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Abstract

This study employs the methodological framework of CA-for-SLA to identify developmental changes in second language learners’ competence in the use of the Korean sentence-ending suffix canh as an interactional resource by examining cross-sectional Korean classroom data. A microanalysis of 68 hours of video-recorded data from advanced- and intermediate-level Korean language classroom interaction focused on students’ varying degrees of competency in the production of utterances with canh to manage shared knowledge in the action of giving accounts. The analysis revealed that the two proficiency levels’ turn construction and design of canh usage are distinctive in terms of their presentation of different types of knowledge. Learners acquire the ability to use canh to manage first-hand, shared knowledge before they acquire the ability to manage common sense knowledge and unshared knowledge using canh. This comparison of the two proficiency levels’ use of contingent methods of using the target suffix provides evidence for the development of L2 interactional competence by showing that learners develop the skill to use interactional devices to achieve delicate interactional outcomes.

1 Introduction

A line of research in second language analysis (SLA) has adopted conversation analysis (CA) in order to conduct rigorous, detailed examinations of interactional contexts in language learning situations. CA-for-SLA (Kasper & Wagner, 2011) studies have reached a general agreement that development in a second language takes place through a situated, conversational process that occurs between participants rather than a cognitive process of one individual’s mind (Firth & Wagner, 1997, 2007; Kasper, 2009; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Lee, 2013). That is, CA-for-SLA investigates L2 speakers’ language use by examining the contexts, semiotic resources, and constraints that L2 speakers make relevant in the sequential structures of turns at talk (Lee & Hellermann, 2014). One of the preferred ways to investigate the developmental changes of L2 speakers in SLA research is by analyzing their use of linguistic resources (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). Instead of identifying the presence or absence of target linguistic resources, studies in CA-for-SLA demonstrate the procedures L2 speakers accomplish by examining how the phenomena of L2 use are sequentially organized and contextually situated in talk-in-interaction (Ishida, 2009; Kim, 2009; Lee, Park, & Sohn, 2011).

Adopting the methodological framework of CA-for-SLA, this study addresses language development specifically in terms of L2 speakers’ use of a particular linguistic resource: the Korean interpersonal modal ending suffix canh. The suffix canh, which has been reported to signal the speaker’s anticipation that the interlocutor will agree with the speaker’s utterance (Kawanishi, 1994; Kawanishi & Sohn, 1993; Lee, 1999; Suh, 2002), embodies delicate interactional business in
the sense-making activities of talk-in-interaction. This study examines the distinctive choices L2 Korean speakers at different proficiency levels make in regard to their use of this suffix in order to illuminate the stages of learners’ development that correlate to interactional competence in the use of linguistic resources in natural interactions. Drawing on cross-sectional L2 data, this study specifically examines how the use of canh is managed in classroom interaction in order to accomplish actions of account-giving in opinion presentation.

2 Background

2.1 CA-for-SLA: Developmental changes in the use of linguistic resources

A considerable amount of recent research has demonstrated how SLA studies benefit from CA’s focus on sequential analysis through the detailed analysis of interactional data. The scholars engaged in such work have focused their attention on describing interactional activities that L2 speakers engage in inside and outside of educational settings and the resources they employ to accomplish certain interactional goals (e.g. Brouwer & Wagner, 2004; Burch, 2014; Hauser, 2013; Kasper & Wagner, 2011; Lee, 2013; Lee & Hellerman, 2013; Markee, 2008; Peker & Poehner, 2010; Seedhouse & Walsh, 2010). In this line of studies, L2 speakers’ development of interactional competence is not located in the mere presence or absence of linguistic forms or structures but in the use of various semiotic resources in interactional exchanges (Lee & Hellermann, 2014). Lee and Hellermann (2014) articulated a conversation analytic approach to L2 speakers’ developmental changes as follows.

The sequential analysis of the exchange shows that L2 use cannot be examined only in reference to the linguistic forms and/or relevant variables. Rather, the analysis needs to take into account the interpretive work of understanding that participants display, even when the task is to trace changes in the target L2 use. CA’s focus on sequential analysis can specify, for example, what the speaker does (and does not) know, what he or she does (and does not) see, what assumptions are enacted, what contextual relevance is brought out and handled, and how particular tasks are recognized and acted on during the course of interaction. (p. 7)

Recently, a body of work has emerged that addresses the developmental agenda more directly by employing longitudinal and cross-sectional study designs and by using CA to focus on contingent language use in the analysis of naturally occurring conversation data. These studies investigate the developmental changes in the use of particular linguistic objects by L2 speakers (e.g. Ishida, 2009, 2011; Kim, 2009; Lee et al., 2011). Ishida’s first longitudinal study (2009) showed how Japanese L2 speakers’ increased interactional competence using the linguistic resource ne enabled them to engage in social interactions more actively over time. Her more recent longitudinal study (2011) examined how L2 speakers of Japanese became more deeply engaged and were able to manage a wider repertoire of listener responses by the end of the study. In a similar vein, Kim’s (2009) cross-sectional study examined the use of the Korean discourse markers nuntey and kuntey by L2 speakers of Korean at different proficiency levels. Using occurrences of the target items by native speakers as a reference (Park, 1999), Kim found different usages and sequential occurrences of the target markers between the different proficiency levels. More recently, Lee, Park, and Sohn’s (2011) cross-sectional study of Korean oral proficiency interviews compared the construction of responses by advanced- and intermediate-level learners of Korean. Their analysis showed that the advanced speakers frequently expanded their responses using phrase-final and sentence-final suffixes to mark various interactional stances. These studies have demonstrated the usefulness of CA in longitudinal and cross-sectional investigation of L2 speakers’ development of interactional competence in the use of linguistic resources.

Building upon this earlier research, this study implements the theoretical and analytical principles of CA in a cross-sectional design to explicate interactional development, based on the premise that advanced and intermediate L2 speakers use linguistic resources differently. It begins its discussion by identifying the presence and the absence of the target linguistic resource in the sequential structure of turns at talk. The focus of the analysis, however, is on participants’ display of mu-
tual understanding in situated contexts of L2 interaction (Lee, 2013). This study thus addresses L2 development through detailed accounts of participants’ situated methods of talk, with particular attention to how the participants use a specific linguistic resource, the interpersonal modal ending suffix canh, during the course of interaction.

2.2 The Korean sentence-ending suffix canh

Korean is an agglutinative language with SOV word order. In Korean conversation, speakers’ stances are frequently displayed through sentence-ending suffixes that affix to the final verb (Sohn, 1999, 2007, 2013). Strategic use of sentence-ending suffixes is therefore essential in social interaction. This study focuses on the use of canh, which has been reported to be one of the most frequently used sentence-ending suffixes in Korean colloquial discourse (Lee, 1991). Canh is sometimes compared to the English tag question isn’t it or the discourse markers right and you know. It has been argued that canh is a reduced form of the long form of negation ci anh, which is comprised of the suffix ci and the negative verb anh (not), having developed through a process of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott, 2003).

