

# Question Design in a Korean Congressional Hearing: An Examination of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka*

SUJIN KANG

*University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa*

## 1 Introduction

Question and response are fundamental actions in communication (Levinson, 2013b). Analyzing questions can reveal whether the knowledgeability between interlocutors and recipients is congruent or not. This incongruence between the participants' epistemic statuses brings about diverse compositional forms of question-response sequences at a turn. The current study addresses how questions used with the suffix *-ci* in Korean are connected to the speaker's fine-tuning of epistemic gaps and relevant pragmatic forces through the methodological framework of conversation analysis (CA).

In general, speakers indicate assimilated stances about shared issues or information through their usage of the suffix *-ci* (Chang, 1985). Though previous studies agree with this definition, there is no absolute consensus on the meaning of the suffix *-ci*. Another representation of *-ci* involves the term 'committal', which relays the speaker's commitment toward the truth of the proposition in a question (H. Lee, 1999). According to this viewpoint, the use of *-ci* in the long negation form, *-ci anh* exudes 'specific and predictable' meanings in a context (H. Lee, 1999:264).

When the suffix *-ci* is used in interrogative constructions, greater diversity in pragmatic functions is observed because of its distinct nature. An

*Japanese/Korean Linguistics 29.*

Edited by Kaoru Horie, Kimi Akita, Yusuke Kubota, David Y. Oshima, and Akira Utsugi.

Copyright © 2022, CSLI Publications.

interesting point of question formulation is raised with the suffix *-ci* in terms of relevant modal expressions that carry one's stance, which has been analyzed within the specific context of a Korean congressional hearing for the current study.

Speakers may modify epistemic gradients to test recipients' knowledge and take their own stance toward shared issues or information by formulating their questions with the suffix *-ci*. This study examines types of questions conjugated with the suffix *-ci*: *-cyo* (*-ci* with polite ender-*yo*) and *-ci anh supnikka* (*-ci* in the long negation form with the deferential ending form *-supnikka*). Focusing on these two grammatical forms, the current study elucidates types of questions as they occur in their sequential environment, including responsive actions to see how respondents manage questioning constraints for a turn<sup>1</sup>.

The findings indicate that questions constructed with *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka* serve a key role to test participants' knowledge of the topic by calibrating epistemic gradients. Responses to each question displayed in subsequent turns are proved the relationship between question form and certain actions such as evasion, refutation, and acceptance, etc. As a result, the scope of interpretation for the suffix *-ci* as implemented for questioning actions are expanded, which ultimately implicates what participants are doing moment-by-moment in institutional forms of talk-in-interaction such as congressional hearings.

## 2 Data and Methodology

The current study used congressional hearings from the investigation of scandals within the Park Geun-hye administration, specifically involving a well-known confidante of the South Korean president, Choi Soon-Sil. Due to its significant role in bringing about the impeachment of President Park, the 4th assembly hearing was utilized as the focal data source<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Before comparing the different uses of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka* within the later part of the political hearing data, this study points out that even simply studying the usages in interrogative contexts is worthwhile. Even though there are different syntactic structures which do not necessarily compare the comparison of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka* accurately, it would still alter perspectives in the field of pragmatics and conversation analysis of Korean.

<sup>2</sup> Additionally, executives of well-known Korean conglomerates had also participated as witnesses, which garnered even more public interest. The hearing proceeded with the underlying implication that corporations had provided slush funds to Choi Soon-Sil, resulting in these circumstances being dubbed "Soon-Sil gate."

The analysis time for this research was approximately 1 hour and 57 minutes and the hearing took place on November 30, 2016. The live hearing had 1 moderator and 28 participants (18 questioners and 10 respondents). The participants were all native Korean speakers. In the transcribed conversations, there were a total of 31,650 words, with 185 occurrences of *-cyo* and 31 occurrences of *-ci anh supnikka*. This study examined two types of questions (pseudo-tag questions and negative interrogative questions) formatted with both sentence enders (*-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka*).

Previous studies have demonstrated the suitability of applying CA concepts to political interviews and debates (Clayman & Heritage, 2002a, 2002b), which this study uses to situate *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka* as formulation components in question-response sequences.

