus wait until after such a solicitation before uttering a reactive token remains a question to be investigated by further research.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study we have demonstrated the interactional resources that are available to Koreans and Americans to construct a speaker's turn at talk. In both languacultures a speaker is not alone in constructing a turn, but listeners co-construct it by withholding a full turn at talk and by using reactive tokens to support the current speaker's turn. Reactive tokens are a small number of lexical and non-lexical items of short duration that the listener places at or near unit boundaries in the current turn at talk. The listener's recognition of these boundaries and, by implication, identification of the units in Korean and English differ quite radically, however. In English, unit boundaries occur most often at places where the syntax, prosody, or pragmatics of the ongoing talk indicates that transition to another speaker may be accomplished smoothly. Reactive tokens in English, therefore, are resources by which the listener overtly declines to take the opportunity for a full turn. The same role is played by some reactive tokens in Korean, but in many cases their role in Korean appears to be broader than in English. A Korean listener's act of placing a token at an intra-turn unit boundary is not simply to decline to take a turn at talk, it is rather to provide overt support for the current speaker's turn, an obligation that has been recognized as an interactional burden on the listener. It is likely that the expanded role of reactive tokens in Korean leads to their more frequent use in Korean conversations. Although we have noticed this in our data, it remains a task for future researchers to determine whether such a difference is statistically significant.

Korean and English provide different resources for conversationalists to create social meaning through talk. We have noticed that because of the open syllabic structure of Korean words, Korean allows stretches of word-final vowels and sonorants much more easily than English, and thus reactive tokens in Korean tend to be longer than in English. We have also seen that the agglutinative structure of Korean words provides intra-turn unit boundaries in the middle of a word that are not recognized as interactional resources in English, and the boundaries of morphological units can be occasions for a speaker, by means of sound stretch and continuing intonation, to elicit a reactive token from a listener.

When bilingual Koreans do conversation in English, the phonological resources that English provides do not allow for lengthy response tokens, but a Korean listener appears to work harder to co-construct a speaker's turn than does an American listener. Although we were not able to confirm this in the present study, we found some evidence that Koreans uttered response tokens in English more often than did their American conversation partners. Our Korean listeners enthusiastically produced response tokens at transition relevance places indicated by the syntax, intonation, and pragmatics of English, but they also uttered response tokens at other places in the speaker's turn, and noticeably after conjuncts coordinating two adjacent phrases rather than before the conjunct, which is the placement preferred by native speakers.

The relationship between the resources that a language provides and the use of language-specific resources by participants in conversation is an ecological balance. An investigation into conversational resources and their use by speakers of a single language is unlikely to provide full understanding of that ecology. It is only by means of contrastive studies of conversations in two or more languages that the ecological relationship becomes clear.

NOTES

1. See the appendix for an explanation of transcription symbols.
2. Korean data is represented in Hangul script with an English transcription (Nam-Kil Kim 1987, 1992) and an English morpheme gloss beneath each line of Hangul. The fourth line is an idiomatic English translation. Agglutinative morphemes in Korean are abbreviated in English as follows: ACC accusative case; AUX auxiliary; CNC concatenating suffix; CND conditional; CNJ conjunctive suffix; FP final particle; INS instrumental case; LOC locative case; MD mood suffix; NEG negator; NOM nominative case; TNS tense.
3. In a more recent paper, Ford (2004) raises questions about the etic, or analysts', identification of syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic units in interaction. In doing so, she says, the analyst does not give sufficient consideration to interactional contingency: the reshaping of units as they unfold.
4. In spoken and some informal written language, nominative and accusative Case particles are omitted and Case is implied by the context.
5. The verb stem **보** [po] has several meanings including 'see,' 'look over,' 'search,' etc.
6. Hangul script allows a transcriber to represent a sound stretch by separating the sounds that, when combined, form the full character. Thus, writing **ㅏ ㅓ** [k u] allows the representation of a stretch on the vowel in the full Hangul character **쿠** [ku].
7. Johannessen (1998: 200–201) analyzes conjunction phrases (CoP) like [there were nine other people from Madison there so a lot of them speak English] in Excerpt 17 according to principles and parameters theory in the following way. The first clause [there were nine other people from Madison there] is the specifier of the conjunction

phrase, and the complement is the CoP' [so a lot of them speak English]. Placement of reactive tokens by native speakers of American English is at this node. The CoP' then projects the conjunct [so] as its head and the CP [a lot of them speak English] as complement. In Excerpts 17–20, placement of reactive tokens by Korean speakers of English as a second language occurs at this lower node.