Fig. 1. Grammaticalization process of canh

The reduced form canh has acquired an interactive function; it seeks agreement from interlocutors or signals the speaker’s assumption that the interlocutor will agree with the speaker’s utterance (Sohn, 2010). Korean language textbooks also often introduce canh as an interactional marker with the function of “assuming agreement” (Cho, Schulz, Lee, & Sohn, 2001). The most widely used Korean language textbook in North America (Cho et al., 2001) explains the function of canh as follows: “the sentence ending canh is used when the speaker assumes that the listener will agree with him/her. It is also used when the speaker wants to reconfirm facts” (pp. 17–18). Excerpt 1 below is an example from this textbook, which emphasizes the agreement-soliciting function of canh.

Excerpt 1. Textbook (Cho et al., 2001, p. 17)

1 A: eti ka-se-yo?
   where go-HON-POL
   ‘Where are you going?’

2 B: pataska-ey ka-yo. nalssi-ka tep-canh-ayo.
   beach-LOC go-POL weather-TOP hot-canh-POL
   ‘To the beach. The weather is hot, you know.’

In the field of Korean first language acquisition, it has been noted that Korean children start using canh productively at a very early age (Choi, 1995). At the same time, it has also been noted that it is exceptionally challenging for non-native speakers of Korean to become proficient in the use of this suffix (Sohn, 2006). These seemingly contradictory findings suggest that the suffix canh has prime interactional importance for Korean speakers, but its subtle functions are not easily describable.

Despite the difficulty of pinpointing the functions of canh due to its interactional and colloquial traits, the status of final canh as a modal suffix for expressing certainty towards a proposition has long been recognized in the literature. Many studies employing an interactional approach examine how canh is used to perform social actions in actual conversation. This line of research treats canh as a linguistic marker that indicates the speaker’s attitude or stance towards the proposition or addressee. Kawanishi and Sohn’s (1993) research was the first to describe the new discourse function indexed by the reduced form of the negation construction ci anh. By analyzing
spoken discourse data, they demonstrated that *canh* indexes a speaker’s unwavering certainty regarding the information conveyed in pursuit of agreement from recipients.

In addition to its function as a means to evoke approval or agreement, previous studies on *canh* have noted its epistemic attributes (Choi, 1995; Lee, 1999) in relation to commitment or assertion as well as its affective qualities in regard to the elicitation of empathy (e.g. Excerpt 1: agreement-seeking). With these functions, *canh* indexes the speakers’ epistemic, affective, and/or moral stance towards a statement (Kawanishi, 1994; Kawanishi & Sohn, 1993; Kim & Suh, 2004; Lo, 2006). In particular, Lee (1999) argues that the speaker’s presumption of the hearer’s affirmative response as represented through the use of *canh* derives from the function of *ci* indicating the speaker’s commitment to a statement. He also discusses the interactional traits of *canh* in discourse by underscoring the role of addressees (p. 269).

Analysis of *canh* has also been conducted from the perspective of language socialization (Kim & Suh, 2004; Lo, 2006; Suh, 2001). Framing their work within Kawanishi and Sohn’s (1993) discussion, Kim and Suh (2004) and Suh (2001) claim that the frequent use of *canh* by a caregiver indexes his or her orientation to a belief in the child’s ability to provide an answer, demonstrating mutual understandings and shared feelings. A caregiver’s frequent use of *canh* orients to the knowledge state of the child and points to shared knowledge to prompt the child to identify the object or information of instruction. Suh’s findings show how a caregiver’s use of *canh* works as an important resource for socialization. In a similar vein, Lo (2006) investigates the use of *canh* in an instructional situation, showing how an afterschool teacher uses *canh* to socialize students. Lo shows that the teacher assigns moral responsibility to students by using *canh* in statements that reflect epistemic stance, affective stance, and alignment in the context of morally justified or unjustified propositions. She also discusses the teacher’s use of *canh* as a device to elicit empathy from students. Lo’s findings demonstrate how the use of linguistic resources such as *canh* index social relationships (Duranti, 1994).

In sum, prior research on *canh* has linked the suffix to epistemics in the sense that they index shared knowledge. By thus using *canh*, the speaker appeals to pre-existing shared knowledge, which serves as an invitation to the co-participant to consider what is already common ground (Clark, 1996).

### 2.3 Management of shared knowledge using *canh* in Korean conversation

Some studies have examined the use of *canh* in terms of speakers’ information status, as it is often employed to index shared knowledge (Ju & Sohn, 2013; Suh, 2002). Suh (2002) and Ju and Sohn (2013) undertook comprehensive analyses of the discourse functions of *canh* in Korean native speaker conversations from a CA perspective. Both studies argued that *canh* is used by the speaker to invoke “common ground” or an assumption that the information he or she presents is shared with interlocutors. In particular, Suh examined *canh*’s functions according to the source of information displayed by *canh* utterances. Suggesting that *canh* is a marker indexing common ground, Suh identified turn-final *canh*’s major functions as (1) providing an account and (2) challenging the other party while negotiating common ground. The following example from Suh’s study shows how *canh* is employed in the context of giving an account.

**Excerpt 2. L1 Korean speaker (Adapted from Suh, 2002, pp. 299–300)**

1. **S:** (1.7) (hh) *cikum kunikkan mak cipphil cuwung-i-si-n?* now so-DM just writing midst-be-HON-ATTR

   ‘So now you’re in the midst of writing [your dissertation]?’

2. **H:** *ai kulay-ya toy-nuntye mos ha-ci* well so should become-CIRCUM NEG do-CONN

   ‘Well, I’m supposed to be doing that, but I can’t.’

3. **maynnal wa-kacikwu ilekwu iss-canh-a?**

   everyday come-CONN like this exist-canh-IE

   ‘I come [to school] every day, and this is all I do, you know.’
In this example, H provides an account for his slow progress on his dissertation by formulating his turn with the suffix canh in lines 2–3. According to Suh, the speaker deploys canh to convey indisputable knowledge shared by the other participant to obtain mutual agreement.

Both of these studies also asserted that this common ground does not necessarily refer to experiences actually shared by the participants. That is, it may be knowledge that the speaker wishes to attribute to the addressee regardless of the addressee’s actual knowledge status. In such a case, the speaker employs the marker to strategically manage the information at hand so as to involve the addressee in the joint construction of common ground (Suh, 2002). The studies thus also provide evidence for the view that epistemic claims are resources that speakers may deploy in various ways that render their talk more fitted to the action that they are doing regardless of whether they “know” the information or not (Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011). Suh’s study is also noteworthy for her discussion of three types of information status where the use of canh indexes common ground: 1) when the source of evidence is immediately shared between interlocutors; 2) when the information marked with canh is commonly shared (i.e., common sense) knowledge; and 3) when canh indexes information that is obviously not known by the addressees. Suh’s report on the type of knowledge indexed by the use of canh is one of the motivations for the current study’s attention to the role of relative epistemic stance and status between conversationalists (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b) in the use of linguistic resources in terms of “epistemic domains” (Stivers & Rossano, 2010). The suffix canh indexes shared knowledge, which indicates equality of epistemic access (Heritage, 2012a). Analysis of the present data reveals that there is often congruence between epistemic status and epistemic stance such that the epistemic stance encoded in a turn with canh is aligned with the epistemic status of the speaker. On the other hand, cases of incongruence between epistemic status and the epistemic stance projected by using canh are also identified. In these cases, by using canh the speakers project an epistemic stance of appearing more knowledgeable than they really are to achieve certain interactional outcomes.