### 3 Findings

#### 3.1 Occurrences of Questions Formulated with Two Forms

There were 185 occurrences of *-cyo* and 31 occurrences of *-ci anh supnikka*. *-cyo* could be formulated with different linguistic components for different question constructions such as tag questions and wh-questions as in Table 1.

	Number of Occurrences	Frequency
Tag Question	179	96.7%
Wh-Question	6	3.24%

Table 1. Question with *-cyo*

The most frequent question formed with *-cyo* were tag questions, which and it has performed the function of asking confirmation about shared knowledge/issues as in example (1).

- (1) Q: ponpwucang-ul                      manna-sye-ss-**cyo**?  
 GENERAL.MANAGER-ACC   MEET-SH-PST-COMM:POL  
 ‘You met the general manager, didn’t you?’

However, *-ci anh supnikka* could not take various question types because of its syntactic structure. *-ci anh* could only occur in negative interrogative constructions as in example (2), functioning as a tag question.

- (2) Q: klueh-**ci**                      **anh-supnikka**?  
 BE:SO-COMM   NEG-Q:DEF  
 ‘Isn’t it so?’

### 3.2 Respondents' Answer Types

Question recipients have several possible formulations to choose from when they provide a response. This research used three types of answers for analysis: type-conforming, non-type conforming and not answering. Type conforming means that the respondent adheres to the prescriptive yes or no answer format demanded by the structural form of polar questions (Raymond, 2003). Nonconforming responses consist of an element of resistance while still providing some answer (Raymond, 2003). Lastly, non-answering is defined as when the speaker claims ignorance intentionally or unintentionally by using phrases such as “I do not know/remember.”

The relative frequencies for each type of response were distinct. The most frequent type of responses was type-conforming, with a frequency of 40.5%. On the other hand, the most frequent response constructed with *-ci anh supnikka* was non-answering formulations as seen in Table 2.

This finding possibly implies that conversational interlocuters employ different types of questions according to their own specific goals and interactional considerations. The following section demonstrates how two question forms project different action formations while tuning the epistemic status among participants.

	Occurrences of <i>-cyo</i>	Frequency	Occurrences of - <i>ci anh supnikka</i>	Frequency
Type-Conforming	95	51.3%	2	6.25%
Non-Conforming	58	31.3%	12	37.5%
Not Answering	32	17.2%	17	56.2%

Table 2. Type of Answer with Two Forms

### 3.3 Sequential Environments and Social Actions of Two Forms

#### 3.3.1 Questions Constructed with *-cyo*

The main pragmatic function of questions formulated with *-cyo* are observed to be itemized fact-checking inquiries within a sort of “tug-of-war” interactional exchange that is prevalent in political talks.

Questions formulated with *-cyo* demonstrate two functions that are indicative of the structure of the sequences within which they occurred. First, unpacking of the main issue allowed for the main question to be asked in a way that constrained the respondent somewhat by relegating the answer to a positionally vulnerable point in the pre-sequence of the turn.

Second, the question formulated with *-cyo* initiates extended talk on a given topic by asking for the respondent's confirmation as part of an expanded series of relevant questions. By doing so, a questioner embodies his/her positive expectation to get answers from the respondents.

In Example (3), the interlocuter asks for confirmation about a past incident. The respondent is being questioned because his corporation contributed 7 billion KRW to Choi Soon-sil's foundation.

(3) Question with *-cyo* for Unpacking the Main Issue

Q: Choi Kyo-il A: Shin Dong-bin

01 Q: *lostey chuk-ey(.) mwut-keyss-supnita.*

LOTTE COMPANY-AT ASK-I.WILL-DC:DEF

*'I will ask Lotte'*

02 *lostey-to? milu-wa K suphochu=caytan-ey=*

LOTTE-ALSO COMPANY-WITH K SPORT-FOUNDATION-TO

*'Your company also the K sport foundation and the company Mi-r'*

03 → *chwulyen-ul ha-sye-ss-cyo?*

CONTRIBUTION-ACC DO-SH-PST-COMM:POL

*'Your company also contributed to, right?'*

04 **ney**, *kuleh-supnita.*

YES LIKE THAT-DC:DEF

*'Yes, we did'*

05 *ku oye-y pyeltolo 70-ek-ul tto=*

THE BESIDE-TO ADDITIONAL 7-BILLION-ACC AGAIN

*'You supported with an additional 7 billion'*

06 → *ceykong-ul ha-sye-ss-cyo?*

SUPPORT-ACC DO-SH-PST-COMM:POL

*'right?'*

07 A: **ney.**

Yes.

