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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Human Action

The primordial site for human action is not pure language, nor situations in which language is the only semiotic system. As argued by Goffman (1964), “the natural home of speech is one in which speech is not always present” (p. 135). The basic site for interaction is a situation in which people build social action together while attending both to each other and to a consequential world (Goodwin, 1994, 2000). To build action together participants must create and sustain what Goffman (1964) called a “moving focus of visual and cognitive attention” (p. 135), one that encompasses the details of their language use, mutual monitoring of each other’s bodies, and a changing orientation to relevant tools and objects.

This dissertation will use videos of participants cooking together to investigate how a specific deictic term in Korean, ilehkey (‘like this,’ ‘this way’), is used to coordinate action that integrates multiple semiotic fields (Goodwin, 2000). This situation provides an opportune site for examining in detail how language is used pragmatically to build complex action in a rich multimodal environment, and calibrating both knowledge and embodied skill. This dissertation will offer a new perspective on Korean deics by focusing on their role in building action that encompasses the stream of speech, but moves beyond it to include the bodies of the participants, the materials they are working with, their reasoning, and emotions.

---

1 I collected and analyzed data from two different contexts: (1) interactions between friends in the US, and (2) interactions between a teacher, and students at a professional culinary school in Korea, which is an institutional setting.
Indeed, I argue that these are essential to analysis of this deictic, since the demonstrative seems to function precisely as a means of linking language to the bodies of actors and the world they are acting in. Pedagogy that includes embodied action and the proper use of tools provides a site where the in situ construction of endogenous action through deictics can be examined with clarity. In addition to offering a multimodal perspective, the current study will shed light on the organization of human interaction in terms of deictic use from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Previous work has been done on the demonstrative adverb like this in several languages, such as the German so (‘like this,’ ‘such’), the Japanese ko (‘like this,’ ‘thus,’ ‘so,’ ‘in this manner’), and the Ilokano kastoy (‘like this’) in the concurrent spoken utterance with descriptive gestures (Streeck; 2002, 2009). However, with respect to ongoing interactions in Korean, research has not explored how the deictic functions in organizing participants’ attention, including talk and the body, in a situated activity.

1.2 Organization of the Dissertation

I begin with establishing a theoretical background, followed by a chapter on methods (Chapter 2), and then present the data on ilehkey (‘like this’/ ‘this way’) in Chapters 3 and 4. Whereas the data employed in Chapter 3 consist of interactions between friends in their homes in the US, the data used in Chapter 4 are derived from interactions between a teacher and student at a professional culinary school in Korea. By analyzing the same deictic term across these two chapters, and settings, I will show how language reflects the participants’ attention, perception, reasoning, and emotions, depending on the social context. In Chapter 5, I then analyze another grammatical feature, the committal suffix ci (‘right?’ in English) (see Table 1.1 in p. 4 for more details on the analytic focus of Chapters 3, 4, and 5. e.g., focus of linguistic items, contexts,
activities, and background information). This suffix seems to be frequently used with the deictic expression during the teacher’s instructions in progress. Whereas ilehkey (‘like this’/ ‘this way’) is placed near turn-beginning position, ci (tag question ‘right?’ in English) is placed in turn-ending position.

To illustrate the nature of my analysis I provide a specific example of the grammatical structure that I am going to analyze in my dissertation. In the teacher’s embodied demonstration of slicing garlic, the teacher says “Like this, you have cuts (on the garlic) this time, ci?” in my data.¹ She puts the deictic term at the turn beginning to organize the recipient’s attention on the object with reference to the working hand. Then after a verbal description of the object or action, she inserts ci at the end of the utterance. This is to mark the boundaries between different physical actions (For the English translation, I put the deictic term at the beginning on purpose, because that is the position where it occurs in Korean and it is important to the analysis of my data, because, as I argue, the deictic functions to indicate where to look on the object before actually performing the action).

Finally, in Chapter 6, I provide a summary of the dissertation. There I explain why my study is important, and how it contributes to the field of interactional linguistics, and suggest future studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Item</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Background Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> <em>Ilehkey</em> (‘like this’)</td>
<td>Interactions between friends at home in US</td>
<td>Demonstration in instruction activity</td>
<td>-Definition and functions in English deixis -Egocentricity of English deixis -Korean demonstratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> <em>Ilehkey</em> (‘like this’)</td>
<td>Interactions between a real teacher and student at the culinary school in Korea</td>
<td>Assessment in scolding activity</td>
<td>-<em>Honnyaki</em> (scolding) in Korean culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <em>Ci</em> (right?)</td>
<td>Interactions between a professional teacher and student at the culinary school in Korea</td>
<td>Demonstration in instruction activity</td>
<td>-Transfer of information and receipt of information -Korean question system and the committal suffix <em>ci</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.1 Contents of analysis chapters**

4
1.3 Theoretical Background

For my dissertation project, I was inspired by several different fields, including Conversation Analysis (CA), Korean linguistics, and cognitive science, as well as anthropology—particularly the interactionist perspective. Each analytic chapter makes a different analytic point and offers distinct arguments, which require their own linguistic and cultural background information (see table 1.1. above). Thus, here in this chapter, I will provide a brief overview of the concepts relevant to my project as a whole, which are (1) a review of CA and specifically Korean CA, (2) Goffman's (1964) concept of mutual monitoring and situated action, and (3) human pedagogy. Previous research on the topic of each chapter will be provided at the beginning of the chapter. For example, in Chapter 3 on ilehkey, I provide a definition and functions of English deixis, Egocentricity of English deixis, and Korean demonstratives. In Chapter 4 on ilehkey, I examine the concept of Honnayki (scolding) in Korean culture. In Chapter 5, I look at the literature on the Korean question system, the committal suffix ci, and the transfer and receipt of information.

1.3.1 Review of CA and Korean CA

Through action, humans are capable of participating in a “communion of reciprocally sustained involvement” (Goffman, 1957, p. 49). CA is “an approach within the social sciences that aims to describe, analyze and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of social life” (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1). CA was developed in the 1960s as a collaboration among Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. The trio was initially inspired by Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel’s works (Sidnell, 2010).

---

2 One point of departure for my review paragraphs on CA is Sidnell’s (2010) work.
Goffman (1971) considered interaction as structural organization that participants deploy to analyze each other’s actions. He showed that situations could be analyzed as “orderly systems of self-sustaining activity” (Sidnell, 2010, p. 6). “Conversation has a life of its own and makes demands on its own behalf and it is a social system with its own boundary” (Goffman, 1957, p. 47). CA was influenced by Garfinkel’s (1967) practical reasoning, according to which human actions are made possible by sharing assumptions and expectancies in everyday activities.

Using naturally occurring talk (Sacks, 1984; Heritage, 1984b), CA researchers show interactional practices and the system of practices (Clayman & Gill, 2004) to explain the orderliness of human interaction (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Such orderliness proves that the members of society systemically organize talk, and show its system to co-participants. In other words, the existence of identifiable order in data (e.g., turn-taking, action formation and sequence organization) is evidence that members of society systemically organize talk and shows its system to those who participate.

Korean Conversation Analysts have investigated grammar and interaction since the 1990s (H. S. Kim & K. Kim, 2015). Studies have been conducted on grammatical particles (K. Kim 1992, 1993; H. S. Kim 2010), referential forms (Kim & Suh 2002; Yoon, 2003), turn-construction, (J. Park, 2009), repair (K. Kim, 1999), openings of a telephone conversation (Y. Park, 2002; S. Lee, 2006a, 2006b), and question and response design (J. Park, 2008, 2009; Y. Park, 2010; Yoon, 2010). In Korean CA studies, most such studies have focused on mundane conversation, with a few examining institutional talk, such as classroom interactions (Kim, 2002; Lo, 2004), and doctor–patient interactions (Y. Park 2011, 2013). Anticipated work for the near future includes multimodal studies using video data, while comparisons between different

---

3 One point of departure for this summary paragraph on the Korean CA is H. S. Kim and K. Kim’s (2015) work.
languages are expected as well (H. S. Kim & K. Kim, 2015).

1.3.2 Embodiment, the Moving Focus of Attention and Mutual Monitoring (Goffman, 1964)

Psychologists refer to embodiment as “understanding the role of an agent’s own body in its everyday, situated cognition” (Gibbs, 2006, p. 1). Bodily experience is a crucial part of cognitive processes as well as language. The study of human interaction adds to this a focus on organization sustained through multiple bodies, and the detailed ways in which participants use phenomena expressed through each other's bodies as resources for the organization of collaborative action. Goffman (1964, 1981) argues that through the full spectrum of the resources made available by embodied action, speakers and listeners in face-to-face interactions socially, cooperatively, and systemically organize talk.

Actors jointly shift the focus of their visible and cognitive attention in the midst of interaction. By doing so, they can monitor each other’s bodies in order to accomplish collaborative action (Goffman, 1964; M. H. Goodwin, 1980; M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013). They share verbal, perceptual, and physical social worlds (Hanks, 1996). Actors may carry out conversation or embodied action only after being co-present in the interactional space, orienting their bodies to each other and receiving explicit attention from their recipient (Goffman, 1964). Participants deploy extra-linguistic actions such as gestures, bodily orientation, and intonation in face-to-face interaction (Goffman, 1964; Goodwin, 1980).

