

## Second summonings in Korean telephone conversation openings

SEUNG-HEE LEE

*Department of Applied Linguistics  
University of California, Los Angeles  
3300 Rolfe Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
shlee@humnet.ucla.edu*

### ABSTRACT

This article is triggered by an analytic puzzle. In about half of a corpus of Korean telephone openings, callers produce a second summons, *yeposeyyo*, in the second turn of the opening sequence. The analysis unravels the interactional and organizational contingencies involved in the construction of the caller's second summons. It shows that the second summons operates as a vehicle for inviting recognition, and that the answerers overlay their work of recognition onto their talk in the third turn. In this way, the parties confront, work through, and display their underlying orientation to the organizational problem of establishing each other's identity in dealing with the second summons/answer sequence. (Conversation analysis, Korean, summons, telephone conversation, openings.)\*

### INTRODUCTION

This article arises out of a puzzle about the caller's production of a summons, *yeposeyyo*, in the second turn of Korean telephone conversation openings. This "second summons" occurs in 50% of a corpus of such openings. Although Korean interactants do not have problems in accomplishing telephone openings with the caller's summons in the second turn, it resists an easy analytic characterization, even by a native speaker of Korean. Below is an example (here, as elsewhere, "A" indicates the answerer and "C" the caller):

(1) [Dinner]

- 0           **((2 rings))**  
1 A:    *yeposeyyo*:<sub>2</sub>ζ  
          hello  
          **'Hello::ζ'**  
2 C:→ *yeposeyyo*:<sub>2</sub>ζ  
          hello  
          **'Hello:ζ'**  
3           (.)  
4 A:    *ney*:<sub>2</sub>?=  
          yes:HON  
          **'Yes::?='**

- 5 C: =ey *samonim ce* ((first name))-n[tey-yo:]  
 yes:HON ma'am I:HUM CIRCUM-DEF  
 '[[] =Yes ma'am it's ((first name)):]'
- 6 A: [a ku[lay:  
 DM be.so:IE  
 '[[] Oh yes:]'
- 7 C: [yey *annyenghaseyyo:]* =  
 yes:HON hi:DEF  
 '[[] Yes hi:] ='
- 8 A: =uu:[ng::  
 yes  
 '[[] =Y:es::]'
- 9 C: [hhh a- *nayil ce- cenyek kathi:-*  
 DM tomorrow dinner together  
 '[[] 'hhh Uh- tomorrow (are we having) dinner together:::]'
- 10 A: e:: *kulem kulem*  
 yes indeed indeed  
 'Yes:: of course of course'

*Yeposeyyo* is used either as a summons (for example, when one enters an empty shop) or as a response when answering a ringing telephone. Although it is translated 'hello' in English, *yeposeyyo* cannot be used as a greeting in Korean. The call above opens with a summons/answer sequence at lines 0–1 (see Schegloff 1968). To the "ringing phone" summons of the caller (line 0), the answerer responds with *yeposeyyo:::]* 'hello:::]' (line 1). With this summons/answer sequence, the parties confirm the openness of a channel of communication and establish their availability to talk (Schegloff 1968, 1986). At lines 2–4, a second summons/answer sequence occurs. The caller produces a second summons with *yeposeyyo:::]* 'hello:::]' in the second turn (line 2). The answerer answers the caller's second summons with *ney:::]* 'yes:::]?' in the third turn (line 4). After this second summons/answer sequence (lines 2–4), the parties proceed to an identification/recognition sequence at lines 5–6 (Schegloff 1979, 1986). The caller evidences recognition of the answerer and identifies herself using her first name (line 5), and the answerer produces an acknowledgment/confirmation in overlap (line 6). At lines 7–8 the parties move to a greeting sequence (Schegloff 1986). The caller initiates a greeting in overlap with the answerer's prior turn (line 7), and the answerer acknowledges the greeting (line 8). At line 9 the caller launches a reason-for-the-call sequence.

The caller's production of a second summons in the second turn (line 2) poses a puzzle with regard to "non-repeatability" of summons/answer sequences (Schegloff 1968). Why does the caller initiate a second summons/answer sequence once the availability of the other party has been established? That is, why does the caller produce a second summons in the second turn after being given an answer to the ringing summons in the first turn? Or, alternatively, does the caller indeed do summoning when initiating a second summons/answer sequence? And does the answerer accomplish answering the summons in (re-)establishment of availability to talk? In particular, do the parties orient to the second summons/

answer sequence as being involved in establishing availability to talk, and develop subsequent trajectories of their talk as such?

These puzzles are directed to the organizational and interactional contingencies involved in the second summons/answer sequence, but they also concern findings in the contemporary literature on telephone conversation openings. Research on telephone conversation openings has been initiated and developed by Schegloff (1967, 1968, 1979, 1986). Based on recordings of actual American telephone conversations, Schegloff has examined a sequential structure of conversational openings. Openings are organized into four core sequences – summons/answer sequences, identification/recognition sequences, greeting sequences, and how-are-you sequences – and each of these sequences is addressed to at least one organizational issue for the conversation being opened. In his analyses, Schegloff stresses that these sequences do not constitute a fixed template of telephone openings but are achieved by the parties on a moment-by-moment basis.

Schegloff's work has provided impetus for investigation of telephone conversation openings in cross-cultural contexts. Based on recordings of actual telephone conversations, researchers have examined cultural differences within a general framework of structural similarities of telephone openings across cultures. For example, in her study on Dutch telephone openings, Houtkoop-Steenstra 1991 analyzes the operation of a preference for self-identification. In contrast to American telephone openings, Dutch callers and answerers both prefer to self-identify by name. Houtkoop-Steenstra suggests that it shows a different way of solving the same problem of opening a telephone conversation. Similarly, in a study of identification and recognition in Swedish telephone openings, Lindström 1994 finds that the Swedish preference lies between the American preference for other-recognition and the Dutch preference for self-identification. On the one hand, Swedish answerers overwhelmingly self-identify by name. On the other hand, Swedish callers deploy resources that invite recognition as American callers do, but the Swedes do so more frequently in conversations with immediate family than with acquaintances. Through the analysis of telephone openings in these three different cultures, Lindström concludes that interactants orient to the same issues and sequential structures, although the ways in which they do so are culturally variable. Finally, in their studies of telephone openings in English, French, Arabic, and Taiwan, Hopper and his students amplify the findings on structural similarities of telephone conversation openings (Hopper & Koleilat-Doany 1989, Hopper, Doany, Johnson & Drummond 1991, Hopper & Chen 1996). While explaining cross-cultural differences as locally occasioned variations accomplished by the parties, Hopper and his students conclude that telephone openings have the same organizational and sequential structure across cultures.