*'Yes'*

*((omitted...))*

13 → Q: *iinwen pwuhoycang-kkeyse tolaka-sy-ess-cyo?*

NAME VICE:PRESIDENT-NOM:HON PASS:AWAY-SH-PST-COMM:POL

*'The vice-president, Lee passed away, right'*

14 A: **ney.**  
 Yes.  
 ‘Yes’

The questions marked with *-cyo* in line 03, 06, 13 display the speaker’s familiarity with the details about a given topic and serve as a vehicle for itemized fact-checking. These itemized enquiries encoded with *-cyo* provide relevant knowledge and background to the audience, which then can serve as a launching pad for the upcoming main question sequence. In addition, this type of questioning narrows the scope of the relevant answer, with respondents expected to answer yes or no. In other words, respondents face a choice of either providing a relevant answer and accepting the presupposition of the question or providing a type-conforming response to the question while simultaneously resisting its presuppositions by not answering directly, i.e., being ‘evasive’ (Hayano, 2013). In this case, the questioner’s epistemic knowledge is congruent, ([K+]) relative to the respondent’s.

Let us consider the respondent’s answer. By producing “yes” tokens in lines 04, 07, and 14, the respondent conforms to the questioner’s itemized fact checking format of inquisition. The frequency of type-conforming answers to *-cyo* questions (51.3%) is found to be higher than that of non type-conforming answers. Questions marked with *-cyo* impose tighter constraints on respondents that compels them to conform to the ways in which mutually familiar issues are framed.

The next example shows a case in which respondents do not conform to the ongoing question format and resist answering. In this conversation, the questioner asks the respondent whether the Samsung Group spent 19 billion KRW to purchase a horse from Germany for Choi Soon-sil’s daughter. Because Choi Soon-sil is exposed as a key stakeholder and decision maker in the Park Administration, it became problematic that Samsung Group had helped her daughter. The respondent keeps feigning ignorance about the issue by withholding a relevant answer. Thus, the questioner pursues a more adversarial line of questioning as indicated by confrontational word choices and direct, un-hedged linguistic expressions. Such questions marked with *-cyo* would be heard as more assertive and aggressive.

(4) Question with *-cyo* for getting confirmation

Q: Anh Min-seok A: Lee Jae-yong

01 Q: *ecce-l swu eps-nun saceng-i=*  
 NO:WAY CAN BE NOT:EXIST-RL CIRCUMSTANCE-NOM

02 *mwe-nya-nun mal-i-pnita*  
 WHAT-QT-RL WORD-BE-DC:DEF  
 ‘What about your extenuating circumstances?’

- 03 ku yayki-lul way mos-hay-yo?  
 THE SAYING-ACC WHY CAN:NOT-DO:POL  
 ‘Why couldn’t you say so?’
- 04 ku yayki-hakey toy-myen noymwulcoy-lo kelli-ki=  
 THE SAYING-DO BE-IF BRIBERY-AS TAKE-NOM  
 ‘Is it because the law concerning bribery?’
- 05 ttaymwuney mos-ha-nun kes ani-pnikka?=  
 BECAUSE CAN:NOT-RL THING BE NOT-Q:DEF  
 ‘would be an obstacle?’
- 06→ mac-cyo?  
 CORRECT-COMM:POL  
 ‘correct’
- 07 A: hayethun (.) kwukmin yelep-wun-tul-kkey cengmal  
 ANYWAY THE:PUBLIC EVERYONE-PL-NOM REALLY  
 ‘Anyway’
- 08 manhun silmang-ul (.) [sikhye-tuli-n cem]  
 A:LOT DISAPPOINTMENT-ACC MAKE-GIVE-RL POINT  
 ‘because I disappointed the public on this point’
- 09→ Q:[sa-cwu-ki-nun] sa-cwe-ss-cyo?=  
 BUY-GIVE-NOM-TOP BUY-GIVE-PST-COMM:POL  
 ‘You did buy it though, right?’
- 10→ sa-cwu-ki-nun sa-cwe-ss-cyo?  
 BUY-GIVE-NOM-TOP BUY-GIVE-PST-COMM-Q:POL  
 ‘You did buy it though, right?’
- 11→ 19 ekc-cali sa-cwu-ki-nun sa-cw-ess-cyo?=  
 1.9 BILLION-WORTH BUY-GIVE-NOM-TOP BUY-GIVE-PST-COMM:POL
- 12 samseng-i?  
 SAMSUNG-NOM  
 ‘Samsung purchased a 1.9 billion horse, right?’
- 13 A: cey-ka cenghwakha-n(.) kes-un tasi hwakin-hayse.  
 I-NOM EXACT-RL THING-TOP AGAIN CONFIRM-AND
- 14 (.) malssum-tuli-keyss-supnita-manun-  
 WORD:HON.-GIVE:HON-I.WILL-DC:DEF-BUT  
 ‘I will notify you after checking the exact details but’