To establish mutual and shared focus of attention, actors can use gestures as well as conversation (Streeck, 2009). For example, Goodwin (2007a) describes the role of an environmentally coupled gesture in aligning participants’ attention in embodied activity. An environmentally coupled gesture consists of “language, a pointing gesture which links specific
things in the environment that are focus of their attention” (Goodwin, 2010, p. 112). A speaker can simultaneously give a verbal explanation of an object in the surroundings while emphasizing a specific aspect with a pointing gesture. An By looking at a particular object, one party can let his or her interlocutor know what (s)he is focusing on (Tomasello, 2008).

The establishment of mutual and shared orientation is essential not only in natural conversation but also in pedagogy. Interactional studies employing video recording have been performed in diverse pedagogical/professional settings such as an archeological field school (Goodwin, 1994; 2007a; 2010; 2013), a science lab (Roth & Welzel, 2001), a dance class (Keevalik, 2013), an auto bodyshop (Streeck, 2009), a cooking class (Mondada, 2014), and surgery (Mondada, 2010).

In particular, Goodwin (1994) investigated how members of a community design actions within a relevant intersubjective field, as a novice gradually comes to master practical knowledge in the field of archeology and competently carry out tasks. He introduced the concept of professional vision, which refers to “socially organized ways of seeing and understanding events that are answerable to the distinctive interests of a particular social group” (Goodwin, 1994, p. 606). An apprentice learns how to see and categorize the world, and how to use his body and a tool in a way relevant to his profession, through the mastery of successive subsets of activities that competent teaching provides sequentially and in isolation.

1.3.3 Human Pedagogy, Embodied Skills and Human Cognition

For example, a teacher is capable of organizing visible and cognitive attention on referential objects such as a Munsell chart and dirt in the local environment through utterances and the concurrent pointing gestures. Different kinds of resources (language and gestures) elaborating each other are recognized and understood within the present environment.
Pedagogy is distinctively human and universal to every culture (Cisbra & Gergly, 2011). Though social learning and communication are common in other types of animals, only humans can transmit knowledge or skills through pedagogy. Moreover, intense monitoring of what the other is doing is one of the differences between humans and apes (Tomasello & Call, 1997). Animals look only at the outcome of an action. Ingold (2001) emphasizes the importance of skill rather than information for assuming the role of a competent member in society. To gain skills, bodily movements and attention are crucial. Learning occurs through both showing and seeing: a novice is able to learn by monitoring an expert’s body, and via participation in the activity. The researcher also differentiates knowledge from information using the example of a cookbook. When cooking with the book, a person is able to carry out the activity, not only because he or she follows the commands in the book, but because of his or her previous experiences in the kitchen context.

1.4 Chapter Summary

In sum, in Chapter 1, I have provided an overview of my research project and related theories on CA and Korean CA, embodied human interaction, and human cognition. Existing literature shows that human actions, including talk, the body and objects, are systemically organized in unfolding interactions. All these occur in the process of sharing the world together and building actions co-operatively.
CHAPTER 2

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Data and Background

2.1.1 Personal Motivation for Investigating Cooking

In addition to the theoretical grounds for studying interaction at a culinary school, which are explained in Chapter 1, I was motivated by my own experiences; during 2012 in Los Angeles, I attended a culinary school to learn baking and cooking as a hobby. I was very intrigued by how the teacher trained me in how to use my body and cooking tools as a cook (Although I had previously been able to cook simple dishes and use tools in the kitchen, it was a completely different experience to see the world and use my body as a professional cook). For example, even chopping garlic requires complicated hand skills deployed in a particular way as a chef (Figures 2.1 and 2.2 below). I learned that I should hold the handle of the knife with my right hand in a particular way, while my other hand slightly gripped the spine of the knife in the middle so as to keep it balanced (depending on the dominant of the hand of the cook, s/he can use a different hand). For making fried shrimp, I learned how to visually check the temperature of boiling oil to see if it was hot enough by dropping in a drip of watery flour to ensure it popped up to the surface in one second. These personal experiences exploring the kitchen as a novice helped shape the idea that I should pursue research on the professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) of cooking.
Figure 2.1 A chef’s right hand holding a knife in a particular way

Figure 2.2 A chef’s left hand guiding the spine of the knife

2.1.2 Data

The data employed in this dissertation consist of cooking activities conducted in Korean. Approximately forty hours of interaction were collected in institutional and non-institutional settings: (1) interaction between a teacher and students at a professional culinary school in Korea, and (2) interactions between friends and family members at the participants’ homes in Korea and the US (Table 2.1 below). These activities were video-recorded bit by bit over a period from 2010 to 2013, during my years in the PhD program. I first video-recorded

\[5\] For better understanding, some images are retrieved from the Internet in my dissertation. Retrieved from http://www.bestchefknifereviews.com/the-best-way-to-hold-a-knife/

interactions between myself and friends as a part of a class project in 2010. After finding the cooking interaction very rich as a terrain of investigation, I secured consent to conduct research from a private cooking school in Korea in 2012, and approval from the UCLA Human Subjects Protection Committee in 2013. The detailed context and conditions for each of the two types of interactions involved, such as participants, and settings will be discussed in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Participants in each data set</th>
<th>Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional context</strong></td>
<td>1) One instructor</td>
<td>Professional culinary school in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) One to fifteen students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Three instructors participated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-institutional context</strong></td>
<td>Friends and family members</td>
<td>Participants’ kitchen in Korea and US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) One instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) One student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Context of data

2.1.2.1 Institutional context: The professional culinary school and Craftsman cooking certificate

2.1.2.1.1 The Goal of the Institution and the Craftsman Cooking Certificate
The goal of this class at the culinary school is to help students pass a national examination to be certified as a “craftsman cook,” a qualification issued by the Korean government, following an examination given by the Korea Institute of Technical Qualification.

In order to understand the characteristics of the cooking school, it is important to first understand what a “Craftsman cooking certificate” is. According to the Food Sanitation Act, a person is required to possess the certificate to work as a cook in a restaurant in Korea. The intent of the examination is to foster professional cooks who can participate in choosing and buying ingredients, as well as cook food with consideration for its nutrition and hygiene.

The examination for the Craftsman cooking certificate issued by the Korean government consists of two parts: (1) a written exam, and (2) a performance test. In order to pass the exam, testees must demonstrate knowledge in the domain of cooking on the written test and embodied skills in the performance test. On the exam date, the testees are asked to construct two random dishes within a limited time, following sample recipes that are available in the official website (testees can obtain detailed recipes from a textbook, published by various publishing companies and sold in bookstores). There are also different types of Craftsman cooking certificates, such as for Korean, Japanese and Western food.

---

7 I got the information on Craftsman cooking certificate from the official website of the Korea Institute of Technical Qualification. Retrieved from http://www.q-net.or.kr/crf005.do?id=crf00503&jmCd=7910&gSite=Q&gId=
However, passing the performance test is not an easy job, because there are specific rules and recipes to follow. According to the Korean government, only 31.1% of testees taking the Korean food examination successfully passed the performance portion in 2013, although 117,379 people took the exam. The judges evaluate the prepared dishes based on the following criteria, updated for 2014: (1) cleanliness and safety worth 10 points (e.g., the appearance of the cook him/herself and his or her apron, as well as the cooking process: organizing and cleaning the kitchen table and etc.), (2) embodied cooking skills for 60 points (e.g., using tools and trimming ingredients in the proper way, and cooking according to the correct steps), and (3) the final dishes for 30 points. S/he should get more than 60 points to pass the examination. There is also a negative selection process, in which testees are disqualified from the evaluation in some cases, such as failing to complete two dishes within their time limits, not

---


10 The criteria for 2014 were indicated on the website itself and are attached as a separate file. However, criteria on files and webpage were slightly different. So I combined them by categorizing similar things together.
following a given method for a particular food (e.g., steaming the fish instead of grilling it for the grilled fish), or using more than two fire grills.

According to the rules of the exam, recipes must be followed strictly in terms of size, cooking methods, quantity of ingredients and plating. Also, a testee cannot taste the food while cooking; graduates should be skillful enough to cook without tasting the dishes; therefore, testees need to memorize information and master embodied practice in order to have sharp eyes and skillful hands as Craftsman cooks. For instance, 50 minutes are allowed for making bibimbap within which time a cook needs to cut fried egg white into 0.3cm x 0.3cm x 5cm strips and mung bean jelly into 0.5 cm x 0.5 cm x 5 cm (Figure 2.4 below). However, the pumpkin needs to be cut using a rotation cut method (Figure 2.5 below). For plating, all cut ingredients are to be sorted by color and placed in a circle following the shape of the round bowl.

![Bibimbap](image)

**Figure 2.4 Bibimbap**

---

11. The recipe can be found on the official website of the Korean government on the Craftsman certificate.  
12. Retrieved from http://www.lovefooding.co.kr/bbs_gallery/bbs_view.asp?code=G1&etc=%C7%D1%BD%C4&page=3&num=532
2.1.2.1.2 Culinary School

As the exam’s rules and the criteria for passing it are complicated and specific, some testees need help from professionals. The culinary classes given here function as a sort of prep school, designed to help testees (The course titles are “Craftsman cooking class-Korean food” and “Craftsman cooking class-Western Food”). They are specifically designed for people who would like to be prepared to take the exam (the exam is not given by the instructors teaching the classes studied here, but by the Korean government, much like the driver’s license, for which preparation is privately managed, but the government actually gives the test). In class, the students not only gain knowledge and embodied skills pertinent to cooking across a range of sensory domains, but also get accustomed to test rules and conditions through simulations.