What makes this discussion on epistemic imbalance noteworthy is its observation that when the participants are giving accounts with and without using canh, different types of knowledge appear to influence turn construction differently according to proficiency levels. The advanced-level students’ data in the current study display all of these uses of canh; their tactical management of information with the use of canh is similar to that of L1 speakers. The intermediate-level students’ data show a narrower range of uses of canh. This study closely examines turn constructions and sequential organization so as to identify what the learners are doing by using or by not using canh. More specifically, the study examines a range of interactional practices across two proficiency levels to show how shared knowledge is managed through the use of the Korean sentence-ending suffix canh in classroom conversation. The following research questions guided the investigation:

1. Is there any difference in the employment of canh and the development of sequences between L2 speakers in different proficiency groups? If so, is there any variation in the ways the different proficiency groups accomplish the same actions?
2. Is the difference in the use of canh between Korean L2 speakers at varying proficiency levels related to the developmental order of canh?

3 Data and method

3.1 Data from a cross-sectional study

The data for the current study consist of approximately 68 hours of video-recorded classroom interactions that occurred in a Korean as a second language program for professionals at a university in the United States during a one-year period. Two classes of the same course divided by proficiency level, advanced and intermediate, were recorded. Each of the classes was small, having only four to six students; altogether, five students participated. These classes were content-based and dealt with matters related to current societal issues in South Korea, such as South Korea’s
emerging generations, changing gender roles, Korean reunification, and so forth. Both classes included a significant amount of student discussion on assigned topics. The majority of the students in the program were Korean-American heritage learners, but some were non-heritage learners of Korean. All participants’ identities are pseudonyms.

### Table 1. Participants’ language profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (gender)</th>
<th>TOPIK(^4) level</th>
<th>OPI level</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy (F)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Bilingual (Eng/Kor)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina (F)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun (F)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue (F)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny (F)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transcription conventions used in this study are adapted from those used in conversation analysis (ten Have, 2007). To clearly indicate the target suffix, each occurrence of \( canh \) appears in bold. The data are transcribed using Yale romanization (Sohn, 1999, pp. 2–3), and morpheme-by-morpheme glosses are provided (glossing conventions and abbreviations appear in Appendixes A and B).

#### 3.2 Focal practice: Sequential placement and turn architecture

In order to describe the collection of interactions under investigation, this section identifies the context in which the focal interactional practice occurs, and then describes sequential placement and turn compositional features of this practice. This study focuses on sequences of opinion presentation in which the speakers express their opinions on certain issues in a classroom discussion setting. Figure 2 shows the broader sequential environment in which \( canh \) regularly occurs in the data. It also displays the sequential positions of the target suffix in the data. The \( canh \) constructions occur as part of a turn in which giving an account is underway within the sequence of students’ presentation of opinion.

These sequences are typically long turns in which a student presents an opinion on an issue under discussion. \( Canh \) utterances typically occur within extended opinion presenting; that is, in turns consisting of more than one turn constructional unit (TCU; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Figure 2 displays a model of the use of \( canh \) in this position, along with an example.

![Fig. 2. Sequential placement of canh](image-url)
This multi-unit turn consists of two distinctive actions: an assertion-equivalent, which is a claim about an issue (e.g. “I think dog-meat is not something bad.”) and the prior or following supporting account for the assertion (e.g. “It’s because…dog-meat is just one kind of meat.”). Turns with the target item canh are repeatedly associated with the particular action of account-giving: The speaker presents knowledge or information as shared to support his or her prior or subsequent claim. Speakers who use canh in this position routinely elaborate on their assertions with accounts, explanations, excuses, and the like. In particular, what final canh indexes in this sequential position is the speaker’s invocation of prior knowledge or experience of the matter at hand (Lee, 1999; Suh, 2002). In terms of turn design, the target turn of account-giving is explicitly designed with an initiation using the causal conjunction waynyahamyen (‘because’), and the speaker marks the information given in his or her account as shared by using canh at the end of the turn. In response to such a turn of opinion presentation including a canh utterance, other participants project an aligning or disaligning opinion depending on their epistemic access and commitment to a particular line of action.

4 Findings: Types of shared knowledge and the use of canh

In this section, the data are presented in excerpts arranged according to the type and status of information managed through the deployment of turns of giving accounts with or without the target suffix canh. For each type of shared knowledge, comparable sequences representing different proficiency levels are discussed and compared in order to demonstrate how the same actions are achieved in somewhat different ways by interactants who have different resources.

The comparison between the two groups is further enhanced by reference to L1 interaction as drawn on the study by Suh (2002). Therefore, this section pays special attention to the different types of shared knowledge introduced in turns of giving accounts marked or unmarked by canh. As mentioned, Suh examined canh’s functions according to the source of information displayed by canh utterances, and proposed that canh indexes common ground with three types of information status: knowledge directly shared between interlocutors, commonly shared knowledge, and unshared knowledge that is not known by the addressees. Many of the phenomena discussed in the current study show a resemblance to those discussed in Suh’s study.

Overall, the learners at the two different proficiency levels all displayed interactional competence in developing a sequence of opinion presentation through the actions of making an assertion and giving an account for the assertion. However, the analysis discovered that the details of turn construction and the types of knowledge learners can manage using canh are different according to proficiency levels. Table 2 categorizes the types of information that the speakers invoked for accomplishing the particular action of giving an account in the excerpts presented in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of sharedness</th>
<th>Type of knowledge</th>
<th>Use of canh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Knowledge with source of evidence</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common sense knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unshared knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students at both levels displayed competence in employing canh when they gave accounts drawing on information with direct, on-the-spot access. Intermediate students, however, used different forms with simpler functions, such as unmarked ko, in the same sequential position when they gave accounts based on common sense knowledge.

4.1 Invoking shared knowledge: Equal access to a source of evidence
The first type of knowledge *canh* proposes in account giving turns marks information in which the source of evidence is presently observable or recoverable by the interlocutors (Suh, 2002), and thus is shared between all the participants in the interaction. Through a *canh* utterance, the speaker implies equality of access to the referent situation or object. Therefore, relative states of knowledge present the circumstances in which both the speaker and the recipient have equal access to information. The two examples in Excerpt 3, from L1 speakers’ interactions, illustrate how *canh* utterances conveying information with immediate access provide conversationalists a shared ground on which to accomplish an interactional goal of giving an account.