This maturing body of literature on telephone conversation openings in cross-cultural contexts (cf. Luke & Pavlidou 2002), however, does not provide a ready

answer to the puzzle about the caller's production of a second summons in Korean telephone conversation openings. Rather, the literature suggests that the second summons is a pattern that is particular to Koreans.

In this essay I examine the caller's production of a summons in the second turn of Korean telephone conversation openings. I start with a brief overview of and a preliminary observation on these openings. Then I analyze what the parties orient to and accomplish in working through the caller's second summons in the second turn. In so doing, I show the role of the second summons/answer sequence in the subsequent development of the opening. I conclude by describing how the analysis relates to past research on telephone openings in other cultural contexts.

#### DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This article is based on 70 ordinary Korean telephone calls audio-recorded in 2003. They were collected at two private residences in Seoul, South Korea, and at five in Los Angeles, California. I transcribed and analyzed the data by employing the methodology of conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974, Heritage 1984b). All names are coded in double parentheses – for example ((first name)), ((last name)), or ((full name)) as given by the speaker (Korean names consist of last name followed by first name).

The data transcripts have three lines. The italicized top line shows Korean romanized according to the Yale system, representing actual sounds rather than standard orthography. The second line displays a literal English translation of each word with a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss. The classification and abbreviation of grammatical morphemes follow Lee 1991 with slight modifications (see Appendix). The third line, or the full turn, provides an idiomatic English translation and is in boldface. Brackets [ ] at the beginning of the third line or the full turn indicate an overlap at that turn. Readers are referred to the top line for the exact place where the overlap occurs.

#### ANALYSIS

I will begin with an overview of and preliminary observation on the organization of Korean telephone conversation openings, then I will analyze the caller's production of a second summons. The analysis is addressed to three problems:

- (i) What is it that a caller accomplishes by producing a second summons in the second turn?
- (ii) What is it that an answerer orients to in responding to the caller's second summons?
- (iii) What is it that the parties accomplish in the development of the trajectories of that particular opening with a second summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns?

Through the detailed analysis of these three issues, I investigate the organizational and interactional contingencies the parties confront and work through in dealing with the second summons/answer sequence.

*Overview: Preliminary observations*

Korean telephone conversation openings are occupied with three main generic issues common to such openings generally: establishing the availability of the parties to talk, establishing the identity of the parties, and establishing topic priority, in that order (Schegloff 1968, 1979, 1986, 2002). The issue of establishing the availability of the parties to talk is worked through with a summons/answer sequence (Schegloff 1968, 1986). To the “ringing phone” summons of a caller, an answerer responds with *yeposeyyo* ‘hello,’ and establishes the openness of a channel of communication and the availability to talk (lines 0–1 in ex. 1). With the answer of *yeposeyyo* in the first turn, answerers do not set relevant topics, conversation types, or legitimate identifications for callers (Schegloff 1967).<sup>1</sup>

After their availability to talk is established, parties work through the issue of establishing each other’s identity (Schegloff 1979, 1986). They employ a sequence directed to identification/recognition, and acknowledge, confirm, and/or reciprocate the relevant identity/identities (cf. lines 5–6 in ex. 1).

Once the identity of each party is established, they deal with the issue of establishing topic priority (Schegloff 1986). They do so by addressing each other’s current state of being and give an opportunity for the other party to “make some current state of being as a matter of joint priority concern” (Schegloff 1986:118). Parties usually produce an inquiry such as “Are you well?” or “Have you been well?,” in which case a “yes” answer does not pursue the talk along those lines, whereas a “no” answer (potentially) engenders a sequence expansion and thus gets topic priority (cf. Sacks 1975, Schegloff 1986). Sometimes parties produce an open-ended inquiry such as “How are you?” or “How have you been?,” in which case a “neutral” response is closure-relevant and a “negative” response opens the opportunity to pursue talk on that particular topic (Sacks 1975, Jefferson 1980, Schegloff 1986). My data set does not contain an instance of a “positive” response. Following Schegloff 1986, I refer to the sequences initiated by the parties’ inquiries addressing one another’s current state of being as a “how-are-you” sequence.<sup>2,3</sup>

Example (2) illustrates a construction of these three issues in an actual telephone conversation opening:

- (2) [Toenail]  
 0 ((2 rings))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo::* ɿ  
     hello  
     ‘**Hello::** ɿ’  
 2 (.)

- 3 C: *e:* = *emma-ya:*?  
yes mom-VOC  
'Yes:=mom:?'
- 4 (.)
- 5 A: *e:*: ((*first name*))-*kwuna:*:  
yes UNASSIM  
'Yes:: ((*first name*))::'
- 6 C: *ung:*:=  
yes  
'Yes::='
- 7 A: =*e:*:  
yes  
'=*Yes*::'
- 8 (.)
- 9 C?: **hh**
- 10 A: *cal*[: - *cinay-ss-ni:*?  
well live-ANT-INTERR  
'[] Have you been well::?'
- 11 C: [*ceki-*  
DM  
'[] Well-'
- 12 C: *ung*: = *emma-twu cal iss-ess-e?*  
yes mom-ADD well be-ANT-IE  
'Yes:=have you been well too?'
- 13 A: *e:*: *e:* = *ne mwe hakkyo-ey- sicakhay.ss-ni?*  
yes yes you what school-LOC start:ANT-INTERR  
'Yes::: yes.=is there anything at school- has it started?'

The call opens with a summons/answer sequence (lines 0–1). The party called answers the “ringing phone” summons (line 0) with *yeposeyyo:*:*ç* ‘hello::ç’ (line 1) and establishes availability to talk (Schegloff 1968). At lines 3 and 5, the parties establish each other’s identity. At line 3 the caller acknowledges the answerer’s answer with *e:* ‘yes:,’ and produces a term that identifies the answerer, *emma* ‘mom’. At line 5 the answerer produces a confirmation/acknowledgment of the caller’s recognition, *e:*: ‘yes::,’ and evidences recognition of the caller (Schegloff 1979). The caller acknowledges/confirms the answerer’s recognition at line 6; and the answerer acknowledges that at line 7. At lines 10–13, the parties deal with the issue of establishing topic priority (Schegloff 1986). The answerer addresses the caller’s current state of being with a yes/no “how-are-you” inquiry (line 10). At line 12 the caller produces a closure-relevant ‘yes’ answer and reciprocates the inquiry. At line 13 the answerer follows her closure-relevant ‘yes’ answer with a specific version of a follow-up, a recipient-designed “how-are-you” inquiry.