In class at the culinary school, there is one female instructor and 1-15 students in each session (Figures 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 below). Three female instructors from the Korean and Western

---

food classes participated in this project. The class consists of approximately two-hour sessions,\textsuperscript{14} four times a week, for a total of twenty-five sessions over the course of a month (I attended seventeen sessions over two months). Registration for the class takes place on a rolling basis, and therefore, students’ skill levels vary; some students are more experienced and competent than others, even though they are in the same class.

\textsuperscript{14} Officially, The class is two-hour sessions but it takes more time because of evaluation and cleaning the kitchen.
2.1.2.1.3 Cooking Session at the Culinary School

The session consists of three parts: (1) teacher’s demonstration for one hour (Figure 2.6 above), (2) students’ performance for one hour (Figure 2.7 above), and (3) teacher’s evaluation of the food and kitchen cleanup altogether for another twenty minutes (Figure 2.8 above). During
the first hour, the teacher transmits embodied knowledge across sensory domains regarding the assigned dishes of the day in the form of embodied demonstration and verbal explanation as to the steps and ingredients. She offers her tips and reads a textbook together with students. Meanwhile, students observe the teacher’s embodied demonstration and its effect on the food. Their job is to understand the teacher’s lecture and remember information such as steps, quantities, and tips so that they can cook better.

During the second hour, students exhibit their understanding through individual performance, which is a simulation of the real cooking test. Meanwhile, the teacher circulates, checking performance, and providing individual feedback; she spends more time on those who do not cook well.

After the time limit, the teacher makes a public evaluation of students’ dishes; the teacher summons students with their two complete dishes, students bring them to one table and they scrutinize each dish closely (Figure 2.8 above). The instructor uses her own demonstration dish as a model and compares it to other students’ dishes. She publically ranks students’ dishes: who is the best and second-best, and comments on why the dish is good or bad and how to improve it. By looking at other’s dishes and listening to the teacher’s comments, students learn to see good and bad examples. Once the evaluation is done, students eat or take the food home and clean their tables and dishes for the students who will come next.

2.1.2.2 Non-institutional Context: Interactions Between Friends and Family Members

During a personal interview with the researcher, the teacher emphasized that she was very busy as a teacher. She had many tasks, such as ordering ingredients from a grocery store on the phone, teaching and monitoring students and cleaning up the kitchen.
In addition to this institutional context, data were collected in a non-institutional context: this involved the interactions among friends and family members. The main goal of these interactions is to teach and learn how to cook, similar to the culinary school. However, the settings and the number of participants are different from institutional settings. It is one-on-one pedagogy. In these data sets, there are two participants in each video clip. One teaches embodied skills and knowledge of the tools and ingredients, while the other learns them. Participants sit at a table next to each other in a shared kitchen so as to see each other’s bodies and faces (Figure 2.9 below). The activity lasted about two hours for each data set.

Figure 2.9 The setting and gaze diagram

The cooking instruction is carried out in the following sequence: (1) the teacher’s explanation of the sub-task and embodied demonstration, (2) the student’s observation and work, and (3) the teacher’s assessment (Figure 2.10 below). The teacher breaks down an activity into the smallest manageable segments. The learner attempts to perform the activity and has her
performance commented on by a skilled cook right after each action. When the student has a problem understanding or executing a subtask, the teacher interrupts and provides feedback with an embodied demonstration for better performance. When a student successfully completes a task, the teacher moves to the next sub activity. These basic sequences were repeated.

Figure 2.10 The instruction sequence

For example, to learn how to prepare avocado with soy sauce, the teacher first instructs those watching to hold an avocado with the left hand. Then she shows how to place a knife horizontally with the right hand and cut it. Once the student follows these leads, the teacher provides instructions on how to use a knife to remove the pit from the avocado without using a finger.

The subsequences are made possible by the fact that the participants are actually present for the activity, and a teacher is able to watch the actual actions of a newcomer, which is crucial for learning embodied skills, as these involve more than the memorization of information. This leads the teacher to evaluate the student’s actions and correct mistakes right away, moment by moment. The students are not evaluated on whether they remember information transmitted in
2.1.2.3 Institutional Context vs. Non-Institutional Context

My institutional and non-institutional data are similar in the sense that there is a student and teacher, and in that they pursue a common activity in a kitchen. In addition to these features, talk, body and local environment mutually elaborate each other in both cases. For example, the teacher transmits embodied knowledge by physical demonstration and verbal description of how to use tools and ingredients. A student shows his/her understanding by individual performance on his/her own dish. However, beyond teaching and learning skills, the institutional setting means that specific goals must be achieved at the cooking school: to help students pass the cooking test and get the certificate. One teacher teaches a group of students. This affects participants’ actions at the cooking school.

First of all, the context, whether non-institutional or institutional, affects the sequence of demonstration and feedback. In our non-institutional data, the teacher breaks down the activity into sub-activities and the student demonstrates her understanding of each action right after the teacher’s demonstration; the teacher’s feedback follow immediately. However, at the culinary school, students’ chance to perform comes once the teacher has completed her entire dish. Therefore, students sometimes seem to forget what the teacher explained earlier and make

---

16 Concerning the teaching and learning sequence, the participants at the non-institutional settings are free to improvise the lesson depending on the situation (e.g., skipping or concentrating on particular steps). The instructions are rather informal. The participants seem to feel free to ask questions and were generous with mistakes. This is because participants at the non-institutional settings do not plan to be a professional cook in the future and do not take the cooking test. Cooking is an everyday activity that they perform to make food for themselves or their family and friends. Also, most participants have close personal relationships with each other.

17 I focused more on describing the institutional setting here because I just described the context of non-institutional settings in the previous chapter and it could be somewhat repetitive.
mistakes even though they have taken notes during the demonstration.

At times, the students at the cooking school make a mistake which the teacher notices only later, recognizing that the error that lies in the food the students prepared in a prior turn (for example, in Chapter 4, the teacher realized that the student had not properly used a paper towel in chopping the nuts even without seeing him). This arises because of the setting, in which the teacher has many students and cannot monitor each one extensively.

In contrast, in the interactions among friends, the feedback is given immediately to the students, and participants are able to monitor each other’s bodies. This is one-on-one pedagogy, and the participants are present together in the interactional space. The issues of memorizing the recipe or rules did not arise, because the student performs and demonstrates her understanding right after seeing the teacher’s demonstration. Rather, the student was unable to carry out the activity, for lack of embodied skills, not for want of knowledge. Even when a novice sees and knows what to do in the form of knowledge, he or she needs embodied practice to acquire competence.

Another difference between the institutional and non-institutional data is the application of strict evaluation criteria such as time, skill, and size. At the culinary school, instructions are formal. The goal of the institution is to help students pass a cooking test designed by the Korean government. Therefore, the teacher has objective and detailed criteria for evaluating students’ actions and is entitled to correct students’ small mistakes and even to scold them.

Lastly, students in the cooking school, as members of a community, are more cooperative and responsible about their conduct; for example, the teacher pushes the students to finish each small task on time, so he or she can shift to next relevant activity (otherwise, the whole class
goes home late). The teacher monitors whether participants use the gas flame and knives in a manner consistent with their safety. If one student uses flame improperly, it threatens the others’ safety as well. Students must cooperate with the teacher as responsible members of the community.

2.2 Methodology and Transcript Conventions

This dissertation uses a video-ethnographic methodology for data collection, and a Conversation Analysis (CA) methodology for data analysis. Video-ethnographic methodology is useful in interactional studies, because it shows in detail both the conversations and movements of participants moment by moment. For this reason, studies in diverse pedagogical/professional settings, including an archeological field school (Goodwin, 1994, 2007a, 2010, 2013), an auto repair shop (Streeck, 2009), a science lab (Roth & Welzel, 2001), a dance class (Keevallik, 2013), a cooking class (Mondada, 2014), and surgery (Mondada, 2003), have made use of video recording.

The data were first recorded in video form, and then later transcribed, following the transcription conventions outlined by Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). I watched the full video clip, and then edited it down to a video clip about thirty-seconds long, depending on my interest in the interaction. I then watched each short video clip repeatedly to capture every detail of participants’ actions. For data analysis, I selected those transcripts relevant to the topic of my research rather than the full transcripts.

Coordination among talk, bodies and tools are central to phenomena I am looking at in studying cooking instructions; therefore, in my transcripts, I use colors to highlight grammatical
features, in particular those, such as deictic terms and committal suffixes, which are used to organize and fine tune coordination. Photographs with arrows and circles accompany the transcript. These serve to highlight tools in the environment, by calling attention to and explicating nonverbal components, such as gesture and gaze. For example, pink indicates the deictic expression í (this) and ilehkey (this way), while blue indicates the committal suffix ci (right?). Purple signals hand gestures. Grey within brackets indicates [the description of important phenomena in an accompanying picture]. Lastly, italics within double parentheses identify ((the participants’ body movements in the interaction space and gaze shifts)).

The words in each balloon indicate what the participant is saying while looking at a certain object prior to shifting his or her gaze. Due to the noise of the kitchen, I had a difficult time hearing participants’ words. Therefore, I used a question mark in parentheses (?) to indicate those words that could not be heard clearly or else a best guess based on looking at the shape of the participants’ mouths.

In transcripts of Korean language, there are three lines: (1) Romanized Korean following the Yale system, (2) English translation morpheme by morpheme, using the abbreviations of grammatical morphemes and (3) English translation in idiomatic speech. In Korean language, lexical items are dropped out in natural conversation frequently. In such cases, in the third line of English translation, the researcher inserted the omitted words within parentheses as needed based on the context.