**Excerpt 3. L1 Korean speaker (Adapted from Suh, 2002, pp. 288)**

1. S: ike-hako ikes-to ttokkath-canh-a. kw-(.)mwenka:;
   this-CONN this-also same-canh-INT that something
   ‘These two items have something in common, right? Something…’
2. J: kule-ney cincca, (.). hh
   like that really
   ‘Indeed [they are similar] really’
3. S: pwunwiki-ka
   atmosphere- NOM
   ‘The atmosphere [of the two items is the same].’

Extract 3 shows a way in which a *canh* utterance claims shared knowledge by providing an on-the-spot observation of a material object (a table) to which all other recipients have immediate access. S’s claim using *canh* in line 1 receives immediate agreement from recipient J in line 2. As illustrated in these interactions between L1 speakers, the use of *canh* in giving accounts seems to serve as evidence for participants’ knowledge of and responsibility for a matter (Heritage & Raymond, 2005).

The following analysis from the current data set from L2 speakers’ interaction demonstrates similar phenomena in the use of *canh* in doing the action of account giving. In the students’ account-giving with *canh*, the first type of knowledge is information in which the source of evidence is presently observable or recoverable by the interlocutors (Suh, 2002), and thus is shared between all the participants in the interaction. Through a *canh* utterance, the speaker implies equality of access to the referent situation or object. The use of *canh* in giving accounts thus seems to serve as evidence for participants’ knowledge of a matter (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b, 2013). Along with *canh*, speakers employ other linguistic resources to mark this type of knowledge, such as quotative expressions and past-tense markings. The source to which the participants have epistemic access can be a material object (see Excerpt 4), a present interlocutor, or a preceding context.

### 4.1.1 Advanced learners

The following conversation (Excerpt 4) from an advanced-level student interaction exemplifies the first phenomenon focused on in this study: In an account-giving turn, students present information to which others have immediate on-the-spot access; to do so, they use the suffix *canh* while pointing out the source of evidence, indicating other participants’ equal epistemic access.

A practice of combining the use of *canh* and a quotative form is observed in Excerpt 4. The source of information is the material object of a newspaper article in this case. The class had read an article about an arson committed in South Korea that severely damaged the *Namdaemun* (the Great South Gate), the first of Korea’s National Treasures.

**Excerpt 4. The Great South Gate (Sun)**

1. Sun: han’kwuk-i: cikum mwe kule-n ke kwanli-ka
   Korea-NOM now DM that-ATTR thing management-NOM
2. cal an-toy-nun ke kath-ayo
   well NEG-become-ATTR thing seem-POL
   ‘I think Korea is not doing very well managing those things.’
This segment begins with Sun’s negative assessment of Korea’s capacity to manage cultural assets in lines 1–2. Subsequent to the teacher’s simple acknowledgement in line 3, Sun presents the reason for her assessment using canh by straightforwardly referring to the article in lines 4 and 5 (‘Yes, because the article stated that when the incident happened, the cultural asset, Namdaemun, was open, right?’). The beginning of the account is marked with a causal conjunction waynyahamyen (‘because’) and is followed by an explicit indication of the source of information: the article (line 4: ‘...the article states that...’). Note that she delivers this information from the article using the combination of a quotative marker lako and the suffix canh in line 5. By indicating not only that the speaker has obtained the information through hearsay, but also that the speaker assumes the information she conveys is previously known to the recipient, the quotative construction along with canh is used to appeal to the recipient to treat what is said as shared information.

In lines 6 and 7, the teacher shows her orientation to the canh utterance’s function of establishing agreement between interlocutors by giving more than an acknowledgement, as she elaborates on what the article says about the government’s position on the unlocked condition of the gate (that it was for the purpose of attracting tourists), using a committal ci which indexing confirmation (Lee, 1999). In the next turn (line 8), after providing an acknowledgement of the teacher’s elaboration by nodding, Sun displays dissatisfaction with the government’s explanation and reaffirms her negative assessment by saying that the Korean government could have better protected the gate while still attracting tourists (lines 8–9). Note that in this reaffirmation of her original opinion, Sun displays a lower level of assertion by prefacing her negative evaluation with praise of Korea’s capacity (Pomerantz, 1984) in lines 11–12. In this segment, we witness one of the functions of canh in the giving of an account by appealing to shared knowledge for which the source of evidence is present.
4.1.2 Intermediate learners

The following two examples from intermediate-level students’ conversations display very similar sequential environments to the excerpt above. Analysis of these examples reveals that intermediate-level students are capable of using canh when giving accounts by proposing information with a direct source of evidence. In Excerpt 5, the students are engaged in a discussion of South and North Korea’s reunification.

Excerpt 5: Sue: Government’s help
1 Teacher: kulem swu-ssi-nun-yo? kungcengcek-ulo sayngkakh-yo?
them VOC-TOP-POL positive-ADV think-POL
‘Then what about you, Sue? Are you for it?’
2 Sue: well↑, ku:
that ‘Well, umm…’
3 (.)
4 Jenny: ((points at Sue with an index finger)) pwucengceki-lay-yo.
negative-HEARSAY-POL
‘She’s against it.’
5 Teacher: ((laughs))
6 Sue: ku: ku nam- no wait oh yeah: no pwukhan salam- tul- i↑
that that South North Korea person-PL-TOP
‘Well, umm…’
7 ku(.2) ku(.2) cwungkwuk-eyse tomangka-myen
that that China-LOC escape-COND
[lines omitted]
‘If North Koreans escape from China, [they get to the South Korean embassy and then the Korean government gives them money because they live in South Korea, they live in houses and they spend all the money.]’
8 they don’t know how to live in our society.
9 and their sengkyek is wancen talla-yo. waynyamyen
personality completely different-POL because Their personality is completely different because...
10 ALL: ((laugh))
[lines omitted]
11 Sue: No. They are not like Dan. No. waynyamyen, ku sinmwun
because that newspaper
12 kisa-eyse one of the girls, waynyamyen the government,
article-LOC because
13 wuli-wuli not my but namhan: namhan cengpwu-ka
we we South Korea South Korea government-TOP
14 a cuw-canh-ayo=
all give-canh-POL
‘Because in that article, my, my not my but (South), Korea’s government gives them every-thing.’
15 Teacher: =ney
yes
16 Yes.

This excerpt begins with the teacher eliciting the opinion of a particular student, Sue, on the issue, in line 1. Upon the initiation of Sue’s response, another student, Jenny, provides a turn of assessment in a comical manner on behalf of Sue in line 4. Although it is delivered in a laughable fashion, Sue appears to confirm Jenny’s claim of Sue’s stance. In elaborating her negative view starting in line 6, Sue talks about possible problems that might be caused by the different dispositions of the South and North Korean people. After her statement about these different
characteristics, in line 13, Sue produces waynyahamyen (‘it’s because’), which marks the launch of her account-giving. This turn of giving an account, however, is cut off by Jenny in line 14. After a brief side sequence regarding a fellow student’s personality (lines 14–19), Sue resumes her truncated prior turn by recycling waynyahamyen (‘it’s because’) in line 19. Note that Sue deploys the suffix canh when appealing to the direct source of authority in this turn of account-giving, similar to the advanced student in Excerpt 4. Again in this case, the source that is directly shared by everyone is an article in a newspaper. To support her negative view on the issue, Sue brings up a story from the newspaper article using canh (lines 19–22: ‘Because in that article […] Korea’s government gives them everything’).