Openings can be, and are, foreshortened in a number of calls. Often callers move to foreshorten the opening by using a particle, *ntey*, in constructing self-identification. *Ntey* in Korean is mainly used to project an action to be followed in the next turn (Park 1997). When callers deploy *ntey* in constructing self-identification in telephone openings in particular, they project a reason for the call or a “switchboard” request in the next turn (Park 1997, 2002). Thus, they

move to advancing the opening past the issue of establishing topic priority. Examples (3–4) illustrate this:

(3) [Orange]

- 0 ((ring))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo:z*  
 hello  
 ‘Hello::z’  
 2 (.)  
 3 C:→ *ung emma-ntey:z*=  
 yes mom-CIRCUM  
 ‘Yes it’s mom (and):z’  
 4 A: =*ung*  
 yes  
 ‘=Yes’  
 5 (0.4)  
 6 C:→ *cip-ey siemni kyeyisi-nka:z*  
 home-LOC mother.in.law exist:HON-DUB  
 ‘Is your mother-in-law at home:z’

At line 3, the caller initiates an identification/recognition sequence by producing an acknowledgment of the answer (line 1) with *ung* ‘yes’ and self-identification with *emma* ‘mom.’ In constructing her self-identification, the caller deploys *ntey*, translated ‘and’ in English, and projects an action of delivering a reason for the call or a switchboard request (Park 1997, 2002). Thus, the caller projects a fore-shortened opening without a sequence directed to the issue of establishing topic priority. At line 4, the answerer acknowledges the caller’s self-identification and allows the caller to move on by not producing any further talk. Indeed, the caller proceeds to launch a reason-for-the-call sequence at line 6.

Example (4) exhibits a similar pattern. Here the caller launches a switchboard request in the turn next to his self-identification constructed with *ntey*:

(4) [CFA]

- 0 ((3 rings))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo:z*  
 hello  
 ‘Hello:z’  
 2 C:→ *yey: annyenghaseyyo ce ((first name))-ntey-yo:z?*  
 yes:HON hi:DEF I:HUM CIRCUM-DEF  
 ‘Yes: hi this is ((first name)) (and):z?’  
 3 A: *ung[z]*  
 yes  
 ‘[] Yes:’  
 4 C:→ *[((first name)) iss-na-yo:z]*  
 exist-NCOMM-DEF  
 ‘[] Is ((first name)) there:z’  
 5 A: *kulay: camkkan-[man:]*  
 be.so a.moment-only  
 ‘[] Yes: just a moment:’  
 6 C: [*yey:z*]  
 yes:HON  
 ‘[] Yes:z’

At line 2, the caller produces an acknowledgment of the answerer's answer with *yey*: 'yes:'. Then he produces a greeting and self-identification in the same turn (line 2). In producing the self-identification, he employs a particle, *ntey*, and projects a main action to be followed in the next turn (Park 1997, 2002). At line 3, the answerer not only acknowledges the caller's self-identification but also invites the caller to move on to the projected action by not producing any further talk. In overlap with the answerer's acknowledgement (line 3), the caller proceeds to launch a switchboard request (line 4). Thus, the caller advances the opening past the issue of establishing topic priority by constructing self-identification with the particle *ntey*.

Three observations on Korean telephone conversation openings are in point. First, the second turn is composed of an acknowledgment of 'yes' AND a term of identification, either of answerer (line 3 in ex. 2) or of caller (line 3 in ex. 3; line 2 in ex. 4). The caller's production of 'yes' serves to acknowledge the answerer's answer as the right destination intended, as inferred from the voice of the answerer. The acknowledgment of 'yes' does not usually occur as a single component but rather seems to serve as a preface to an upcoming term of identification in the same turn (cf. Zimmerman 1984). Thus, the second turn is mainly directed to constructing self-identification and/or displaying recognition of answerer.

Second, the third turn begins with an acknowledging or confirming 'yes' and can be composed of 'yes' alone. Answerers may produce 'yes' and a term that identifies the caller, as in line 5 of (2). Or they may produce 'yes' alone, as in line 4 of (3) and line 3 of (4): Although the production of a single 'yes' is also oriented to the caller's use of *ntey* in the self-identification in these examples, the caller treats the answerer's 'yes' as an adequate display of acknowledgment of the identification by moving on to the next sequence.<sup>4</sup> Thus, when callers produce a term of identification and initiate an identification/recognition sequence, answerers may respond with an acknowledgment/confirmation.

Finally, greeting sequences rarely occur.<sup>5</sup> When a greeting occurs, it is usually constructed before the caller's self-identification and is not produced to be possibly complete. For example, at line 2 of (4), the caller produces a greeting but follows it with self-identification in the same turn. By producing it to be non-possibly complete, the caller does not construct the greeting as sequentially implicative for the next turn (Sacks et al. 1974). Indeed, the answerer does not return the greeting. Thus, when working through telephone openings, the parties do not canonically construct greeting sequences.

The canonical organization of Korean telephone conversation openings with these three observations is summarized below:

- (5) ((Turn 0)) Summons  
 A: ((Turn 1)) Answer  
 C: ((Turn 2)) (Acknowledgement with 'yes' +) a term of identification  
 A: ((Turn 3)) Acknowledgement/confirmation with 'yes' (+ a term of identification)  
 C: ((Turn 4)) "How-are-you" inquiry or reason for the call

*A second summons: Yeposeyyo in the second turn*

I briefly revisit example (1), which triggered the puzzle about the caller's second summons. I reconsider it in terms of the preliminary observations summarized in (5) above. The example is reproduced in (6):

(6) [Dinner]

- 0 ((2 rings))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo*:<sub>ζ</sub>  
 hello  
 'Hello':<sub>ζ</sub>'  
 2 C:→ *yeposeyyo*:<sub>ζ</sub>  
 hello  
 'Hello':<sub>ζ</sub>'  
 3 (.)  
 4 A: *ney*:?<sub>=</sub>  
 yes:HON  
 'Yes':?<sub>=</sub>'  
 5 C: =*ey* *samonim ce* ((first name))-*n*[*tey-yo*:<sub>ζ</sub>  
 yes:HON ma'am I:HUM CIRCUM-DEF  
 '[] = Yes ma'am it's ((first name)) (and):<sub>ζ</sub>'  
 6 A: [a *ku*]:<sub>lay</sub>:  
 DM be.so:IE  
 '[] Oh yes:'  
 7 C: [yey *annyenghaseyyo*:<sub>ζ</sub> =  
 yes:HON hi:DEF  
 '[] Yes hi:<sub>ζ</sub> ='  
 8 A: = *uu*:<sub>[ng]:</sub>  
 yes  
 '[] = Yes:':  
 9 C: [*hhh a- nayil ce- cenyek kathi*:<sub>-</sub>  
 DM tomorrow dinner together  
 '[] 'hhh Uh- tomorrow (are we having) dinner together:':  
 10 A: *e*:<sub>;</sub> *kulem kulem*  
 yes indeed indeed  
 'Yes:: of course of course'

First, the caller does not produce a term of identification in the second turn (line 2). Nor does she produce an acknowledgment with 'yes' and acknowledge the answerer's answer. Rather, she constructs the second turn with a single component, *yeposeyyo*. Thus, she does not formulate any elements related to the work of identification/recognition, except that she provides a voice sample. However, when initiating the identification/recognition sequence in the fourth turn (line 5), the caller produces an acknowledgement with *ey* 'yes,' evidences recognition of the answerer, and identifies herself. Thus, the caller constructs the fourth turn in a similar way to the second turn described in (5) above.