---

18 One point of departure for this paragraph on the transcripts is S. Lee’s (2006b) work.

19 Concerning the position of the deictic term ilehkey in English (third line in the transcript), I will put it at the beginning of the turn. It will be more colloquial in English to put the deictic term at the end of utterance. However, in my data, the deictic term occurs near the turn beginning and this position within a turn is crucial in organizing participants’ attention (Although the adverb ilehkey (‘like this’) can be placed in any position in natural conversation, I could find them near the turn beginning or one word in my instruction data).
CHAPTER 3

THE USE OF *ILEHKEY* (‘LIKE THIS,’ ‘THIS WAY’)

IN INSTRUCTION ACTIVITY

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Overview of Chapter 3 and Chapter 4

The present chapter explores the role of a specific Korean deictic, *ilehkey* (‘like this,’ ‘this way’) in cooperative human interaction. This study will fill a gap in the literature by looking at how the deictic expression functions interactively to organize attention and action. Doing so, however, will require including phenomena beyond the stream of speech within the analysis. Indeed, I argue that this is essential in analysis of the deictic, since the demonstrative seems to function precisely to link language to the bodies of actors and the world they are acting in. One site where this phenomenon can be examined with clarity is pedagogy.

In addition to offering a multimodal perspective, the current study will shed light on the organization of human interaction in terms of the deictic from a cross-linguistic perspective. Previous work has been done on the demonstrative adverb *like this* in several languages such as the German *so* (‘like this,’ ‘such’), the Japanese *ko* or *kou* (‘like this,’ ‘thus,’ ‘so,’ ‘in this manner’) and the Ilokano *kastoy* (‘like this’) in the concurrent spoken utterance with descriptive gestures (Streeck, 2002, 2009). However, with respect to Korean, research has not explored how the deictic functions in organizing participants’ attention, including talk and body in situated activities.
The main argument aims to show 1) how *ilehkey* (‘like this’) provides a way of linking language to other semiotic fields such as gesture, prosody and the local environment, and how it operates in organizing the cooperative attention of participants, 2) how gaze organizes shifts in attentional focus that are crucial to the organization of the situated activity, and 3) how *ilehkey* functions as a link between participants when they decompose, reuse and transform the actions and materials from previous turns.

To support my arguments, two chapters in my dissertation (Chapter 3 and 4) explore the interactional usage of the deictic term *ilhekey* (‘like this,’ ‘this way’) in two different pedagogical contexts: (1) interactions between friends, and (2) interactions between a professional teacher and students at a culinary school (See footnote for my motivation for choosing this deictic term among others for two chapters). Looking at my own data, *ilehkey* (‘like this’) was mainly used in two distinct activities, (1) instruction activities, and (2) scolding activities. It is therefore these two activities that my chapters explore. Whereas *ilehkey* in instruction activities was found in both contexts, *ilehkey* in scolding activities was found only at the culinary school (the scolding activities will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4).

The present chapter (Chapter 3) analyzes non-institutional interactions between two

---

20 Among other deictic terms, I investigated *ilehkey* in particular because of its importance and frequency in my cooking data. Organizing attention on an object and gesture are crucial to carrying out an embodied activity in particular (In contrast, in mundane conversation, the focus of analysis is not an usually object or body, but talk). I found that “like this” was very frequently used in combination with gesture as an environmentally coupled gesture (Goodwin, 1994) by teachers and students. Other demonstratives were less frequent and not as intricately paired with gestures as *ilehkey*.

I spent two chapters (Chapter 3 and Chapter 4) on this term because I was interested in the significance of context in the interactions. I initially collected the non-institutional data and analyzed ilehkey as a pilot study in Chapter 3 and wanted to expand my research scope to interactions at a professional cooking school and collected data there. While repeatedly watching the data at the cooking school, I found that the deictic term has a different function, which is scolding (to show a negative stance). Thus, I decided to compare and contrast use of the same deictic term in different settings.
friends to see how the deictic term organizes participants’ visible and cognitive attention on their hands, particularly during instruction activities. Looking and showing the working hands are crucial to the work participants perform together. The hands are important parts of the body in the cooking activities, when a cook makes food and shows his competence, using objects such as cooking tools and ingredients.

In the next chapter (Chapter 4), I analyze institutional interactions at the culinary school. In addition to use of the deictic term as part of instruction activity, found in interactions between friends (e.g., “do it this way,” accompanied by physical demonstration), a distinct function of the deictic term at the culinary school is to indicate the negative stance of a teacher toward young students (the students I analyze in Chapter 4 are teenagers). More specifically, the deictic term is used in scolding activities as a means for the teacher to inculcate practices and norms as a cook. By this method, the teacher not only organizes attention on participants’ hands, just like friends do in instruction, but also objects to a student’s previous action and indicates that it was performed incorrectly. This possibly arises because the teacher has not been following the moment-to-moment development of the student’s activity.  

3.1.2 Organization of Chapter 3

In the present chapter (Chapter 3), the investigation proceeds by analyzing three embodied instruction-instructed action-evaluation sequences in pedagogy which arise 1) when a student shows her understanding by performing the next relevant action to a teacher, 2) when

---

21 In Chapter 2, I compared and contrasted non-institutional and institutional interactions. Context leads to significant changes within the activity in each data set.

22 Instructions consist of a pair: the utterance of the instructions and the next action required to realize them (Mondada, 2014).
she fails to perform, and 3) when the student again attempts to understand the action. I begin with a brief overview of English deixis, followed by a discussion of Korean demonstratives and then present the data.

3.2 English Deixis

3.2.1 Definition and Functions

Deictic expressions in English are terms such as this, that, here, and there, which point out referential objects in connection with surrounding context (Hanks, 2009). They are also called “indexicals”, “shifters” or “deictics,” since they act as pointers in the context of an utterance. From the traditional point of view, the deictic indicates the speaker’s physical distance from an object at a specific moment, a concept we might call “I-here-now” (Hanks, 2009, p. 11). For instance, English demonstratives have a proximal form, this, which refers to an object close to the speaker, and distal form, that, which refers to an object that is not.

3.1.2 Egocentricity of English Deixis

Hanks (2009) points out the egocentricity of deictic categorization in English, its dependence on closeness to me, and argues that we should instead consider the relational structure between an origo (“pivot” or zero-point) and an object. The deictic reference constantly changes as the relationship between utterance and context changes (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992), raising the issue of taking into consideration actual speech contexts when analyzing language. Contexts involving deixis include time, perception (tactual, visual and auditory), and memory, as well as space (Hanks, 2009).
3.3 Korean Demonstratives

Unlike English, both the speaker’s and hearer’s physical distance play an important role in Korean demonstratives (Lee & Song, 2010). Korean demonstratives have a three-way distinction: a proximal form, and speaker- and hearer-centered distal forms. For example, *i* (this) is employed in pointing to an object closer to the speaker, *ku* (it) for an object closer to the hearer, and *ce* (that) for objects distant from both speaker and hearer. Korean demonstratives are more grammatically complicated than English ones, as they are combined with other morphemes (e.g., a nominal *kes* [thing], an adverb *lehkey* [way] and an adjective *lehata* [is]). (See Table 3.1. below different variations).23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>With Adverb</th>
<th>With Adjective</th>
<th>Noun (with nominal <em>kes</em> [thing])</th>
<th>Final-ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td><em>i</em></td>
<td><em>i-lehkey</em></td>
<td><em>i-lehata</em></td>
<td><em>i kes</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td><em>yo</em></td>
<td><em>yo-lehkey</em></td>
<td><em>yo-lehata</em></td>
<td><em>yo kes</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td><em>ku</em></td>
<td><em>ku-lehkey</em></td>
<td><em>ku-lehata</em></td>
<td><em>ku kes</em></td>
<td><em>ku-ci?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td><em>ce</em></td>
<td><em>ce-lehkey</em></td>
<td><em>ce-lehata</em></td>
<td><em>ce kes</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Korean demonstratives and their variations

23 As there are many variations in demonstratives, I colored *i* (this) related demonstratives (discussed in Chapter 3 and 4) in pink and *ku-ci* (discussed in Chapter 5) in blue. I will discuss the difference between *i* and *yo* (this) and *ilehkey* and *yolehkey* (like this) in Chapter 4. I present this table here to better illustrate the Korean demonstrative system overall. However, I will narrow my research scope and focus on particular deictic (‘like this’) terms to investigate its significance and frequency in embodied instructions. However, I would like to study other deictics in the future.
There have been a few studies on three Korean demonstratives—*i* (proximal; near speaker), *ku* (medial; near addressee), and *ce* (distal: away from speaker and addressee) – which focus on their grammatical forms and functions in naturally occurring conversation. Kim and Suh (2002) have found that *ku* (medial) and *ce* (distal) function as placeholders for a particular referent in the word-searching processes, thereby engaging a hearer in the next utterance. “Placeholder” refers to a type of demonstrative a speaker uses to hold the place of a word that is momentarily unavailable (Hayashi & Yoon, 2006). However, whereas *ku* invites hearer to identify the referent together with the speaker, *ce* does not (Kim & Suh, 2002). Yoon (2003) argues that *ku* and *ce* are used as hesitation word-search markers and placeholders for upcoming references. Building on those studies, Hayashi and Yoon (2006) have conducted a cross-linguistic study on Korean and Japanese demonstratives as “filler words” when speakers have difficulties in formulating a word, and point out that there are commonalities between the languages.