Although Sue uses a number of different resources (e.g. code-switching) in her account-giving turn, she displays her competence in the use of canh when she proposes an account based on information that is obviously shared by all her interlocutors. She invokes shared knowledge using canh by referring to a specific source the other participants in the interaction are also familiar with. Her pursuit of agreement successfully elicits a positive answer from the teacher in the following turn (line 23: ney ‘Right’). This excerpt clearly shows that an intermediate student can employ canh to elicit empathy or agreement from interlocutors.

These two examples from the two proficiency levels (Excerpts 4 and 5) show the L2 speakers’ competence in the use of canh to express strong epistemic confidence in their management of shared information with direct sources. In both cases, the speaker first asserts that he or she had a prior discussion regarding this matter, and then moves on to cite that part as evidence for the recipient’s knowledge of the reported matter.

4.2 Invoking shared knowledge: Equal access to common sense information

The excerpts in this section demonstrate the use of canh when invoking another type of knowledge during account-giving. Participants call on commonly known or common sense knowledge, such as a well-known social phenomenon or societal trend (Suh, 2002). This is a type of knowledge with which the speaker is not necessarily directly involved. In terms of epistemic domain, account-giving with common sense knowledge illustrates a convergence in the relation between the speaker’s epistemic status and epistemic stance (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b, 2013), which is projected through the use of canh. However, conveying common sense knowledge does not guarantee epistemic equality. Although common sense knowledge is assumed to be “normatively shared” (Suh, 2002) by conversationalists, it is not something that participants can immediately access in real time. Therefore, various supplementary factors are involved, such as a person’s access to it, a person’s right to know it, and so on (Heritage, 2012a). The example below shows the L1 speaker’s use of canh that marks common sense knowledge in giving accounts.

Extract 6: L1 Korean speaker (Suh, 2002, p. 290)

1 R: wuli tongney po-myen ta hance-yey-yo.
   our neighbor see-COND all Korean brand-COP-POL
   ‘Everybody in our neighborhood uses Korean products.’

2 S: tongney acwumma-tul-1 kule-n tey palk-canh-ayo.
   neighbor housewife-PL-NOM such matter savvy-canh-POL
   ‘Housewives are savvy in choosing the right stuff, aren’t they?’

In response to R’s statement in line 1 regarding Korean housewives in her neighborhood, S provides explanation using canh, by which she invokes the common sense knowledge that housewives are usually knowledgeable in the domain of household appliances (line 2). Given that an utterance with it contains knowledge that is generally shared, using canh serves as an efficient strategy to seek agreement from the other interlocutors (Suh, 2002). In the present data, the occurrences of canh invoking this type of knowledge in giving accounts are found throughout both advanced and intermediate students’ interaction. However, intermediate-level students’ data also
display non-occurrences of *canh* in this sequential position, which could provide an indication of development in the use of *canh*.

Excerpt 7 shows an advanced learner’s use of *canh* in this context, while it illustrates the absence of *canh* in the same kind of context by an intermediate learner, for the purpose of comparison. Identifying the presence of the device *canh* is, however, merely the first step in demonstrating the detailed interactional method that the participants deploy. The point of this analysis is to detail the ways in which participants manage the action of giving an account using various resources including *canh*.

### 4.2.1 Advanced learners

Excerpt 7 comes from a classroom discussion by advanced-level students on the consumption of dog meat in South Korea. Students read a Korean newspaper article regarding the history and benefits of dog meat. Prior to this exchange, the teacher initiates a question soliciting students’ opinions on the issue.

**Excerpt 7: Dog-meat (Wendy)**

1. Wendy: *kun-tey wuski-n-key.* >"yeylul tulese" < <sokoki>
   - but-DM funny-ATTR-thing for example *beef*
2. *manhi mek-canh-ayo.* kun-tey mwe >"yeylul tulese" <
   - a lot eat-*canh*-POL but DM for example
   - ‘But, the funny thing is... people eat cows a lot, right? But for example, …’
3. *into-na <hintu> ha-nun tey-se-nun so-ka koyngcanghi*
   - India-or *Hindu* do-ATTR place-at-NOM cow-NOM extremely
4. *wusangsi toy-canh-ayo*
   - idolize become-*canh*-POL
   - ‘... cows are very much idolized in India or places where they practice Hinduism, right?’
5. =kulayse *ku salam-tul-un:*
   - so that people-PL-NOM
6. *so mek-nun salam-tul koyngcanghi hyemoha-nuntey::(.2)*
   - cow eat-ATTR people-PL extremely loathe-CIRCUM
   - ‘So, they hate people who eat cows very much …’
7. *ku kay-lul <an mek-nun::>↑ nala-tul-1*
   - that dog-ACC NEG eat-ATTR country-PL-NOM
8. *sencinkwuk-ilako hay-se developed country-HEARSAY because*
   - ‘... just because some developed countries don’t eat dog-meat, …’
9. Teacher: *ummm*
10. Wendy: *wuli-ka ku-ke-l kkok nappu-tako hal*
    - we-NOM that-thing-ACC certainly bad-ØT do
11. *philyo-nun "eps-nun kes kath-ayo²="*
    - necessary-ATTR not exist-ATTR think-POL
    - ‘I think there’s no need for us to say that eating dog is bad.’
12. Teacher: =*ummm*

Wendy presents her opinion beginning in line 1. In this long turn of opinion presentation (lines 1–4), her accounts using *canh* precede her assertion on the issue. After securing an interactional space by using the disjunctive marker *kun-tey* (Park, 1999) and the following evaluative adjective *wuskin* (‘funny’) at the beginning of the turn (line 1), she provides an account while offering an example in which she uses *canh* to mark information that is common knowledge (line 2: ‘People eat cows a lot, right?’). Note that she again completes an example-providing turn with *canh* lines 3–4: ‘But for example, cows are very much idolized in India or places where they practice Hinduism, right?’). In both cases, Wendy provides accounts for her position by invoking knowledge based on common sense as background information, using *canh* with contrasting categorizations of ‘people who eat beef (we)’ and ‘people who do not eat beef (Indians or Hindus)’. In this re-
spect, canh is employed when the speaker uses common sense to obtain the addressee’s recognition (Kawanishi, 1994; Suh, 2002). Such a stance is conveyed mainly by the deployment of the final canh.