Second, the answerer produces a 'yes' answer at the third turn (line 4). Rather than redoing an answer to the summons, for example with *yeposeyyo* as in line 1, she answers the second summons with *ney*:?<sub>=</sub> 'yes:?''. After the caller evidences recognition of the answerer and identifies herself (line 5), the answerer acknowledges that with *a kulay*: 'oh yes:' (line 6). Thus, the answerer constructs the

second part of the identification/recognition sequence (the fifth turn) in a similar way to the third turn described in (5) above, although doing so with a different linguistic item available in Korean.

Finally, a greeting sequence does occur (lines 7–8). When constructing the self-identification (line 5), the caller employs *ntey* and projects a construction of a reason for the call (Park 1997, 2002). Nonetheless, in overlap with the answerer's acknowledgment/confirmation (line 6), the caller initiates a greeting sequence (line 7). At line 8 the answerer responds by acknowledging the greeting, although she does not reciprocate with an equivalent term of greeting: She seems to orient to the caller's use of *ntey* and invites the caller to move on to the projected action. At line 9, the caller advances the opening past the issue of establishing topic priority and launches a reason-for-the-call sequence.

These preliminary observations raise further questions. On the one hand, the identification/recognition sequence in the fourth and fifth turns (lines 5–6) operates and is constructed identically to the one in the second and third turns without a second summons/answer sequence (see ex. 5). What do the parties orient to and accomplish in working through the summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns? On the other hand, even in the face of the caller's projection of a reason for the call with *ntey* (line 5), a greeting sequence does in fact occur (lines 7–8). Is the construction of a greeting sequence related to the summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns? What is the effect of the construction of the second summons/answer sequence on the subsequent trajectories of the opening and/or the conversation being opened?

It is parties to the interaction that provide a key to these puzzles about the caller's production of a summons in the second turn. When answerers construct talk other than an answer to the second summons, they reveal what they are oriented to in working through the caller's *yeposeyyo* in the second turn. First of all, it is not a problem of establishing the availability to talk to which the parties are oriented. Consider the following example:

(7) [You again]

- 0 ((ring not recorded))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo:̇*  
 hello  
 'Hello:̇'  
 2 C:→ *yeposeyyo:̇* =  
 hello  
 'Hello:̇' ='  
 3 A:→ =*way(h) tto(h) ce(h)nhwa(h)ha(h)y.ss-e(h)*  
 why again call:ANT-IE  
 '=Why(h) di(h)d yo(h)u ca(h)ll(h) a(h)gai(h)n(h)'  
 4 C: *hh tule.o-sye.ss-eyo?*  
 come.in-HON:ANT-DEF  
 'hh Has (he) got back?'  
 5 A: *ani: an tule.wa.ss-e acik.=*  
 no NEG come.in:ANT-IE yet  
 'No: (he) hasn't got back yet.='

- 6 C: =*e*: way tto hay.ss-nya-kwu-[yo]ḷ  
 yes why again do:ANT-INTERR-COMP-DEF  
 '[ ] = Yes: you asked why I called again;'
- 7 A: [e. =  
 yes  
 '[ ] Yes. ='
- 8 C: =ung: nay-ka- mwul-e po-lyekwu-yo  
 yes I-NOM ask-CONN try-PURP-DEF  
 '= Yes: I- want to ask (you) something'

After the answer to the phone (line 1), the caller produces a summons, *yeposeyyo*, in the second turn (line 2). In the following turn at line 3, the answerer produces not an answer but a jocular complaint, a question about why the caller has telephoned again, into which laugh tokens are inserted. Thus, she does not orient to the caller's second summons as raising issues about her availability to talk. If she does so, she is not likely to produce talk other than confirming or (re-)establishing availability by answering the summons, because the availability to talk is not yet established. Rather, by latching a jocular complaint about the caller's calling AGAIN, she presumes the establishment of the availability to talk and displays an accomplishment of recognition of the caller as the one who called before and is calling again. Thus, in the sequential position of answering the summons, the answerer overlays her accomplishment of recognition onto her utterance designed for this particular caller who is so recognized.

Upon the caller's summons in the second turn, it is possible for the answerer to accomplish recognition of the caller and produce talk designed for this recipient as early as in the third turn. While the caller does not direct her talk to constructing identification/recognition in the second turn (line 2), the answerer uses the caller's *yeposeyyo* as a voice sample – thus a “recognition source” – and displays a “recognition solution” in the third turn (Schegloff 1979). Indeed, in the following turn at line 4, the caller does not orient to a problem in establishing the availability to talk but moves on with the understanding that not only the availability to talk but also the parties' identities are established.

Similarly, in example (8) the answerer does not orient to the caller's second summons as being directed to a problem of establishing the availability to talk. Rather, he orients to the issue of establishing identity in constructing the third turn:

- (8) [Uncle]
- 0 ((3 rings))
- 1 A: *yeposeyyo*:ḷ  
 hello  
 'Hello:ḷ'
- 2 C:→ *tsk yeposeyyo*:?  
 hello  
 'tsk Hello:?'
- 3 A:→ *e*: [((first name)):ḷ] =  
 yes  
 '[ ] Yes: ((first name)):ḷ ='

- 4 C: [hh-  
 5 C: =ey:  
       yes:HON  
       ‘=Yes:’  
 6 A: e: cal iss-ess-e<sub>i</sub>=  
       yes well be-ANT-IE  
       ‘Yes: have you been well<sub>i</sub>=’  
 7 C: =ney  
       yes:HON  
       ‘=Yes’

After the summons/answer sequence (lines 0–1), the caller constructs a second summons, *yeposeyyo*:? ‘hello:?’ at the second turn (line 2). In the third turn (line 3), the answerer produces *e*: ‘yes:’ and a term that identifies the caller. By following *e*: ‘yes:’ with the caller’s first name in the same turn, the answerer shows that he does not treat the caller’s second summons as dealing with a problem of establishing the availability to talk but presumes the establishment of the availability. Rather, by producing the caller’s first name, the answerer shows that he was involved in doing the work of recognition upon the caller’s second summons. Thus, with the voice sample provided in the caller’s *yeposeyyo* in the second turn (line 2), the answerer accomplishes recognition of the caller and evidences it in the third turn (line 3). Although the caller does not design her talk to produce identification/recognition per se, the answerer orients to it as a “recognition source” and surfaces his underlying orientation by evidencing recognition of the caller (Schegloff 1979). At line 5 the caller confirms the answerer’s recognition; and the answerer moves to dealing with the issue of establishing topic priority by initiating a yes/no “how-are-you” sequence at line 6. Thus, a problem in establishing the availability to talk does not occur in the subsequent course of the interaction.