On the other hand, studies on the proximal *i*, which is central to this study, are relatively fewer than those concerning other Korean demonstratives. Kim (2012) studied the proximal deictic verb *ile-* (‘go like this’) and distal verb *kule-* (‘say like that’) in reported speech, using corpus-based analysis. While *ile-* (‘go like this’) was used by a speaker in reported speech with embodiment to animate stories within the current interactive field, *kule-* (‘say like that’) was used to reference something outside the current interactive field. Also, Yang (2007), as part of her studies of Korean demonstratives, has found that the *i* format functions to indicate a referent which is mentioned in a previous turn, and implies the speaker’s emotional closeness or familiarity. Also, it is used when the speaker tries to project a long description on a referent by him/herself. For instance, when a speaker is describing her story about having an upset stomach
from eating pepper, she uses *i* in its verb form, *ilehta* (‘do this’), while tapping her chest with her right hand.

### 3.4 Data

The materials for the present chapter are drawn from interactions between two friends in their kitchen. The goal of the activity was to teach and learn how to whisk an egg white, using a bowl and whisk. However, the participants conducted the activity in order to make food to eat together and to have fun, not to improve their competence as cooks or teachers.

There are two participants: (1) Jung (left figure in the picture from Section 3.5 transcript), playing the role of teacher, and (2) Eun (right figure in the picture from Section 3.5 transcript), playing the role of a student. The participants can see each other’s bodies over the course of the action. In terms of the sequence of the activity, participants carry out cooking together simultaneously, as each one has their own dishes and material to work with. For example, the teacher breaks down the cooking activity into small steps first, and illustrates how to do it. Then she observes moment by moment how the student is performing. The student can be continuously instructed by intense monitoring and immediate feedback from the teacher.

Concerning the position of the deictic term *ilehkey* in English (third line in the transcript), I will put it at the beginning of the turn. It would be more idiomatic in English to put the deictic term at the end of the utterance. However, in my data, the deictic term occurs near the turn

---

24 The activity sequence is different at the culinary school. At the culinary school, the students largely worked separately from the teacher. For example, the teacher demonstrates about an hour alone, and the students observe the teacher’s actions. Then next hour, the students perform alone, showing their understanding of the teacher’s actions in the previous activity, and the teacher monitors and makes comments on their actions, more like an observer. In this chapter, the main focus of this chapter is interactions between friends, institutional interactions will not be discussed.

25 This intense monitoring in one-on-one pedagogy is impossible in the culinary setting because of the number of the students being instructed.
beginning and this position within a turn is crucial in organizing participants’ attention
(Although the adverb *ilehkey* (‘like this’) can be placed in any position in natural conversation, I identified it at the turn beginning or one word away in my instruction data).  

### 3.5 Analysis on *Ilehkey* in Instruction Activity

In the present section, I examine how the attention of participants is collaboratively organized through two deictic terms, (1) the adjective *i* (‘this’), and (2) the adverb *i-lehkey* (‘this way’) as part of a sequence of instructions (Goldberg, 1975). After explaining the functions of these deictic terms, I will devote Sections 3.5.1.2, and 3.5.1.3 to analyzing the resources a skilled person uses to teach embodied skills to a novice.

In order to understand the characteristics of the demonstrative adverb *ilehkey* (‘this way’), which is the main phenomenon examined in this study, it is important to first comprehend the function of the adjective *i* (‘this’). That is because *ilehkey* (‘this way’) derives from the *i* (‘this’) morphologically, and the two are interactionally interrelated as well. *i* (‘this’) has meaning as an independent morpheme. However, it cannot stand alone. Other morphemes, such as *lehkey* (adverb) and *lehta* (verb), are agglutinated in order to complete the word and change the grammar form, or else a separate noun immediately follows, such as *i ke* (this thing).

In Section 3.5.1 below, the student fully grasps embodied instruction and shows her understanding by *doing*. The teacher demonstrates how to use her left hand with a bowl in a

---

26 My data consist of embodied activity, which includes bodies and objects. Therefore, it is important first to see objects or body before performing an action. I think the reason why the deictic occurs in or near the beginning position is that it is more efficient to indicate where to look by using the deictic term (a pointer) at the beginning of an utterance, rather that at the end or middle.

27 In Korean, when there is a space between two words, it means that they are two different words. For example, *ilehkey* (this way) is one word combining the adverb together with the morpheme *lehkye* (way). On the other hand, *i ke* (this thing) consists of two separate words and *i here is an adjective describing a noun, which is an object in my data.
particular way to tilt a bowl and beat an egg. Consider the following sequence.

3.5.1 Bowl: The Deictic Terms and Organization of Attention

Instruction: introduction of the objective of the activity

00 ➔

[The participants’ gaze] looking at the student’s hand with eggshell before instructions

01 Jun: ➔ i ke-lul (,) ce-e-ya hay-yo.

this thing-AC beat-INF-if only do-POL.

‘This (=the egg), (we) have to mix’.

02 Eun: ➔ ung.

yes.
‘Okay’. 

**Instructions: embodied demonstration**

03 Jun: ce-ul ttay= (*briefly looking at the student’s bowl and directing her body towards the student*)

beat-PRS when

‘When (you) beat (the egg),

*The teacher’s turn in Korean (line 3) continues until line 7 in Korean. For an English translation of the turn, see the third row in lines 3 and 5.

04 Eun: =ung=

yes

‘Okay’.

**Instruction: embodied demonstration (the hand gesture and deictic)**

05 Jun: → =((brings her body to the original position close to her own bowl and looks at the bowl))

i ke-lul ((tilting the bowl with the left hand)) sa- yo-lehkey

this thing-AC four-this-way

‘This (=the bowl), this way, tilt 4- ab- 45- about 45 degrees and’
Green letters indicate the teacher’s numerical description, ‘forty-five,’ and pink letters indicate the deictic term, ‘this way.’ Readers can see that the pink letters (the deictic term) are placed between the green letters (numerical descriptions).

*Yo (‘this’) is the first syllable of yo-lehkey (‘like this,’ ‘like this’) and Yo-lehkey is synonymous with i-lehkey (‘this way’), according to Naver, a Korean online dictionary source. The difference between ilehkey and yolehkey is briefly outlined in the footnotes before I move on to the main argument because I assume the two forms of the same deictic term indicate the stance of the actors, a teacher and a student, in their pedagogical relationship. To my knowledge, ilehkey (‘like this’) is used in both spoken and written discourse, whereas yolehkey is used only in spoken discourse.

---

28 http://krdic.naver.com

29 According to Naver, a Korean online dictionary source, the definition of i-lehhta (verb form) is “being like this in terms of condition, shape, and characteristics”. Compared to ilehkey, yolehkey sounds (1) more playful or (2) the speaker is disparaging the person or subject matter. An example for case (1) is “spread your arm yolehkey (‘like this’)”, and an example for case (2) is “if the product is yolehkeye (‘like this’), don’t buy it.”

Also, ilehkey and yolehkey seem to be relevant to Korean sound symbolism, or ideophonic. According to Sohn (1999), Korean has a sound symbolism, which makes human daily interaction and literature vivid and expressive by showing connotational nuance. For example, “bright” (yang) vowels such as ɑ, ɛ, ɤ and “dark” (ying) vowels such as e, u, ə work synergistically and lend different connotations. Bright vowels imply “sharpness, lightness, smallness, thinness, and quickness” whereas dark vowels evoke “darkness, heaviness, dullness, slowness, depthness, and thickness” (Sohn, 1999, p. 96). (Yolehkey seems to function as a yang vowel by adding o sound after the initial i sound).

In the current data set, interactions between friends, yolehkey was found only in the teacher’s utterance, not in the student’s. I therefore infer that yolehkey indicates the teacher’s stance on the activity and the object, which is teaching how to do deal with an object in general, and tilting the bowl in this example. The literature above appears to support my assumption. For the teacher, the task is something small, easy because she has done it before and she already has embodied skills. So, the teacher is undervaluing the level of the work and uses yolehkey from time to time instead of ilehkey. In contrast, the student only uses ilehkey, because the work is not something she can disparage, since she has no previous experiences by which to judge. The teacher employs yolehkey when she is making a small, movement/gestures that can be performed quickly; this is in keeping with the characteristics of bright vowel use.
[Participants’ gaze on the same bowl by the deictic term ‘this’]

[The teacher’s repairs (line 5)] (1) left-hand picture: tilting the bowl, (2) right-hand picture: adding the deictic “this way”]

06 \rightarrow \texttt{sa-sip-o ceng- sa-sip-o to (E tilting her bowl) (J leaning her body)}

four-ten-five ab- four-ten-five degrees

[The left picture] Teacher (T) looking at Student (S) and checking S’s understanding

[The right picture] S performing
[The sequential order of action on the right picture]

(1) S looking at her own object → (2) S tiling → (3) T looking at her tool → (4) T moving her body toward the bowel to check student’s performance

*The S’s bowl is very big and deep, so the teacher needs to lean her body in order to see the bottom of the bowl better.

07 → cengto [kiwuly-e-cwu-e-se.

about tilt-INF-give-INF-so.