REFERENCES

- Agar, Michael. 1994. *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Boersma, Paul and David Weenink. 2004. *Praat: Doing Phonetics by Computer* (version 4.2). Retrieved March 15, 2004 from <http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/>
- Clancy, Patricia M., Sandra A. Thompson, Ryoko Suzuki and Hongyin Tao. 1996. The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 355–387.
- Educational Testing Service. 2003. *Test of Spoken English (TSE)*. Retrieved March 15, 2004 from <http://www.toefl.org/tse/tseindx.html>
- Ford, Cecilia E. 2004. Contingency and units in interaction. *Discourse Processes* 6: 27–52.
- Ford, Cecilia E. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press. 134–184.
- Franklin, Sidney (Producer) and Mervyn LeRoy (Director). 1940. *Waterloo Bridge*. United States: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.
- Gardner, Rod. 1997. The conversational object *mhm*: Weak and variable acknowledging token. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 30: 131–156.
- Gardner, Rod. 2002. *When Listeners Talk: Response Tokens and Listener Stance*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Benjamins.
- Hayashi, Reiko. 1988. Simultaneous talk – from the perspective of floor management of English and Japanese speakers. *World Englishes* 7: 269–288.
- Hayashi, Reiko. 1996. *Cognition, Empathy, and Interaction: Floor Management of English and Japanese Conversation*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Itoh, Natsumi. 1995. Japanese backchannel cue behavior in English conversation. Unpublished MA thesis, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1997. The Northridge earthquake conversations: The floor structure and the 'loop' sequence in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 661–693.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press. 350–377.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. Transcription notation. In J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press. ix–xvi.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York and Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. 1999. Phrasal unit boundaries and organization of turns and sequences in Korean conversation. *Human Studies* 22: 425–446.

- Kim, Nam-Kil. 1987. Korean. In Bernard Comrie (ed.) *The World's Major Languages*. New York and Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press. 881–898.
- Kim, Nam-Kil. 1992. Korean. In William Bright (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (volume 2). New York and Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press. 282–286.
- Lee, Hansol H. B. 1989. *Korean Grammar*. New York and Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- LoCastro, Virginia. 1987. *Aizuchi*: A Japanese conversational routine. In Larry E. Smith (ed.) *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes*. New York: Prentice Hall. 101–113.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1923. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In Charles Kay Ogden, Ivor Armstrong Richards, Bronislaw Malinowski, Francis Graham Crookshank and John Percival Postgate (eds.) *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language Upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: Kegan Paul Trench Trubner. 296–336.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1986. On back-channel behavior in Japanese and English casual conversation. *Linguistics* 24: 1079–1108.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1990. Conversation management in contrast: Listener responses in Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 397–412.
- Murata, Kumiko. 1994. Intrusive or co-operative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 385–400.
- Ohta, Amy Snyder. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1982. Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 71–93.
- Streek, Jürgen. 1995. On projection. In Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin and Esther N. Goody (eds.) *Social Intelligence and Interaction: Expressions and Implications of the Social Bias in Human Intelligence*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press. 87–110.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 1999. *Turn-taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study in Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Benjamins.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2000. Turn projection in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33: 1–38.
- Tao, Hongyin and Sandra A. Thompson. 1991. English backchannels in Mandarin conversation: A case study of superstratum pragmatic 'interference'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16: 61–75.
- White, Sheida. 1989. Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in Society* 18: 59–76.
- Yngve, Victor H. 1970. On getting a word in edgewise. In *Papers From the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, April 16–18, 1970*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, Department of Linguistics. 567–578.

APPENDIX

American speakers are identified as AA, BA, JA, and KA; Korean speakers as DK, EK, MK, and SK. Transcription conventions are taken from Jefferson (1984) with additions by Ford and Thompson (1996), and are as follows:

- [Point of onset of overlapping talk.
-] Point at which overlapping talk terminates.
- = Paired equals signs connect two adjacent lines to indicate that the second is 'latched' to the first, that is, it follows the first with no discernable silence between them.
- (0.4) The number in parentheses indicates the duration of silence measured in tenths of a second.
- (.) A hearable silence less than two tenths of a second.
- wife Underscoring indicates some form of stress, usually a combination of loudness and pitch movement.
- I- A dash in the English transcript indicates an abruptly cut-off sound.
- 저-는 A dash in the Korean transcript indicates an internal morpheme boundary in an agglutinated word.
- . , ? Punctuation marks are *not* used to indicate grammar, but are instead used to indicate the nuclear tone on a pitch unit. A period '.' indicates falling tone, a question mark '?' indicates rising tone, and a comma ',' indicates a slight rise or level tone.
- :: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the preceding sound. More colons indicate a longer sound.
- °° Degree signs are used to indicate the onset and termination of a stretch of speech that is quieter than the surrounding speech.
- >< A 'greater than' followed by a 'less than' symbol indicates the onset and termination of speech that is faster than the surrounding speech.
- > A 'greater than' symbol on its own indicates the boundary of a pragmatic unit.
- / A slash character indicates the boundary of a syntactic unit.
- hhhh Laughter or hearable out-breaths are indicated by a sequence of 'h's.
- hh A raised dot preceding 'h' indicates a hearable in-breath. The more 'h's, the longer the in-breath.
- () Empty parentheses indicate that something was said but that the transcriber cannot recognize what it was.
- ↑↓ Up and down arrows indicate a hearably greater range of pitch movement.

Address correspondence to:

*Richard F. Young
Department of English
University of Wisconsin-Madison
600 North Park Street
Madison
Wisconsin 53706-1403
U.S.A.
rfyoung@wisc.edu*