In the following concluding turn, Wendy explains the implication of her example by highlighting Hindus’ strong opposition to beef-eaters: ‘So, they hate people who eat cows very much’ (lines 5–6). The ensuing utterance (lines 7–8, 10–11) contains the epistemic marker kes kath (‘I think, seem, appear’), which displays a mitigated tone. This mixed use of modal expressions including canh demonstrates the speaker’s interactional competence concerning the use of such expressions as part of the linguistic resources for social interaction.

### 4.2.2 Intermediate learners

The following example from an intermediate-level students’ conversation presents a very similar sequential environment as Excerpt 7. However, in this excerpt, when the speaker invokes common sense knowledge, she accomplishes the action of giving an account in ways other than employing canh. The students here are also talking about the consumption of dog meat in Korea. The conversation follows the teacher’s question to the students of whether they think the consumption of dog meat is bad or not.

**Excerpt 8: Sue: Strange food**

1 Sue: Umm (2.0) umm (.4) ttalu-n na:::la:: ey::(.5)uhh: other-ATTR country-GEN

2 umsik mwunhwu-laul (.5) <ihay>hay-ya tway-yo=

food culture-ACC understand-should-POL

‘Um…they should understand other countries’ food culture.’

3 =>waynyamyen< ku like ISANGHA-N <umsik>-ul yulay. yulay?=

because that strange-ATTR food-ACC origin origin

‘Because that, like, strange food…origin…origin?’

4 Teacher: =ney.

yes

‘Yes.’

5 Sue: yulay-ka iss--iss--iss-ki ttaymwuney↑ way↓ °like

origin-NOM exist-NML because-DM

6 >CWUNGKUK-eyse< pelley-ka mek-ko↑ and >phulangsu-eyse<

China-LOC bug-NOM eat-CONN France-LOC

‘Because they have origins like, like, they eat bugs in China and they also eat horses in France.’

7 mal-to mek-ko↑ (.2) kulaaye, (.2) isang()ha-tako

horse-also eat-CONN so strange-QT

8 sayngkak-ul ha-ci↓ mahr-ko↑ >kunyang<(.)uh

think-ACC do- NEG-CONN just

9 umm:.()kunyang ihayhay- ya [tway-yo.

just understand should-POL

‘So they shouldn’t think it’s weird, they should just, umm, just understand.’

10 Teacher: [um umm

11 (.3)

12 Sue: cingkulep- ciman::

gross- but:CONN

Even though it’s gross.

13 Teacher: umm::

14 Sue: ney:((nods))

yes

Yes.

Sue’s answer to the teacher’s question in line 1 strikingly resembles Wendy’s answer from the preceding Excerpt 6, and, as such, presents an interesting case for comparison. First, Sue provides...
an initial claim on the issue in the first part of her opinion-presenting sequence (lines 1–2). Second, her accounts for her claim are accompanied by a precise supporting example (lines 3, and 5–7). Finally, she concludes her turn by providing a final claim (lines 8–9). In line 1, after a turn with a perturbation, she begins to make her claim on the issue in her next utterance: People need to be more understanding of the food cultures of other countries since each has its origin and history (line 2: They should understand other countries’ food culture). In line 3, Sue begins to give an account for her opinion, which is signaled by the discourse marker waynyamyen (it’s because). She briefly engages in a lexical item negotiation sequence (Hellermann, 2008) with the teacher on the word ywulay (origin, lines 3–4) then lists examples of “strange” food just as Wendy did in the preceding segment. By saying “like” in English (line 5), she marks the beginning of the example she is presenting.

The following turn, ‘They eat bugs in China and they also eat horses in France’ (lines 6–7), is very similar to the extract from the advanced class in that she gives concrete and commonly known examples from other countries in order to compare them with the consumption of dog meat in Korea. This list thus serves as an account for Sue to support her claim. In other words, just as in the preceding extract, Sue is supporting her claim by giving an account with a list of examples that are common and represent knowledge shared by others. What is different from the advanced-level student’s example is that Sue does not use canh. Instead, the transition point from one example to the other is marked with the clausal connective ko (lines 6–7). Ko is a prototypical connective with a simple function that is introduced in Korean textbooks for beginners (Cho, Schulz, Lee, & Sohn, 2000).

In addition, her turn of assertion (lines 7–9: So they shouldn’t think it’s weird, they should just understand) is shaped in a similar way to that of Wendy’s in the preceding example in that it draws a conclusion by using the discourse marker kulayse (so, therefore) in the beginning part of the turn (line 7). The difference is that she gives the final claim in a commanding tone that is upgraded from the first part of her claim by using the imperative ci malta (must not) in line 8, the discourse marker kunyang (just), and the modal expression ya twayta (should) in line 9.

As observed in the above segment, the intermediate-level L2 speakers deployed alternative methods in a sequential environment where more competent speakers might use canh well. However, although they used different ways to do so, they accomplished the action of giving an account without hindering the progressivity of the interaction.

4.3 Invoking unshared knowledge: Unequal access to information

Utterances with canh are also employed to present knowledge to which the recipient has no access to. Speakers propose common ground by providing obviously unshared information in support of their claims: It is unlikely that the speakers believe that the interlocutors know anything about what they are claiming. That is, the divergence in the relation between epistemic status and epistemic stance is maximized. This use of canh demonstrates that epistemic claims are, indeed, claims to know, and as such may or may not reflect actual knowledge states (Heritage, 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Stivers et al., 2011). The following example from Suh (2002) briefly shows how the suffix canh is used as a strategic device invoking common ground among interlocutors even when the information is not actually shared.

Extract 9: L1 Korean speaker (Suh, 2002, p. 291)

1 A: cal an-tway mwulkelley  
   well NEG do:IE wet mop
   ‘The wet mop doesn’t work well.’
2 B: ku-chi?  
   that-COMM:IE
   ‘That’s right, isn’t it?’
3 A: son-ul hay yatway.  
   hand-by do-should:IE
   ‘You have to scrub by hand [instead of using a wet mop].’
In response to A’s negative assessment about a wet mop in line 1 and the following claim that hand scrubbing is better (line 3), B gives agreement using canh to convey personal information regarding B’s use of a mop at home (line 4). It is implausible that B assumes that A is aware of B’s home cleaning practices. However, the use of canh in this environment positions recipients as a knowing recipient. Advanced-level students’ data from the current study displays tactical management of information with the use of canh similar to that of L1 speakers. However, only one example, which is from an advanced student, shows such a case.\(^{15}\) In the current data collection, it is presented in Excerpt 10.