Questions raised by the interlocutor in the excerpt above are exemplars of a type of content question that imposes specific parameters on the respondent's answer. Here it is used to pose “what” (in line 02) and “why” questions (in line 03). This question is produced in varying phrasal forms with their respective responses displayed as clausal phrases that reject the presumptive notions of the question (Fox and Thompson, 2010).

Such non-conforming responses affect the design of turn-sequences. Non-conforming displays engender longer turn-sequences than type-conforming ones. As these extended question-response sequences are commonly found in the midst of a “tug of war” interaction that takes place between participants in politically-charged assembly hearings, question design serves as an important conversational tool to expose witnesses being either complicit or directly involved in committing corporate crimes. Questions marked with *-cyo* can be used to expand one’s turn as seen in line 06.

The sequential environments of *-cyo* questions are similar to the question-response sequences previously shown in Example (3). *-cyo* is used to constrain the scope of answers and to check past actions, as seen in line 06, 09, 10 and 11. By repeating questions formulated with *-cyo*, the speaker increases the amount of pressure on the respondent to provide satisfactory answers.

However, questions formulated with *-cyo* cannot always guarantee success in obtaining a relevant answer from the respondent. As seen in the excerpt, the respondent continually resists the upshot of the question by providing irrelevant answers during the cross-examination (in line 07 and 12). By doing so, the respondents claim that he has more epistemic authority over commonly well-known issues.

Comparing the sequential environments of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka* reveals their interactional utility for fact-checking and testing the hearer’s knowledge. Their differences are clearly illustrated in the turn-by-turn contexts illustrated in the excerpts thus far. The next example addresses how questions formulated with *-ci anh supnikka* construct different sequential environments with relevant social actions.

### 3.3.2 Questions Constructed with *-ci anh supnikka*

A question constructed with *-ci anh supnikka* carries a different pragmatic force due to its specific location within the question itself. Rather than serving as a device for itemized fact-checking and unpacking shared information in *-cyo* formulated questions, *-ci anh supnikka* formulated questions appear in the middle or end of questioning sequences, carrying a distinct discursive force. In these circumstances, the negative interrogative construction *-ci anh supnikka* can be understood to position the speaker in a [K-] position, or at least an equivalently knowledgeable position comparing with *-cyo*.

The following example concerns the Lotte Group's illegal contributions of property among several corporations. The questioner suspects the respondent is involved in an illegal funding scheme.

(5) Question with *-ci anh supnikka* for seeking affirmation  
Q: Lee Man-hee A: Shin Dong-bin

01 Q: lostey sintongpin hoychang-kkey mwut-keyss-supnita.  
LOTTE NAME CHAIRMAN-NOM ASK-I.WILL-DC:DEF  
'I will ask Lottee Chariman Shin Dong-bin'

02 cinan 3-wel 14-ilnal hoychangnim-kkeyse-nun=  
LAST MARCH 14- CL CHAIRMAN-NOM-TOP  
'Last March 14<sup>th</sup>, you'

03→ taythonglyeng-ul toktayha-n sasil-i iss-cyo?  
PRESIDENT-ACC MEET-RL FACT-NOM BE-COMM:POL  
'You met the president in person, right?'