In sum, parties do not orient to the caller’s second summons in the second turn as being directed to a problem of establishing availability to talk. Rather, answerers presume the establishment of availability to talk and respond to a second summons by doing the work of recognition. Although callers do not construct self-identification and/or answerer-recognition per se, answerers orient to the caller’s *yeposeyyo* as a “recognition source” and provide a “recognition solution” in the following turn (Schegloff 1979). This is accomplished, for example, by producing talk designed for the recipient (ex. 7) or a term that identifies the caller (ex. 8). Faced with a surface format of a summons produced by callers, answerers orient to it as a vehicle for implementing the work of identification/recognition (cf. Schegloff 2002, forthcoming).

In examples (7–8), the answerer displays recognition of the caller by producing recipient-designed talk or a term that identifies the caller. When producing a ‘yes’ answer to the summons, answerers overlay their work of recognition onto the format of the answer. Consider the following example:

(9) [She's sick]

- 0 ((3 rings))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo?*?=  
 hello  
 'Hello:?'=  
 2 C:→ =*yeposeyyo?*  
 hello  
 '=Hello?'  
 3 A:→ *ung:*.  
 yes  
 'Yes:.'  
 4 C: *'hh ne-n onul hoksi hakkyo ka-ni?*  
 you-TOP today by.any.chance school go-INTERR  
 'hh Do you go to school today by any chance?'  
 5 (0.2)  
 6 A: *ani?*  
 no  
 'No?'  
 7 C: *ung: =cip-eyse hay?*  
 yes home-LOC do:IE  
 'I see: =are you working at home?'

After the summons/answer sequence (lines 0–1), the caller constructs a second summons in the second turn (line 2). In the following turn at line 3, the answerer produces an answer to the summons with *ung:*. 'yes:'. In so doing, she designs her answer in its non-honorific form of talk (honorific forms of talk are identified with a morpheme abbreviated as HON or DEF at the second line of the transcript, whereas non-honorific forms of talk do not have such morphemes). In Korean, speakers cannot design their talk using non-honorific forms unless (i) they know the person they're talking to, AND (ii) their social and/or personal relationship with their interlocutor(s) allows the use of a non-honorific form of talk. On the one hand, if persons design their talk employing a non-honorific form when they stand in a relationship with their interlocutor(s) that requires use of an honorific form, it is usually considered rude, disrespectful, or even offensive. On the other hand, if persons deploy an honorific form when they stand in a relationship with their interlocutor(s) that requires the use of a non-honorific form, this may carry negative implications about the relationship, such as showing some degree of disaffiliation, trouble, and so on. Thus, the honorific system in Korean obligates interlocutors to establish mutual recognition as a matter of priority.

Thus, when the answerer produces a non-honorific form in her answer at line 3, she indicates that she has accomplished recognition of the caller and has designed her answer for the caller so recognized. With the voice sample provided in the caller's *yeposeyyo* in the second turn (line 2), the answerer engages in the work of recognition; and she displays her recognition of the caller with the non-honorific form of the answer in the third turn (line 3). Indeed, the caller orients to the answerer's non-honorific answer as a display of recognition: He moves to launching a reason-for-the-call sequence, using a non-

honorific form of talk as well (line 4). In so doing, he treats the parties' identities as having been established.

Now I return to example (1)/(6), which triggered the original puzzle. As in example (9), the answerer overlays her work of recognition onto the form of the answer to the caller's second summons. The answerer stands in a relationship with the caller that requires her to use a non-honorific form of talk, while the caller uses honorific forms.

In example (6), the caller produces a second summons in the second turn (line 2). A micro-pause ensues at line 3, during which the answerer withholds answering. By not moving on to answering the summons after having already established the availability to talk in the first turn (line 1), the answerer seems to display some trouble in recognizing the caller. When she finally produces an answer to the summons (line 4), the answerer hints at the underlying trouble: She formulates an honorific form of the answer in an interrogative intonation, *ney::?* 'yes::?' (Remember that the answerer stands in a relationship with the caller that requires her to use non-honorific forms of talk.)<sup>6</sup> By using an honorific form of answer, the answerer displays a possible failure to recognize the caller.

Indeed, as soon as the answerer produces the answer to the summons, the caller initiates an identification/recognition sequence in the fourth turn (line 5). After producing an acknowledgment of *ey* 'yes,' she evidences recognition of the answerer and identifies herself using her first name. Thus, the caller orients to the answerer's response as displaying a possible failure of recognition. At line 6, the answerer indeed reveals her failure of recognition in producing a second part of the identification/recognition sequence. She first marks her "just now" accomplishment of recognition by displaying a change of state from non-recognition to recognition of the caller with a 'oh' (Schegloff 1979, Heritage 1984a). Then she designs her confirmation/acknowledgment of the caller's identification/recognition in its non-honorific form, *kulay*: 'yes:' (line 6). Thus, when the answerer deploys an honorific form of the answer at the third turn (line 4), the caller is informed about the answerer's failure of recognition and thus designs the subsequent talk at the fourth turn (line 5) by initiating an overt identification/recognition sequence.

Right after and in overlap with the answerer's accomplishment of recognition (line 6), the caller initiates a greeting sequence at line 7. Thus, the greeting sequence gets launched right at the moment when the parties finally resolve the trouble in establishing one another's identity. In the following turn at line 8, the answerer acknowledges the caller's greeting and ratifies the resolution of the trouble in doing the work of establishing identity. (With the acknowledgment, the answerer also invites the caller to move on to the action projected by *ntey* in the self-identification at line 5). Thus, the parties seem to construct a greeting sequence in orientation to the resolution of trouble in dealing with the work of identification/recognition after the second summons/answer sequence.<sup>7</sup> With the construction of a greeting sequence, the parties seem to show an accom-

plishment of a state of “ratified mutual participation” after having worked through some troubles engendered in establishing each other’s identity (Goffman 1963:100). At line 9 the caller launches a reason-for-the-call sequence as soon as the answerer starts to acknowledge the greeting.