**Excerpt 10: Mina: Prejudice against Korea**

1 Teacher: hankwuk-ey ka-ki cen-ey hankwuk-ey tayhay Korea-LOC go-NML before-LOC Korea-LOC about
day ngakak. (.) kwa. cikum:(.)
2 kacy-ess-te-n. () sayngkak. (.) kwa. cikum:(.)
3 have-PST-RT-ATTR thought and now
4 kacang(.) manhi pyenha-n pwupwun. () i-laymen
most a lot change-ATTR part COP-COND
eita-n key iss-ulka-yo.
which-ATTR thing exist-Q-POL
‘What were your opinions on Korea before you went to Korea, and what opinion do you think changed the most?’
5 Mina: um::: (1.0) a::: mwe akka-twu tanswunha-n:::
DM before-also simple-ATTR
6 kes-pwuthe sicakha-myen-un
thing-from begin-COND-ATTR
‘Um…Well starting off with the simple things first, like before…’
7 Teacher: um
8 Mina: hankwuk:: ce-nun icye hankwuk-ey tayha-n::(2) kes-ul
Korea I-TOP DM Korea-LOC about-ATTR thing-ATTR
9 um icye pwunonim-hanthey >manhi paywe-ss-canh-ayo<
DM parents-from a lot learn-PST-canh-POL
‘Korea…So, I learned about Korea from my parents, right?’
10 Teacher: ney=
yes
‘Yes.’
11 Mina: =cip-eyse: icye hankwuk salam-un ilehta= hankwuk sahoy-nun
house-LOC DM Korea person-TOP like this:PLN Korea society-TOP
like this:QT-ATTR that-ATTR prejudice-ACC a lot have-CONN
12 ilehta-la-nun kule-n phyenkyen-ul manhi kaci-ko
ka-n ke kath-ayo
go-ATTR seem-POL
‘At home…I was taught, “Korean people are like this,” “Korea’s society is like this,” so I think I went to Korea with this bias.’
13 Teacher: ney
yes
‘I see.’
14 Mina: >kulenikka< phyenkyen-ilako ha-myenun: mwe:
so-DM prejudice-QT do-COND DM
15 elun-ul kongkyengha-ko: conkyeng-kongkyengha-ko;
elders-ACC respect-CONN respect-CONN
‘So, when I say biased, I mean like, you must respect your elders.’
16 Teacher: um
Upon the teacher’s seeking student Mina’s opinion about Korea before and after visiting (lines 1–4), Mina starts providing her opinion in line 5. Before Mina reaches the self-evaluative comment that she first went there with a bias against Korea (lines 12–13), she gives an account for this claim (lines 8–9: I learned about Korea from my parents, right?). In this turn of account-giving with canh, Mina conveys that the information clearly falls within her epistemic domain. Although it is unlikely that the teacher has this knowledge about Mina’s personal history, the turn with canh successfully elicits an acknowledgement from the recipient in the next turn (line 10).

4.4 Frequency of canh by level of knowledge sharedness

In order to give a general picture of the data, this section quantitatively describes the extent of the differences observed between the two proficiency groups. Figure 3 shows the distribution of the 88 instances of canh utterances found in the data by proficiency level and the three types of knowledge (directly shared, common sense, unshared). While 64 (72.7%) utterances occurred in advanced-level interactions, 24 (27.2%) occurred in intermediate-level interactions. Not only was the total frequency of canh utterances by the intermediate students much lower than that of the advanced students, but the intermediate students showed a narrower range of usage in terms of the types of knowledge the speakers invoked to accomplish the particular action of giving an account.

![Fig. 3. Frequency of canh by types of knowledge in account-giving](image)

Students at both levels displayed competence in employing canh when giving accounts by providing information with direct, on-the-spot access. Intermediate students, however, used different forms with simpler functions in the same sequential position when they proposed accounts based on common sense knowledge or information that was not shared. The next section presents the qualitative analysis, which specifies how the participants accomplished the interactional outcome of giving accounts with or without canh.

5 Conclusion

Drawing on the methodological framework of conversation analysis, this study investigates how L2 speakers of Korean use the linguistic resource canh in order to achieve certain interactional goals in Korean language classroom interactions. The study is designed to facilitate cross-sectional comparisons and analysis of how advanced- and intermediate-level speakers give accounts with or without canh through the management of shared information. Through an analysis of cases from the classroom interaction data and by consulting the related published research, this study showed that canh is used by L2 Korean speakers to construct social action by managing dif-
ferent types of information: the on-going interactional environment, universal/social “common sense” knowledge, and unshared information such as hypothetical instances. In terms of second language development, this study showed that students at different proficiency levels have different ranges in their use of canh in regard to the type of knowledge they invoke in their account-giving. While the extracts presented in this paper demonstrate that speakers at both proficiency levels engage in similar practices of account giving, the employment of contextual resources including the linguistic device canh differs depending on proficiency levels.

From the perspective of second language acquisition, two findings of this study are noteworthy: 1) The intermediate-level speakers used ko in environments where more proficient speakers use canh, and 2) the distribution in the use of canh according to the different types of knowledge being invoked suggests a developmental order; that is, the ability to manage common sense knowledge and unshared knowledge using canh is a skill acquired later than the ability to use canh to manage direct, first-hand knowledge.

The first observation suggests that the intermediate-level speakers in this study had not yet acquired the full range of the diverse uses of canh. In possible environments for canh, the intermediate-level speakers often used the contrastive connective ko instead. As a language item with one clear meaning, ko is easier to learn than an item like canh with several different functions. Intermediate learners tend to resort to one clear invariant form for one function (Pienemann, 2002; Shirai & Andersen, 1995), which explains the pattern observed for the intermediate-level speakers in this study.

The second observation leads to a significant implication for second language development because it suggests a certain order of emergence among the three types of canh observed in the study. The distribution of canh utterances differs according to proficiency level in terms of the presentation of different types of knowledge and sequential positions. The examination of the use of canh in L2 Korean speakers’ conversation revealed a graded distribution of the different functions of canh according to the speakers’ proficiency level. While the advanced-level students employed canh in presenting all types of information, the intermediate-level students used different forms in the same sequential environment when they conveyed information regarding common sense or hypothetical situations. They used different forms with simpler functions, such as unmarked ko, in the same sequential position when they gave accounts based on common sense knowledge.

As discussed throughout the paper, canh is a device that indicates the speaker’s degree of confidence or certainty of what he or she is communicating, whereby the speaker tries to influence the degree to which the recipient will accept the validity of the conveyed information. In other words, the use of canh is highly sensitive to the relativity of the information status of the conveyed message. What is noteworthy is the relationship between the level of sharedness of knowledge and the developmental order of the different uses of canh that emerged across speakers of different proficiency levels. As shown in Figure 4, canh that is used for encoding discourse-new information, which was not previously shared among interlocutors, was found to be the last to be acquired by L2 Korean speakers.17

![Fig. 4. Developmental order of canh in terms of information status](image-url)

By attending to the influence of epistemic balance and imbalance when canh utterances are employed in giving accounts, this paper demonstrates a variety of ways in which speakers perform the same action (i.e., giving accounts using canh) in order to manage the degree of sharedness of the proposed information. It also demonstrates a way in which CA can be used to examine how second language speakers use local linguistic resources to achieve certain interactional goals in the target language. CA methods of specifying interactional details enable us to fully explore the multifaceted array of resources, tactics, and constraints demonstrated in L2 interactions. Through
the detailed analysis of diverse cases, we can capture various methods in which similar linguistic and non-linguistic phenomena are managed (Lee & Hellermann, 2014). In doing research on how the suffix canh is used in the management of information in Korean language classroom discourse, this study contributes to the literature that is facilitating better understanding of how language use and the development of interactional competence work together. This study also shows that, as a topic of investigation, the development of interactional competence has much to offer any research tradition that seeks to understand the complexity of what L2 speakers accomplish through natural interaction (Kasper & Wagner, 2011).