3.5.1.1. The Deictic Term ‘this’ for Joint-attention on the Referential Object

The teacher introduces the goal of the activity, “beating this (=egg)” in line 1. Here, she uses the deictic term for two reasons: (1) to introduce the topic of the activity, and (2) to organize participants’ visible attention on the referential object, which is the egg in the bowl. The fact that the deictic organizes the participants’ visible attention is evidenced by the participants’ shifting gaze, and body alignment in the next turn (line 2). For instance, while the teacher utters the deictic ‘this,’ (line 1) both participants shift their visible attention from the student’s hand, holding the eggshell (line 00), to the teacher’s bowl (line 1) (see Figure 3.1 below). The teacher looks at her own bowl. This is to indicate where to look for the novice: the gaze functions like a pointer. Listening to the teacher’s deictic term, the student first moves her head toward the teacher body and looks at the teacher’s bowl so as to be ready for the next relevant activity. Indeed, the participants cooperatively, systemically orient their bodies to each other in order to build up actions. For constructing such actions, the deictic is used to organize shifts in attention toward each other’s body, and objects in the environment that are central to the activity the participants are pursuing together.
Figure 3.1 The participants’ gaze on different objects before vs. after the deictic ‘this’ in line 1 (the student’s hand)→(the teacher’s egg in the bowl)

*The sequential order in the right-hand picture: (1) T’s deictic ‘this’+T’s gaze on her own bowl, (2) S moving her head toward the teacher and, (3) S’s gaze on the teacher’s bowl.

In a similar fashion, the teacher moves her gaze to her own bowl, uttering the deictic ‘this’ at the same time (line 5 in Figure 3.2 below). The teacher proceeds with the action right after briefly looking at the novice’s bowl by directing her body towards it (line 3), so that she may better judge the student’s prior action with the bowl (line 4). This body alignment – the teacher’s leaning posture and head movement – shows the participants’ engagement in the current activity.
Figure 3.2 Teacher’s gaze shift after the deictic ‘this’

3.5.1.2 The Deictic Yolehkey ‘this way’ to Organizing Attention on the Environmentally Coupled Gesture

The deictic terms, $i$ (‘this’), and ilehkey/yolehkey (‘this way’), sometimes occur together within the participants’ utterances near the turn-beginning position, prior to any verbal description of the action (see Table 3.2 below). This has an interactional function, specifically organizing the attention of the addressee as soon as possible. In particular, ‘$i$ (‘this’), which describes an object, is followed by ilehkey (‘this way’) in my data (in the teacher’s utterance in lines 5-6 “This (=the bowl), this way, tilt 4- ab- 45- about 45 degrees,” and in the student’s utterance in line 20 “Ah, then this thing (=whisk), this way, this way, moves left and right?”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$i$ (‘this’) =object</th>
<th>ilehkey (‘like this’) =hand</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s utterance</td>
<td>“This (=the bowl),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lines 5-6)</td>
<td>this way</td>
<td></td>
<td>tilt 4- ab- 45- about 45 degrees”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s utterance</td>
<td>“this thing (=whisk),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(line 20)</td>
<td>this way, this way,</td>
<td></td>
<td>moves left and right?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 $i$ followed by ilehkey near the turn-beginning position and the sentence
structure

As a result, they are very efficient mechanisms for organizing participants’ visual attention directing it toward the materials to which instructions apply. That is because participants need to look at the target object first before they act on it with their hands; both terms are indexical to materials and bodies in the local environments. Yet, whereas *i* is used to refer and point to an object in the immediate environment together with use of the gaze, *ilehkey* is used in combination with gestures. More specifically, *ilehkey* is to show “how” to position the hand in a particular manner, either with a tool or in the air.

The claim that the deictic adverb *ilehkey* organizes the attention of participants on the speaker’s hand is supported by the teacher’s self-repairs near the beginning of the turn (see the deictic adverb *yolehkey* in Figure 3.3 below, and lines 5-6. In the Figure, green letters indicate the teacher’s numerical description, “forty-five,” and pink letters indicate the deictic term, “this way”. Readers can thus see that the pink letters [the deictic term] are situated between the green letters [numerical descriptions]).

*Yo (this) is the first the first syllable of yo-lehkey. Yolehkey is equivalent to ilehkey (this way). Whereas ilhekey is used in the spoken and written discourse, yolehkey is used only in the spoken discourse*
The teacher’s first change (“four-this way”) involves an intentional fine-tuning process to organize the focus of attention by adding the deictic demonstrative at the beginning of the turn. The deictic term points toward the speaker’s hand holding a bowl in the local environment. “This way” encompasses the referential object, the teacher’s hand working with the bowl, that the participants are working on and the speech event of instruction (Hanks, 1992). For
instance, the left hand is most crucial to carrying out the small task of tilting the bowl about forty-five degrees. Thus, the teacher uses the deictic expression at the beginning of the turn to single out a referential object (the teacher’s hand and bowl) as a focus of attention from a complex structure consisting of a kitchen and ingredients (Hanks, 1992). She lets her recipient know that what is coming up is important, and she should look at her hand in particular.

**Instruction: the gesture and deictic term**

05 Jun:  i ke-lul (tilting the bowl with the left hand) sa- yo-lehkey, this thing-AC four-this-way

‘This, this way tilt 4- ab- 45- about 45 degrees and.’

**45 degrees and the student’s performance during the teacher’s turn**

06 sa-sip-o ceng- sa-sip-o to ((E tilting her bowl))((J leaning))

four-ten-five ab- four-ten-five degrees

[The student's performance during the teacher's turn]

*The sequential order in the student’s performance: (1) S’s gaze on her own bowl (2)S’s performance (3) T’s gaze on the S’s hand with the bowl (4) The T’s leaning body toward the S’ bowl

**The verbal prompt of action**
Building on the teacher’s instruction, the student attempts to perform the requested action during the teacher’s turn (line 6) and reuses the same deictic in her own turn (line 8). The teacher has given the student the information “forty-five degrees,” but has not verbally prompted a specific action yet (line 6). This demonstrates that in such an interaction, the proper understanding of the other’s turn requires attention to both speech and to the embodied activity being performed and indicated by the deictic expression.

The addressee does this not only while listening to the teacher’s language, but also while paying attention to the teacher’s hand. Although the student has both her hands inside the bowl prior to instruction, as soon as she hears the complete information, she re-positions her hands outside the bowl to hold it like the teacher (see Figure 3.4 below).
Figure 3.4 Looking at the teacher’s hand and listening to the teacher’s language

Note that the student’s utterance is grammatically incomplete, and contains neither subject nor verb; it is a single adverb (line 8). How could the teacher interpret the utterance and conduct the next relevant action? Together with the enactment (which is the student’s embodied version of understanding) and a rising intonation at the end, the deictic is rich enough to function as a request for evaluation and a question seeking confirmation from an epistemic authority, who knows how to hold and use a bowl (Figure 3.5 below). In using the deictic expression, the student is also requesting that the teacher to pay attention to her performing hand and tell her how she is doing.
Notice that the teacher employs three distinct ways of telling the student how the bowl should be positioned in her instruction (lines 5-7, Figure 3.6 below). The first is through language -- the deictic “this thing” and “this way,” as well as the numerical description "forty-five," which functions more or less like a symbol. The second method is the actual physical demonstration of a “tilting” hand. The third one is provided by the structure of a local environment, such as the bowl and the participant’s bodies orienting towards each other. Together they constitute an integrated use of language structure and embodied phenomena to demonstrate to a newcomer crucial information about an activity's progression. All of these semiotic resources mutually support each other.
3.5.2 Whisk: a Shifting Gaze and Gestures in the Air in the Corrective Sequence

Here, I will investigate how both instruction and understanding are organized through dynamic changes to the relevant focus of attention within a field of action. Gesture plays a crucial role in this process. In Section 3.5.2.1, a student fails to understand the instructions provided, inducing a corrective intervention by the teacher. This correction demands that the teacher use a particular way of seeing the student’s body and the relevant materials present in the physical environment. To do this, the instructor deploys a shifting gaze that touches on multiple fields (her own hand, the other’s hand and the material that she is working with), her use of
gestures, characteristic grammar and interpretation of how the student responds in the subsequent sequence.

3.5.2.1 A Shifting Gaze

The following sequence begins with the teacher’s embodied demonstration, which uses the deictic expression accompanied by a gesture showing how to use a whisk. However, looking at the student, the instructor realizes that the student is holding the whisk the wrong way and is using the wrong part of her body.

The teacher’s embodied demonstration

06 Jun:   ((handing a whisk to Eun))

06 Jun:   (0.3) i-lehkey hay-se, (gesture in the air

this-way do-and so,

‘This way, do (it) and,’
07

with a fork)) sonmok-ul iyong-hay-se-yo,

terminals use-do-and so-POL,

‘Use (your) wrist and,’

The student’s turn: “Oops! It’s wrong! 😅”

08 Eun:  ((Eun mixing)) i-lehkey i-lehkey ha-la-kwu?

this-way this-way do-IM-QT?

‘This way, this way, (You tell me to) do?