Thus, the ways in which a summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns is worked through have a bearing on the subsequent trajectory of the opening. A (possible) failure of recognition displayed in the answer to the second summons has an effect on how the opening unfolds: It engenders initiation of an overt identification/recognition sequence and a subsequent greeting sequence. Thus, the work of establishing the parties’ identities and how it gets worked out in the summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns have consequences in the ways in which the subsequent course of the opening develops.

Finally, when a caller produces a summons in the second turn, parties may get involved in an interactional “game” of recognition. As the summons, *yeposeyyo*, does not itself constitute a sequence directed to identification/recognition, but rather is used as a vehicle for inviting such work, a caller may mask an underlying orientation to establishing his or her identity with the surface format of a summons. This move may not be an innocent one. When an answerer has trouble accomplishing recognition, he may get involved in a number of turns of unraveling the work of identification/recognition masked with the surface representation of a summons/answer sequence. In the example below, a caller in Los Angeles makes a call to a friend in Korea. As revealed later in the call, the caller knows that he is not likely to be among the answerer’s set of potential callers and that the answerer is likely to have difficulty accomplishing recognition (cf. Schegloff 1986). Knowing this, the caller initiates a “game” of recognition with the production of a second summons in the second turn. The answerer is in a relationship with the caller that allows him to use non-honorific forms of talk:

(10) [Who’s this]

- 0 ((music))  
 1 A: *yeposeyyo*?  
 hello  
 ‘Hello?’  
 2 C: *yeposeyyo*\_  
 hello  
 ‘Hello\_’  
 3 (0.4)  
 4 C: ‘hh[hh-’  
 5 A: [yey: yey.  
 yes:HON yes:HON  
 ‘[] Yes: yes.’  
 6 C: yey: yey.h  
 yes:HON yes:HON  
 ‘Yes: yes. h’ ((produced as an exact repeat of the A’s prior turn))  
 7 (1.2)  
 8 A: *ney*?=  
 yes:HON  
 ‘Huh?=?’

- 9 C: =yey(h) heh  
yes:HON  
'= Yes(h) heh'  
(0.8)
- 10 (0.8)
- 11 A: ((first name))?  
(0.3)
- 12 (0.3)
- 13 C: ani-ntey:ǰ ehehheh-  
no-CIRCUM  
'No:ǰ ehehheh-'  
(0.5)
- 14 (0.5)
- 15 A: ku way,  
DM why  
'What's up,'
- 16 C: 'ss- ((first name)) hyeng ani-ntey- ani-ntey:ǰ  
brother no-CIRCUM no-CIRCUM  
'ss- it's not- not brother ((first name)):ǰ'  
(1.0)
- 17 (1.0)
- 18 A: yey:ǰ?  
yes:HON  
'What:ǰ?'  
(0.2)
- 19 (0.2)
- 20 C: ((first name))-yey.yo=((first name)).  
CP:DEF  
'It's ((first name))=((first name)).'  
(1.0)
- 21 (1.0)
- 22 A: nwukwu-sey.yo?  
who-HON:DEF  
'Who is this?'
- 23 C: ((first name))-lakwu-yo:  
DECL:COMP-DEF  
'(I'm telling you)/(I said) it's ((first name)):ǰ'  
(0.5)
- 24 (0.5)
- 25 A: e:: ya  
DM VOC  
'Oh:: hey'
- 26 C: yey=  
yes:HON  
'Yes='
- 27 A: =olaynman-[i-ta  
long.time-CP-DECL  
'[] =It's been a long time'
- 28 C: [ehehhehheh 'hehh hakin cey-ka- ce-hanthey cenhwa-ka  
indeed I:HUM-NOM I:HUM-from call-NOM  
o-l:: li-ka eps-ta-ko sayngkak-ul  
come-ATTR possibility-NOM not.exist-DECL-COMP thought-ACC  
ha.sye.ss-keyss-kwun ehuh heh heh  
do:HON:ANT-DCT.RE-UNASSIM  
'[] ehehhehheh 'hehh You might have well thought that there's no  
possibility I- you'd get:: a call from me ehuh heh heh'

After the summons/answer sequence (lines 0–1),<sup>8</sup> the caller constructs a second summons in the second turn (line 2). Then a 0.4-second silence ensues (line 3), which seems to be related to the answerer's trouble of recognizing the caller. When he finally produces an answer to the summons (line 5), the answerer displays a (possible) failure of recognition: He designs his answer in its honorific

form. The answerer's use of an honorific form of answer shows to the caller that the answerer has possibly failed to accomplish recognition, as the caller knows that the answerer uses non-honorific forms of talk when talking to him. In the following turn at line 6, however, the caller produces an exact repeat of the answerer's answer. Rather than producing a term of identification (cf. ex. 6), the caller simply repeats the answerer's *yey*: *yey*. 'yes: yes'. Thus, he does not provide any talk in the interest of identification/recognition, but a voice sample instead.

The caller's production of *yey*: *yey*. 'yes: yes' (line 6) poses a problem for the answerer. The answerer has established his availability to talk and has allowed the caller to move on to the next stage of the call, even without knowing the identity of the caller. What he gets, however, is an exact repeat of his own answer to the summons (line 6). Thus, after 1.2 seconds (line 7), all the answerer can do is to initiate a repair, *ney?* 'huh?' (line 8). By constructing a repair initiator in the form of 'huh?' rather than, for example, 'who is this', he shows that his trouble is not directed to the problem of accomplishing recognition but rather to what is going on in this interaction with this unknown caller (cf. Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks 1977, Schegloff 1979, Drew 1997). Immediately after the answerer's repair initiator, the caller gives the answerer yet a third voice sample *yey(h)* 'yes(h),' this time infiltrated with laughter (line 9). Though not providing any other identifying information but the voice sample, the caller invites an understanding that what is going on is a "game" or a "joke" by inserting a laugh token into his talk and giving a laughter 'heh' (line 9).

At line 11, the answerer finally figures out that this is a problem of establishing the identity of the caller: He produces a "try-marked" first name of the caller using an interrogative intonation contour (Schegloff 1979). In so doing, the answerer not only makes a guess about who the caller is but also shows his understanding that the caller is one of his acquaintances and, most likely, one of his friends, whom he usually calls by first name only. However, he makes a wrong guess. At line 13 the caller says *anintey:* *ɿ* 'no:ɿ' with laughter. While pointing out that the answerer's guess is wrong, the caller does not make a correction by providing, for example, self-identification. Thus, he continues to invite the answerer to accomplish recognition of his mysterious interlocutor. In the following turn at line 15, however, the answerer does not treat the caller's 'no' (line 13) as serious. He believes that the caller is who he figures it is and advances the opening by initiating an inquiry; *way*, 'what's up,' literally 'why (did you call)' (line 15). However, the caller persists in toying with the answerer by extending the game a bit more. At line 16, he points out that he is not the one the answerer figures he is and further invites the answerer to accomplish recognition by not producing self-identification.