04 A: ney, iss-supnita.  
YES BE-DC:DEF  
'Yes, I did'

05 Q: ku nayyong-un kemchal-uy kongsocang-ey=  
THE CONTENT-TOP PROSECUTOR-GEN DOCUMENT-AT  
'It was stated in the official papers'

06 ceksi-toye iss-nun nayyong-intey.  
WRITE-BE BE-RL CONTENT-GIVEN.THAT  
'It was stated in the official papers, but'

07 cenhye kule-n sasil-i eps-supnikka?  
NOT:AT:ALL SUCH-RL FACT-NOM NOT:EXIST-Q:DEF  
'Such a fact was never true?'

08 A: kongsocang cey-ka cikcep po-n cek-i eps-ko  
THE:DOCUMENT I-NOM DIRECT SEE-RL THING-NOM NOT:EXIST-AND  
'I did not see the document in person'

09 ettehkey sse iss-nunci cey-ka cal molu-pnita.  
HOW WRITE BE-OQ I-NOM WELL DO:NOT:KNOW-DC:DEF  
'I do not know how the document is written'

10 Q: losteykulwup-eyse-nun kak kyeyyelsa-eyse=  
COMPANY-AT-TOP EACH BRANCH-AT  
'in Lotte company, each affiliate'

- 11 5-wel 25-il-pwuthe 5-wel 31-il-ey kelchy-ese=  
MAY 25-CL-FROM MAY 31-CL-AT OVER-AND  
*'From the time from May 31<sup>st</sup> to May 25<sup>th</sup>'*
- 12 chong 70-ek wen-ul K-suphochu-caytan-ey =  
TOTAL 7-BILLION-ACC K-SPORT-FOUNDATION-AT  
*'A total 7 billion'*
- 13 chwuka-lo chwulyen-ul hay-ss-supnita.  
ADDITIONAL-BY CONTRIBUTION-ACC DO-PST-DC:DEF  
*'was additionally contributed to K-sport Corporation'*
- 14 i sasil-ey tayhayse chwulyen cen-i-na?  
THIS FACT-TO ABOUT CONTRIBUTION BEFORE-COP-OR  
*'In regard to this fact, before the contribution'*
- 15 chwulyen ihwuey poko-lul pat-un sasil-i iss-supnikka?  
CONTRIBUTION AFTER REPORT-ACC RECEIVE-RL FACT-NOM BE-Q:DEF  
*'or after the contribution, was it reported to you?'*
- 16 A: cey-ka choykuney wa-se,  
I-NOM RECENT COME-AND  
*'Recently'*
- 17 10-wel mal-i-na 11 wel cho-ey.  
OCTOBER. END-COP-OR NOVEMBER BEGINNING-AT  
*'at the end of October or the beginning of November'*
- 18 cey-ka (.) kulen poko-lul pat-ass-supnita.  
I-NOM SUCH REPORT-ACC RECEIVE-PST-DC:DEF  
*'I had received such a report'*
- 19 Q: sacenpoko-nun pat-ci mos-ha-yss-tanun=  
PRE:REPORT-TOP RECEIVE-COMM NOT-DO-PST-QT  
*'You didn't get a preliminary report?'*
- 20 malssum-i-si-pnikka?  
WORD:HON.-BE-SH-Q:DEF  
*'You mean'*
- 21 A: ney, mac-supnita.  
YES CORRECT-DC:DEF  
*'Yes, correct'*

((omitted...))

- 24 Q: 70-ekey tayhayse-nun cenhye=  
7-BILLION ABOUT-TOP NOT:AT:ALL  
'about the 7 billion KRW'
- 25 a-si-nun pa-ka eps-tanun kes-i-cyo?  
KNOW-SH-RL THING-NOM NOT: EXSIST-QT-RL THING-BE-COMM:POL  
'You don't know anything about the 7 billion KRW, right?'
- 26 kule-myen ilen chwuka chwulyen-i.  
THEN-IF LIKE:THIS ADDITION CONTRIBUTION-NOM  
'Then, this additional contribution'
- 27 2015-nyento 11wel-ey thallakha-n  
2015-YEAR NOVEMBER-AT DROP-RL  
'in November of 2015'
- 28 losteyweltuthawe myenseycem thukhekwen=  
COMPANY TAX.FREE.STORE PATENT  
'and the Lotte Tower or its bid'
- 29 sinkyu palkup-kwa kwanlyen-hayse.  
NEW RELEASE-WITH RELATION-AND  
'or duty-free are they not related?'
- 30 yemtwu-ey twu-ko mith-ey iss-nun sacang kulwup-tul-i=  
THINK-AT PUT-AT UNDER-AT BE-TOP CEO GROUP-PL-NOM  
'the subsidiaries made this contribution with this presupposition'
- 31→ hay-ss-tako-nun sayngkakha-ci anh-usi-pnikka?  
DO-PST-QT-TOP THINK-COMM NEG-SH-Q:DEF  
'Don't you think?'
- 32 A: kuleh-key sayngkakha-ci-nun anh-supnita.  
LIKE-THAT THINK-COMM-TOP NEG-DC:DEF  
'I don't think so'