[Gaze directed at the teacher’s own hand]  [Gaze directed at the student’s face]

[Like this, like this]

[Gaze directed at the student’s hand]
At the beginning of the turn, along with the verbal instruction for the right wrist gesture (line 7), the teacher directs her gaze to her own right hand while demonstrating with a whisk (Figure 3.7 below). By doing so, she proposes that “the gesture is something to look at” (Streeck, 2009, p. 88) as an explicit focus for her interlocutor's attention which offers visual access to the event. Then, upon turn completion, the teacher withdraws her gaze from her hand, looks instead at the addressee’s face to verify the recipient’s understanding, and invites her into the participation framework. When the student’s gesture is sequenced as the next action, the instructor shifts her gaze to the student’s hand for evaluation (line 8).³⁰

³⁰ This pattern is repeated in other turns (lines 9 and 11) when the teacher quotes the other person's action from the previous turn as well.
Notice that the teacher watches the student’s hand rather than her whole body. This mechanism of interpretative seeing creates the framework for what the participants do next. In other words, what the teacher has seen prompts her next action. As a competent cook, she is able to recognize what is wrong with how this student is performing the activity and undertake corrective action. Consider the following sequence.

The corrective sequence, grammar, and bodily quoting

The student’s turn: “Oops! It’s wrong! 😅”

08 Eun:  
(Eun mixing) i-lehkey i-lehkey ha-la-kwu?

this-way this-way do-IM-QT?

‘This way, this way, (you tell me to) do?’

The corrective sequence: bodily quoting the incorrect way

09 Jun:  
enni-nun (gesture) i-lehkey i-lehkey ha-canh-ayo cikum.

sister-NM this-way this-way do-COMM-POL now.

‘You, this way this way, (you) see (you) do (it) now.’

[Quoting the student’s previous gesture]

10 Eun:  
ung.
yes.

‘Yes,’

11 Jun: (highlighting her arm) cenchey-lul iyongha-canh-ayo,

total-AC use-COMM-POL,

‘You see (you) use the whole (arm)’

12 Eun: ung.

yes.

‘Yes.’

The claim that the teacher closely monitors the student’s hand and arm is supported by the sentence-final suffix canha (“you see” or “you know”) (Sohn, 2010) in the speaker’s turn (lines 9 and 11 in the data above). This grammatical form communicates that the speaker is certain of the information being conveyed and expects agreement or alignment from the recipient (Kawanishi & Sohn, 1993). The teacher is socially recognized as having greater expertise in this area. Therefore, she is in a position of epistemic authority (K+) with respect to the information
domain of cooking, whereas the student is in a K- (less knowledgeable) position (Heritage, 2013). Therefore, the instructor is in a position to evaluate the correctness of actions performed by the student. In response to the teacher’s particle conveying her epistemic supremacy, the student demonstrates that she is allowing herself to be corrected by not challenging the teacher’s stance. This is manifest in part through the student’s “go ahead” responses, which are an acknowledgement of the teacher’s feedback (lines 10 and 12), and through the deictic expression spoken with a rising intonation, which serves as a confirmation question regarding her corrected performance (line 15).

![Figure 3.8 The teacher and student’s grammar](image)

Nevertheless, the student’s acknowledgement (lines 10 and 12) is only a claim that she sees and recognizes the teacher’s hand in the air; it does not mean she is able to perform the action, because she has not demonstrated her understanding through her own version of embodied performance yet. It simply indicates that she is paying attention to the teacher’s embodied demonstration, and understands its significance. Eun’s claim is one of recognition regarding the erroneous use of her body in previous turns. By using acknowledgement tokens, she claims to see the teacher’s body and understand how she herself was performing in the
previous turn so that the participants can carry out the next relevant sub-activity, “learning a correct way” (line 13).

In addition, the student’s confirmation question (lines 8 and 15) shows that the student assumes the teacher is looking at “her hand” rather than the other parts of her body (see Figure 3.9 below), yet the sentence lacks a noun describing any part of the body. In fact, the student only utters “(You tell me to) do this way this way?” (line 8) and “this way?” (line 15). The prior sequence has created a framework in which the importance of the hand is mutually understood. Even if the student says nothing about which part the teacher needs to look at, there is a mutual assumption that the teacher will look at the student’s hand.

Q and A
Q: Oh, no! Why there is no noun describing a body?
A: It’s okay! Participants have a mutual assumption that the teacher will look at the student’s hand!

Note that the teacher also assumes the student is paying attention specifically to the teacher’s hand. Based on this assumption, the teacher extracts the student's problematic movements as something to be focused on in isolation, highlighting them as a starting point for correction of the student’s bodily performance (lines 9 and 11). She narrates a story which shows
*why* she is telling a story, *what* the student has done (line 9), at *this* moment, and *why* it is wrong (line 11) in multi-unit turns (Sidnell, 2010). Because the teacher constructs a story structure, animates a protagonist, and creates contrast, her story may be considered a minimal narrative (Goffman, 1981).

![Image of a teacher and student demonstrating the wrong way to hold a fork](image)

**Figure 3.10** The teacher monitoring the student’s hand (left), and illustrating how not to hold the fork and use her body (right)

Within the narrative, the skilled person quotes the other’s action[^31] (line 9). As soon as the teacher perceives what the student is doing wrong (line 8, the left picture in Figure 3.10 above), she switches how she holds the whisk, and uses her wrist (line 9, the right picture in Figure 3.10 above). The gesture in line 9, an enactment of the student’s movement in the previous turn, is a quoted gesture. Quoting a student’s words and body movement is a teaching strategy that teachers frequently employ (Keevallik, 2010). Quotation of the other typically provokes active evaluation and commentary on what is being quoted (Volosinov, 1986). The

[^31]: Not only the teacher, but the student also quotes the embodiment of the other. For instance, in line 8, the student uses a quotative *ko* ending to enact the prior addressee and principal character's gesture.
teacher is selecting what information to give next based on what she has seen.

09 Jun: → enni-nun (*gesture*) i-lehkey i-lehkey ha-canh-ayo cikum.

sister-NM this-way this-way do-COMM-POL now.

‘You see you do (it) this way this way now.’

![The teacher performing in the incorrect way]

**Figure 3.11 The teacher performing the gesture of the student within the narrative**

Whose gesture is represented in line 9 (Figure 3.11)? The hand is that of the teacher, the current performer or storyteller (Goodwin, 2007b). However, she is not performing just anyone’s gesture, but that of the co-present student who is the prior addressee and the protagonist of the teacher’s story (Goffman, 1981). In doing so, the teller shows exactly what happened, and claims his or her epistemic access to the event is superior to that of someone who only witnessed or heard about it (Sidnell, 2006; Keevallik, 2010). As a storyteller, the teacher is entitled to display the epistemic grounds the report is based on (Sidnell, 2010). The gesture provides evidence of the problem observed (Keevallik, 2010). By replaying the problematic movement of
performers in the previous turn, the teacher makes the past movement observable so that the student may see and correct it (Keevallik, 2010).

3.5.2.2 *Ilehkey* with Gestures in the Air

![Diagram showing 'hacanhayo cikum' (do now) and 'incorrect way'](image)

**Figure 3.12 The gesture in the air in front of the student’s face**

We may also note that the teacher performs the gesture the wrong way in the air, right in front of the student’s face, to make it prominent, whereas Eun performs her mixing in the actual bowl (Figure 3.12 above); this constitutes one way for either the student or teacher to draw attention to a particular part of the body. This performance is reinforced by the deictic *ilehkey*

---

32 Teachers frequently quote students’ bodies in order to contrast correct and incorrect performances (Keevallik, 2013). In dance class, as students’ body movements are momentary and fleeting, a teacher recreates the perished movement of a student's prior turn by bodily quotation of the student's performance. The teacher performs bodily quoting correction as soon as she identifies the student's problematic area, so that she can connect the sequence to her pedagogical purpose. Decomposition, highlighting and exaggeration are common techniques that teachers use. Similar to the examples from dance class, Jung’s corrective sequence immediately follows the student’s incorrect performance and was exaggerated and decomposed as a focused activity so that the student could realize what she was doing wrong and how she could improve her body posture.
as a focus of attention indicating the movement (line 9). By doing this, the teacher is explicitly
telling her addressee that the hand is the problematic area, and that the wrist gesture is the
explicit focus of the interaction this time. In other words, Eun is asked to gaze at Jung’s hand,
which is holding a whisk the wrong way and using the wrong part of the body to beat the eggs.
As her next turn, the student’s acknowledgement (line 10) follows.

Jung then begins to incorporate decomposition, highlighting, and exaggeration into her
instruction – techniques which, according to Keevallik (2013), are commonly used in teaching.
Consider the following sequence.

10 Eun:      ung.
        yes.
       ‘Yes.’

Quoting the incorrect performance

11 Jun:  → ((highlighting her arm)) cenchey-lul iyongha-canh-ayo,
entire-AC use-COMM-POL,
   ‘(You) see (you) use the whole (arm)’

[Highlighting her own arm with the left hand] A template body for teaching
Notice that the teacher highlights her own right arm using her left hand when adding an increment (line 11 in the data above). She is using her own body as a template for the other person’s, even if the body that she is describing is present and available right next to her. She can offer a better demonstration by pointing toward her own arm to illustrate the formal organization of a process the participants are looking at. Also, she is able to reproduce the problematic aspects of the gesture herself, whereas she cannot move the student's muscles, even if she can point to the student's body.

Having mobilized the student’s acknowledgment (line 12), a claim of recognition, the teacher moves on to the next action. She performs the gestures that the student is supposed to make: moving the hand and holding a whisk (lines 13-14). By performing the different gestures consecutively, Jung dramatically and visibly compares the correct and the incorrect ways to execute them. The instruction involves explicit comparisons between the wrong way and the right way to perform. This is accomplished not just through talk, but in terms of embodied activity, which is, of course, crucial, since the way the arm is actually used is central to any successful performance of the activity. In this manner, the instructor offers the student feedback regarding how and why the way she is holding the whisk is wrong. After showing how she is
using the wrong part of her body, the teacher instructs the student on how to correct her form.