The caller's persistent playing of the "game" of recognition provides the answerer with more trouble. The answerer figured out that the problem posed by this caller was directed to the work of identification/recognition and tried to

solve that problem by making a guess about the identity of the caller (line 11). And he believed he had solved his problem (line 15). However, the caller indicates that the answerer has failed to do so (line 16). What is the answerer supposed to do now? After 1.0 second (line 17), the answerer produces another repair initiator, *yeyi?* 'what:?' at line 18 (Schegloff et al. 1977, Drew 1997). By initiating repair in the form of 'what' he shows his trouble in understanding what the caller is trying to do, rather than establishing who the caller is. Finally, the caller produces a self-identification twice in the next turn at line 20. By producing his first name, he shows not only that he has been involved in toying with the answerer but also that the trouble on the answerer's part has been related to the work of recognition.

However, upon the caller's self-identification (line 20), a 1.0-second silence ensues (line 21). The 1.0-second silence seems to show that the answerer has a problem in accomplishing recognition of the caller even when he is provided with the caller's first name. The answerer now has trouble in placing the caller as identified by first name only within his set of potential callers. Indeed, after the 1.0-second silence (line 21), the answerer initiates a repair directed to the problem of recognition, *nwukwuseyyo?* 'who is this?' (line 22), making explicit that he cannot determine who the caller is (cf. Schegloff 1979). In the following turn (line 23), the caller repeats the first name self-identification but does not provide any additional recognition source. Thus, he claims to have the answerer accomplish recognition by means of his first name. At line 25, the answerer finally displays accomplishment of recognition of the caller; and he provides a quasi-account for not having accomplished recognition (line 27). At line 28, the caller conveys that he has been toying with the answerer throughout the whole opening by indicating that he knew he might not be among the answerer's set of possible callers.

Thus, the caller's use of *yeposeyyo* in the second turn operates as a vehicle for inviting recognition while allowing the answerer to respond to the surface format of a summons/answer sequence without accomplishing recognition. However, such an underlying orientation to the work of establishing identity surfaces when there is trouble in doing so, and resulting trajectories of talk subsequent to the second and third turns are organized in ways to deal with the problem of accomplishing recognition per se. Thus, the caller's use of a summons in the second turn shows not only that the second turn is a sequential locus for doing the work of establishing identity, but also that identification/recognition is one of the issues to be worked through in the opening before the parties can move on to developing any further talk (Schegloff 1979, 1986, 2002).

#### IMPLICATIONS

The analysis so far shows that parties orient to and construct the work of establishing one another's identity through the surface format of a summons/answer

sequence in second and third turns. However, if a caller wants to work through the issue of establishing identity in the second turn, why does he produce *yeposeyyo* at all when he has other resources available, such as displaying recognition of the answerer (ex. 2) and self-identification (exx. 3–4)? That is, what does a caller accomplish by producing a summons in particular in the second turn?

First, when callers produce *yeposeyyo* in the second turn, what they do NOT do is display recognition of answerers. In the first turn of an opening, answerers provide a first “recognition source” in the form of a voice sample (Schegloff 1979). Thus, callers are potentially able to recognize answerers, and displaying recognition of answerers is potentially relevant. Alternatively, callers can produce a term that identifies themselves to the answerer. However, when producing a summons in the second turn, callers do neither of these things. Thus, when callers produce a second summons, the question of recognition remains in a pending state. Instead, the second summons, in providing a voice sample, redirects the problem of recognition to answerers. Indeed, given that *yeposeyyo* is produced as an alternative to both self- and other-identification, it can be concluded that *yeposeyyo* is a means of insisting that the answerer’s recognition of the caller is relevant and due.

Second, as noted, through the second summons callers invite recognition from answerers by means of a voice sample. When producing a summons in the second turn, callers make relevant the production of an answer in the immediately next turn. In order for answerers to produce an answer, they have to figure out whether to use an honorific or non-honorific form of talk, which necessarily involves the work of recognition of the caller’s identity. Thus, when callers produce a summons in the second turn, they pose a recognition problem for answerers without providing any “recognition source” other than a voice sample (Schegloff 1979). Answerers are thus made to do the work of recognition with the caller’s voice sample and come to display their solution to the problem of recognition – whether successfully or not – in designing their answer to the caller’s second summons.

Finally, through the second summons, callers can avoid self-identification until the fourth turn or beyond. When answering a caller’s summons in the third turn, answerers display their recognition (or not) of the caller. Thus, when callers produce talk in the fourth turn, they are informed about whether an answerer has recognized them and can formulate their talk by reference to that. On the one hand, when answerers display recognition, callers can withhold identification/recognition at the fourth turn but move on to a “how-are-you” inquiry or a reason-for-the-call sequence (see ex. 9). On the other hand, when answerers display a (possible) failure of recognition, callers can then formulate identification/recognition by reference to that failure (see ex. 6). Thus, callers can construct a term of identification in a “safer” position before which answerers display their current state of recognition and in which callers can design identification/recognition by reference to that.

These observations suggest that Korean callers prefer to get recognized from their voice sample (cf. Schegloff 1979). That they invite recognition from an-

swerers by means of their voice samples while frequently and systematically withholding self-identification suggests the operation of a preference for recognition of caller by answerer (cf. Schegloff 1979, Park 2002).<sup>9</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

In the analysis above, I have demonstrated that parties work through a summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns of telephone conversations by orienting to the underlying issue of establishing one another's identity. While the surface appearance of second and third turns is realized in the format of a summons/answer sequence, the ways in which parties develop trajectories of their talk show that they confront and work through issues of identification/recognition. In addition, with the "legacy" of a summons/answer sequence in second and third turns, parties develop the subsequent course of their openings in ways particular to what transpired at those turns (Schegloff 2002).

The analysis presented above invites a comparison of telephone openings in Korean with those in other cultural contexts. As reported in past research, the ways in which callers and answerers establish their identities are culturally variable (cf. Lindström 1994). American callers invite other-recognition by constructing greeting sequences (Schegloff 1979, 1986). By contrast, Dutch callers prefer to self-identify by name (Houtkoop-Steenstra 1991). Swedish callers tend to avoid self-identification but do so more with immediate family than with acquaintances (Lindström 1994:243). In the Korean telephone openings analyzed above, callers show a marked preference for other-recognition. However, as we have seen, Korean callers implement this "American" preference in a distinctively Korean way. The second summons is, as far as we know, a specifically Korean way of requiring telephone answerers to recognize the identity of callers. This distinctive Korean methodology is nonetheless contained within the immanent logic<sup>10</sup> of telephone call openings.