This excerpt confirms the pragmatic force of questions formulated with *-cyo* that has been mentioned in earlier sections. Locating the pre-sequence at a turn, the question unpacks shared information among participants and at the same time allows the questioner to engage in fact-checking while revealing his epistemic primacy on the topic (in line 03). The questioner then raises

another issue about the written form of arraignment in line 07. The respondent disconfirms the questioner's assumptions by stating that he did not have a chance to see the document in line 09. With the respondent's several denials up to this point, the questioner tries to raise background issues to allude to and impel an answer concerning illegal funds.

After several turns are taken to discuss the same issue, the interlocutor re-formulates the question with *-ci anh* in line 31. The questioner's use of the predicate *sayngkakhata* 'think' with the negative interrogative displays his epistemic status as [K-] because the epistemic gap is widened through his insertion of the negation marker *-ci anh*. Rather than soliciting information, this type of question is cautiously seeking affirmation. As this case demonstrates, this form tends to be situated after a series of questions encoded with *-cyo* and it represents the interlocutor's subjective opinion rather than claiming epistemic primacy toward facts of a matter.

Another sequential environment within which *-ci anh supnikka* occurs allows it to function as a device for stance-taking in the assembly hearing. The following segment exemplifies how a speaker formulates a question with *-ci anh supnikka* for delivering the speaker's subjective opinion and how hostile presuppositions in questions can be embedded. In example (6), the questioner and respondent talk about Hyundai Motors' funding for Choi Soon-sil's company. As the interlocutor poses adversarial questions based on factual evidence, the respondent avoids answering.

- (6) Question with *-ci anh supnikka* for unpacking speaker's stance  
Q: Park Beom Key, A: Chung Mong Koo

01 Q: kongsocang-ey hyentaycatongcha kulwup-kwa kwanlyen-hayse.  
DOCUMENT-IN HYUNDAI: MOTORS GROUP-WITH RELATION-AND  
'In the subpoena, about the Hyundai Motor Group'

02 ton ttut-ki-n key-eyyo?  
MONEY EXTORT-PAS-RL THING-Q:POL  
'Was company money extorted?'

03 A: kuke-n ce-nun molu-cyo.  
THE:THING-TOP I-TOP DO:NOT:KNOW-COMM:POL  
'I don't know such a thing'

04 Q: kongsocang-ey kulehkey nao-pnita?  
OFFICIAL:DOCUMENT-AT LIKE THAT COME-DC:DEF  
'In the official document, there was a description'

05→ changphiha-ci anh-usey-yo?  
 SHAME-COMM NEG-SH-Q:POL  
 ‘Aren’t you ashamed?’

06 A: kongsocang-ey-nun-  
 OFFICIAL:DOCUMENT-AT-TOP  
 ‘In the written document’

The speaker uses *-ci anh supnikka* to form a rhetorical interrogative in line 05 which functions as a negative assertion toward the answer about illegal funding. The speaker’s stance lead confronts the hearer’s non-answer and highlights this moment by mentioning the shameful nature of the addressee’s behavior as a chairman of a conglomerate. In the next turn, the answerer does not respond towards the moral insinuations posed by the questioner’s utterance/stance. Compared to *-cyo* questions that appear in the same environment where respondents reject to answer, *-ci anh supnikka* is more assertive and hostile because it formulates a negation with claims to a [K+] epistemic stance.

The following example shows how the sequential environment within which *-cyo* occurs allows it to function as a device for stance-taking in the assembly hearing. In previous scenes, the questioner raises the same question on how much the respondent has paid for estate tax or inheritance tax three times, but the respondent gives evasive answers.