5.1 Implications for teaching

The results of this investigation of how the suffix canh is used in L2 Korean interaction suggest significant implications for the teaching of Korean as a second language. First, the level of knowledge sharedness in the use of canh should be incorporated into the teaching of canh. The majority of textbooks present canh only once at the intermediate level and describe only one function of it throughout the whole course. Due to canh’s subtle functions and learners’ high demand for its usage, it certainly would be a wise pedagogical practice for educators to elaborate their methods of teaching canh in order to cover its various interactional functions.

This study of the development of interactional competence in the use of the Korean suffix canh provides solid evidence that Korean L2 students are sensitive to epistemic information. While the advanced-level students employed canh in presenting the same types of information for which native speakers use canh, the intermediate-level students used different forms in the same sequential environment when they conveyed information based on common sense knowledge. The findings of this study could provide Korean language educators with information about the general developmental process involved in attaining competency in the production of canh utterances so as to facilitate the instruction of the suffix in Korean language classrooms. Explicit instruction of the interaction of knowledge types with the micro-practices of using the suffix canh might resolve a number of difficulties that teachers and students face.

Second, this study shows that research into the development of interactional competence can illuminate our understanding of the complexity of L2 speakers’ accomplishments in natural interaction (Kasper & Wagner, 2011). Through a bottom-up analysis of competent use of resources by L2 speakers using CA, the study adds to the existing empirical evidence that facilitates conceptualization of the development of interactional competence in L2 talk. As such, the current study contributes to the field of CA-for-SLA, in which CA is used as a research methodology for SLA research. CA permits analysts to scrutinize a variety of functions of linguistic devices in interaction, which, in turn, allows identification of the various degrees of acquisition and development of second language. Although this study does not look at developmental changes that occur in the same L2 speakers over time, it identifies some general developmental processes in terms of the interactional competencies involved in the production of a specific target item by adopting a cross-sectional design. Future studies that adopt a longitudinal study design and obtain data from a variety of activities would contribute to expanding the understanding of Korean L2 speakers’ development of interactional competence.

Notes

1 Novice-level students were not considered for this study, as the suffix canh is first introduced in Korean textbooks for intermediate-level learners (Cho et al., 2000).
2 Participants’ proficiency levels were assessed by a certified ACTFL rater before the data collection and reassessed after the data collection.
3 Although the majority of the participants were Korean-American heritage learners, the heritage and non-heritage distinction is not the focus of my interest.
4 The Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK) is a Korean language test for speakers whose first language is not Korean, including overseas Koreans, students wishing to study at a Korean university, and individuals seeking employment at Korean corporations in and outside of Korea.
By using “because,” speakers claim that what follows belongs to the preceding turn. In other words, the speaker characterizes the following utterance as a next element of the ongoing construction of a list, thereby displaying (or establishing, or claiming) affinity between the following utterance and the preceding turn.

A comparison with Suh’s (2002) examples was conducted after a close analysis of the current data set.

Her assertion is also downgraded with the use of an epistemic expression sayngkakhay ‘I think that…’ in line 12.

This is evidenced by Sue’s following turn, in which she does not deny Jenny’s comment (lines 6–12).

Here, Jenny completes Sue’s prior turn by equating North Koreans’ dispositions to that of a fellow student in class who is known for his easy-going personality. In response, Sue displays disagreement.

Heritage (2012a) points out that real-time shared experience might not assure epistemic equality.

If we look at this utterance more closely, we can see that to support her claim, Wendy refers to the category of locations (Sacks, 1992) where Hinduism is practiced as an example of places that idolize cows with the use of canh. This category of locations (places where Hinduism is practiced, such as India) is contrasted with the category of person “we.” The omitted subject in the turn of line 1 appears to be wuli ‘we’, which appears in Wendy’s subsequent utterance in line 10.

Such a use of this epistemic marker is a good example to contrast to the use of canh in her previous turn, in that kes kath displays a mitigated tone compared to her account-giving with canh. This pattern (assessment or claim using kes kath and account-giving using canh) recurs in advanced-level speakers’ opinion-presenting sequences.

This is indicated by a word-searching marker and elongated sounds in line 1.

Notice that this first claim is shaped in a direct way by using the verb ya twayta ‘should’. This utterance is comparable to the preceding advanced student’s utterance in both the action they are achieving and the turn construction.

The lack of many examples may be due to the goals of the institutional interaction, which differ from those of ordinary conversation (Drew & Heritage, 1992). L2 classroom interaction orients to the core institutional goal of teaching and learning the L2. From this core goal, a number of consequences result that distinguish the way in which L2 classroom interaction is accomplished from the way in which ordinary conversations are accomplished (Markee, 2000; Seedhouse, 2004).

This quantification is based on a prior sequential analysis of all of the canh utterances found in the data.

Although the focus of this study is on the use of a particular linguistic resource, identifying the mere presence or absence of such a resource does not specify the language use and interactional competence of L2 speakers when dealing with the local context of interaction. Even though the intermediate-level students’ interactional outcomes seem to be different from those of the advanced students to a certain extent in the above extracts, it is necessary to note that the absence of canh does not impede the progress of the ongoing interaction (Stivers & Robinson, 2006). Intermediate-level students might be less competent in the use the suffix canh. However, they are competent enough to give accounts in order to support their claims using other resources.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Transcription symbols

- point of overlap onset
- point of overlap ending
= no gap (latching)
(.5) timed pause
( ) untimed micropause
: prolongation of the immediately prior sound
-- sharp cut-off of an utterance
. falling intonation
, continuing intonation
? rising intonation
↑ slightly rising intonation
↓ shift to higher pitch
↓ shift to lower pitch
talk emphasized speech
TALK louder than surrounding speech
°talk° quieter than surrounding speech
<talk> slower than surrounding speech
>talk< faster than surrounding speech
.hhh audible inbreath
hhh audible outbreath
ta(h)lk within-speech aspiration, possibly laughter
( ) unintelligible to transcriber
(talk) uncertain content or speaker identification
(( )) transcriber’s additional explanations or descriptions

Appendix B: Interlinear glosses

ACC Accusative
ADV Adverbial
ATTR Attributive
CIRCUM Circumstantial
COMM Committal
CONN Connective
COND Conditional
COP Copular
DM Discourse marker
GEN Genitive
HEARSAY Hearsay marker
HON Honorific
IE Informal ending
LOC Locative
NEG Negation
NOM Nominative
NML Nominalizer
PL Plural suffix
PLN Plain speech level
POL Polite speech level
PST Past tense
Q Question particle
QT Quotative particle
RT Retrospective
TOP Topic marker
VOC Vocative