#### APPENDIX: Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative	ADD	Additive
ANT	Anterior suffix	ATTR	Attributive
CIRCUM	Circumstantial	COM	Comitative
COMP	Complementizer	CONN	Connective
CP	Copula	DCT.RE	Deductive Reasoning
DECL	Declarative	DEF	Deferential
DET	Determinative	DM	Discourse Marker
DUB	Dubitative	HON	Honorific
HUM	Humble	IE	Informal Ending
INTERR	Interrogative	LOC	Locative
NCOMM	Non-Comitative	NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominative	POL	Polite suffix
PURP	Purposive	TOP	Topic
UNASSIM	Unassimilated	VOC	Vocative



a possible failure of recognition. Consider the following example from an opening after a switch-board request (the parties use honorific forms of talk to each other):

- 0 (after a switchboard request)
- 1 A: *yeposeyyo*<sub>ζ</sub>  
hello  
**'Hello<sub>ζ</sub>'**
- 2 (0.3)
- 3 C: *yeposeyyo?*  
hello  
**'Hello?'**
- 4 A:→ *ney:*<sub>ζ</sub>  
yes:HON  
**'Yes:<sub>ζ</sub>'**
- 5 (0.2)
- 6 C:→ *yey:* *ce* ((full name))-*ntey-yo:*  
yes:HON I:HUM CIRCUM-DEF  
**'Yes: this is ((full name)) (and):'**
- 7 A:→ *a annyenghaseyyo,* [*yey*  
DM hi:DEF yes:HON  
**'[ Oh hi, yes'**
- 8 C: [*yey annyenghaseyyo,* =  
yes:HON hi:DEF  
**'[ Yes hi, ='**
- 9 A: =*yey*  
yes:HON  
**'=Yes'**

The caller produces a summons in the second turn (line 3). The answerer designs his answer in a (quasi-) interrogative contour in the third turn (line 4). In the fourth turn (line 6) the caller initiates an overt identification/recognition sequence by producing self-identification. In so doing, he orients to the answerer's answer as displaying a possible failure of recognition. At line 7, the answerer reveals his failure of recognition by displaying a change of state from non-recognition to recognition of the caller with a 'oh' (Heritage 1984a). Thus, the answerer's answer in its (quasi-) interrogative contour displays and is oriented to as displaying a possible failure of recognition.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly, in the example illustrated in note 6 above, the answerer produces a greeting after the resolution of trouble in accomplishing recognition. As analyzed in note 6, the answerer fails to accomplish recognition of the caller with the voice sample provided in the second summons (line 4). At line 6 the caller initiates an overt identification/recognition sequence by producing self-identification. Thus he displays his understanding of the answer (line 4) as showing a possible failure of recognition. As soon as the caller identifies himself (line 6), the answerer displays a "just now" accomplishment of recognition with a 'oh' at line 7 (Schegloff 1979; see also Heritage 1984a): This reveals his failure of recognition in the third turn. Right after accomplishing recognition of the caller (line 7), the answerer launches a greeting in the same turn. With the greeting, he seems to show his resolution of the trouble in accomplishing recognition. At line 8, the caller returns the greeting and ratifies such a resolution of trouble in dealing with the work of identification/recognition. Thus, the parties construct a greeting sequence after resolving a trouble in establishing their identities engendered during the summons/answer sequence in the second and third turns.

<sup>8</sup> As noted earlier, callers may hear a musical phrase instead of individual phone rings in Korea.

<sup>9</sup> In addition to the caller's second summons, other compositional elements of the second turn seem to show a preference for recognition. When constructing the second turn with identification of answerers, callers do not usually produce self-identification (cf. ex. 2). In cases where they produce self-identification in the second turn, callers usually do so with the use of a particle, *ntey*, and follow the identification sequence with a first topic or reason-for-the-call sequence (exx. 3–4). Thus, when callers construct self-identification, they seem to do so in the interest of launching a reason-for-the-call sequence as early as in their second turn (cf. Park 2002). These constructions of the second turn seem to suggest a preference for recognition in Korean telephone openings.

<sup>10</sup> This may hold at least for calls that do not have an electronic caller identification function.

## REFERENCES

- Drew, Paul (1997). 'Open' class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28:69–101.
- Goffman, Erving (1963). *Behavior in public places*. New York: Free Press.
- Heritage, John (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hopper, Robert, & Chen, Chia-Hui (1996). Languages, cultures, relationships: Telephone openings in Taiwan. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29:291–313.
- \_\_\_\_\_; Doany, Nada; Johnson, Michael; & Drummond, Kent (1991). Universals and particulars in telephone openings. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 24:369–87.
- Hopper, Robert, & Koleilat-Doany, Nada (1989). Telephone openings and conversational universals: A study in three languages. In Stella Ting-Toomey & Felipe Korzenny (eds.), *Language, communication and culture*, 157–79. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke (1991). Opening sequences in Dutch telephone conversations. In Deirdre Boden & Don Zimmerman (eds.), *Talk and social structure*, 232–50. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jefferson, Gail (1980). On 'trouble-premonitory' response to inquiry. *Sociological Inquiry* 50:153–85.
- Lee, Hyo Sang (1991). Tense, aspect, and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal suffix in Korean from a typological perspective. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Lindström, Anna (1994). Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings. *Language in Society* 23:231–52.
- Luke, Kang Kwong, & Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula (2002) (eds.). *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structures across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Park, Yong-Yae (1997). A cross-linguistic study on the use of contrastive connectives in English, Korean, and Japanese conversation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002). Recognition and identification in Japanese and Korean telephone conversation openings. In Luke & Pavlidou (eds.), 25–47.
- Sacks, Harvey (1975). Everyone has to lie. In B. Blount & M. Sanches (eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language use*, 57–79. New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; Schegloff, Emanuel A.; & Jefferson, Gail (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50:696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1967). The first five seconds: The order of conversational openings. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70:1075–95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, 23–78. New York: Irvington.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies* 9:111–51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002). Reflections on research on telephone conversation: Issues of cross-cultural scope and scholarly exchange, interactional import and consequences. In Luke & Pavlidou (eds.), 249–81.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (forthcoming). *Sequence organization: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; Jefferson, Gail; & Sacks, Harvey (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53:361–82.
- Zimmerman, Don H. (1984). Talk and its occasion: The case of calling the police. In Deborah Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications*, 210–28. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

(Received 29 November 2004; revision received 18 April 2005;  
accepted 25 April 2005; final revision received 9 May 2005)