Thus, the questioner puts forth more hostile presuppositions by using *-cyo* in line 05. Questions formulated with *-cyo* present a stance lead that invokes a sense of incongruity between the questioner’s expectations and the actual facts of a situation, thus engendering a strong sense of bias that is reflexive of the speaker’s subjective opinion on shared pieces of information on a public event or scandal.

(7) Question with *-cyo* for unpacking speaker’s stance  
 Q: Park Young-sun, A: Lee Jae-yong

01 Q: cey-ka al-ki-lonun 16 ek nay-sye-ss-supnita.  
 I-NOM KNOW-NOM-AS:FAR:AS 1.6 BILLION PAY- SH-PST-DC:DEF  
 ‘As far as I know, you paid 1.6 billion KRW’

02 ca. apeci-lopwuthe 60 ek pat-ase=  
 WELL FATHER-FROM 6 BILLION RECEIVE-AND.THEN  
 ‘You received 6 billion KRW’

03 ku tangsi-ey 16 ek nay-ko.  
 THE TIME-AT 1.6 BILLION PAY-AND  
 ‘paid 1.6 billion in tax’

- 04 8 co-uy caysan-ul ilkwe-ss-supnita.  
8 TRILLION-GEN ASSET-ACC EARN-PST-DC:DEF  
'You earned 8 trillion since then'
- 05 → koyngcanghi sengkongha-sy-ess-**cyo**?  
INCREDIBLY SUCCESS-SH-PST-COMM:POL  
'You've been incredibly successful, right?'
- 06 A: (2.0) cey-ka te aphulo kiek kyenyeng-ul  
I-NOM MORE FORWARD COMPANY MANAGEMENT-ACC  
'I will manage my company'
- 07 =yelsimhi. hayse:  
DILIGENTLY DO-AND  
'more diligently and'

#### 4 Conclusion

Employing conversation analysis as an analytic framework, this study clarifies interactional and environmental sequences of *-cyo* and *-ci anh supnikka*. First, a question encoded with *-cyo* delivers three functions. First, the suffix *-cyo* can perform a function of unpacking main concerns selected by speakers while listing enquiries for fact-checking in pre-sequence locations. Second, *-cyo* presupposes that the speaker is aligned with the hearer's epistemic gradient. Questions with *-cyo* narrow the scope of answers and cannot be evaded by respondents. If the respondents avoid answering, this serves as explicit evidence of strategic evasion. Third, *-cyo* serves as a prolific vehicle for introducing stance-leads, especially in adversarial contexts where the questioner utilizes questions marked with *-cyo* to project a biased and negative predisposition. This aspect serves as an interactional obstacle for respondents. A key feature of the environments within which *-cyo* appears is the presence of larger gaps between a questioner's expectation and the actual answers that are provided. Meanwhile, negative interrogatives encoded with *-ci anh supnikka* perform two pragmatic functions. The first can best be described as a fact-checking device. However, its discourse force does not claim a strong degree of epistemic certainty since the high frequency of *-ci anh supnikka* is correlated with rhetorical questions that do not require a specific answer. Second, *-ci anh supnikka* is also used as a stance-taking device that presents the speaker's biased stance towards issues. Thus, questions marked with *-ci anh supnikka* will be heard as assertions rather than genuine requests for information. In terms of sequential positioning, *-ci anh supnikka* questions appear after sequences in which

there is a strong denial from the respondent and also after pre-sequences where *-cyo* has been used.

Overall, this study highlights question formulations as a spotlight for speaker's epistemic knowledge and stance toward a given topic. In terms of daily social interaction, language itself can mold and initiate a certain social action deeply intertwined in speakers' epistemic statuses.

## References

- Chang, K. H. 1985. *A Study of Modality Categories in Modern Korean*. Seoul: Tower.
- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. 2002a. Questioning presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of Eisenhower and Reagan. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 749-775.
- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. 2002b. *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, B. A. and Thompson, S. A. 2010. Responses to Wh-Questions in English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43 (2), 133-156.
- Hayano, K. 2013. Territories of knowledge in Japanese conversation. PhD thesis, Radboud University, Nijmegen.
- Lee, H. S. 1999. A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the committal *-ci* in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(2), 243-275.
- Levinson, S. 2013. Action formation and ascription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 103-130. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Raymond, G. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68, 939-967.