3.5.3 Transformation: Ilehkey as Tying to Action in a Prior Turn: Reusing and Transforming Earlier Actions

In Sections 3.5.1, and 3.5.2, we have examined 1) how a teacher and student complete an activity, relying mainly upon three semiotic resources as a multimodal package: language (the deictic term ilehkey in particular), gesture and material objects, and 2) how instruction and understanding are organized by changing the focus of attention (the actor’s own hand, as well as the other’s hand and face).

Here, I will illustrate how participants build up actions by reusing and transforming each other's previous utterances and actions into a new action. By implementing previously referenced resources, including the deictic ilehkey (language), gestures, and the local environment, the participants create a sense of continuity between different speakers’ actions. The deictic in particular is vital to this process because it links the current utterance to a prior one (Sidnell, 2010).³³

In Section 3.5.3.1, a student attempts to achieve understanding through a series of questions, rather than simply following the teacher's directives as before. This provides an opportunity for a teacher to calibrate what is happening through embodied demonstration and pedagogy. The goal of following sequence is to learn how to release the tension in the participants’ right hand. They actually shake their respective hands in the air without a whisk to

³³ According to Sacks, tying structures refer to “tying structures by utterance to utterance. e.g., pairs of utterances” (1992, p. 540). The tying structures are crucial, when organizing conversations by topics, and checking out the other’s understanding.
experience the state of relaxation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Jun:</td>
<td>‘Relax the tension and (move) in this way, this way,’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Eun:</td>
<td>‘Ah, (You tell me to) just do this way this way this way?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jun:</td>
<td>‘Yes.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Eun:</td>
<td>‘Ah, then this thing (=whisk) moves left and right this way, this way?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22 Jun:</td>
<td>‘No, do this way and think that (you) draw this oval like this.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Eun:</td>
<td>(moving)) This way this way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jun:</td>
<td>‘Yes.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.13 Collaborative actions provided by others and the tying deictic

3.5.3.1 The Deictic *Ilehkey* as a “Bridge” between Participants

Utterances involve the cooperation of two socially organized parties: an addressor and addressee. In order to connect these two different entities, an orientation towards language as social action is crucial. The demonstrative *this way* draws attention to phenomena outside the stream of speech and fills the gap left by the missing word. It typically locates or points toward a part of the speaker’s body, thus creating “a bridge thrown between myself and my addressee,” as Volosinov once wrote (Volosinov, 1986, p. 86). The demonstrative *ilehkey* (‘this way’) “bridges” the body of the addressee and that of the speaker, directing the focus of the addressee’s attention towards the physical content of the communicative interaction.

Throughout the sequence, neither conversant makes a direct reference to a hand, but the absence of the focal lexical icon does not inhibit the flow of interaction to the next relevant activity. By using a combination of "this way" and gesture (lines 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23) as a substitute for directly referencing the body [with the exception of "yes" (line 19), and "no" (line
24)(see Figure 3.13 above) the teacher and student create a shared resource of non-speech knowledge which can then be reused and modified as needed in ensuing interaction to communicate each speaker’s level of understanding.

This embodied knowledge is initially created when the teacher uses *ilehkey* in conversation to signal to the listener that she should shift her attention from the teacher’s speech-based communication to her physically-based communication. Because it functions as a transition in an interaction from speech to gesture, *ilehkey* may be identified as a deictic term, or a word which has not only a grammatical value, but also locates relevant physical entities beyond the stream of speech.

Deictics not only organize the focus of attention, as argued in Sections 3.5.1, and 3.5.2, but also tie a previous action of the interlocutor to the current action of the speaker (see Figure 3.14 below). In this example, after receiving “this way” and its accompanying action from the teacher as a common resource, Eun, the student, performs *ilehkey* and the gesture that Jung, the teacher, has demonstrated in a previous turn (line 17), and looks to Jung for an evaluation of her performance. Jung negates Eun’s action from a prior turn with the word “no,” and then transforms Eun’s action into her own correct action, implying that the student’s performance was incorrect (lines 21-22).
By communicating through a combination of the different semiotic materials provided by each participant, especially deictic terms and visual display, participants are able to co-construct actions within their turns (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013). Thus, when the lexical item of the focal referent is absent, the actors cooperatively carry out an activity when reusing the demonstrative and organizing their attention.

The student’s confirmation question and performing in the correct way ☺

18 Eun:→ ah, kunyang ((Eun shaking her hand)) i-lehkey i-lehkey i-lehkey ha-la-ko?

CST, just this-way this-way this-way do-QT?

‘Ah, just, this way this way this way, (You tell me to) do?’
The student's realization of how to relax the tension of her wrist by shaking her hand

The teacher's confirmation

19 Jun: n ey.
yes: POL
‘Yes.’

The student's question: applying her knowledge to a new field

20 Eun: → ah, kulem i key ((drawing a line with a whisk))i-lehkey i-lehkey
CST, then this thing this-way this-way
w-ass-ta-ka- ss-da hanunkeya?
come-PST-DC-go-PST-DC Do-RL-thing-INT
‘Ah, then this thing (=whisk), this way, this way, moves left and right?’
3.5.3.2 Decomposition, Reuse and Transformation of Earlier Actions

In line 20 and Figure 3.14 above, the student transforms the substrate provided by the teacher (the teacher’s positive assessment in line 19) (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013). The actor is showing her understanding of the other’s action by performing the next relevant action (Heritage, 1984a). The student decomposes what the teacher has already said and done (the deictic with the gesture of relaxing her hand in the air) using the relevant materials in the surrounding environment (here, a whisk and bowl). She then reuses and transforms them in lines 18 and 20, first by adding an interrogative with a rising intonation at the end and a state of token *Ah* (‘oh’) to the deictic, and then adding virtual horizontal lines drawn with her whisk on the bowl to the gesture.

The student’s change-of-state token (Heritage, 1984a) *Ah* in lines 18 and 20 (oh in English) at the beginning of the turn indicates the student’s understanding of the subject matter, as well as the teacher’s confirmation. According to Heritage (1984a), *oh* functions as a change of state token to signal to the speaker that the talk has led to a new change in the speaker’s knowledge. Before the particle *oh*, the recipient is ignorant of the subject matter in contrast to the speaker. However, after the particle is used, the recipient confirms the interlocutor’s prior turn and continues the sequence with a subsequent inquiry.

She applies her knowledge (relaxing her hand in the air) from the previous turn to the new field using the whisk and bowl (line 20). She has shifted her attention from her wrist to the
end of the whisk so that she can decompose the movement and observe the virtual shape (vertical lines) she is making. She has moved on from the description of the action to the effect of the action on the whisk. From there, she can perceive the effect of the whisk on the egg.

Through this performance, the learner also provides a candidate gesture and a transformed question using the deictic ilehkey and a rising intonation at the end. The rising intonation at the end then prompts the teacher to respond. Eun presents an enacted version of her understanding of what the instructor has told her to do. Once again, this process integrates language structure, a deictic term and the prosodic or linguistic markers of uncertainty with an embodied demonstration. By doing so, she is now in a position to await an assessment of her understanding from the instructor.

The teacher’s calibration: gesture in the air

21 Jun: → ani-yo. i-lehkey ha-ko ((drawing an oval with fingers)) yo-lehkey
no-POL. this-way do-and this-way

‘no, this way (you) do (it) and this way

[The teacher correcting the student’s line to an oval in the air] ➔ The teacher’s calibration of the

---

34 For the difference between ilehkey and yolehkey, see p. 36.
student’s previous action

22 ((drawing an oval)) yo-len tawan-ul mantu-n-ta-ko sayngkakha-ko.

This oval-AC Make-RL-DC-QT think-and
think that (you) draw this oval like this’.

The student’s performance in the correct way

23 Eun: ((moving)) i-lehkey i-lehkey?

this-way this-way?

‘This way, this way?’

24 Jun: ney.

yes: POL

‘Yes.’

Similarly, answering the student’s question provides an opportunity for the teacher to reshape the student’s utterance and to calibrate the gesture just made by the student (lines 21-22 and Figure 3.15 below). The teacher incorporates the student’s action into a visible embodied correction (Goodwin, 2010; Goodwin & Goodwin 2013). Based on the virtual line drawn by the novice with a whisk, the teacher uses her index finger to make an oval so that the student can pay attention to the difference in shape. The calibration is only possible because they are engaged in a collaborative action together.

The actions of both the teacher and the student are “co-operative in that they are built by performing operations on materials provided by another” (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013, p. 5). The mutual understanding is achieved gradually by successively layering each party’s actions, which
encompasses the deictic *ilehkey* and pointing gesture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Jung (the teacher)</th>
<th>Eun (the student)</th>
<th>Jung (the teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Shaking hand in the air</td>
<td>Drawing virtual lines on the bowl</td>
<td>Drawing an oval in the air with her index finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>To learn relaxation of the wrist</td>
<td>To apply her knowledge (relaxation of the wrist) to the movement of the whisk and its effect on the egg</td>
<td>To correct Eun’s understanding and to teach her the correct way the whisk should move (an oval instead of a line)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.15 Transformations of the action provided by the other
3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to provide an interactive analysis of the Korean demonstrative, ilehkey (this way). Like all deictics, this term is deeply contextual. I have tried to demonstrate how it is organized with reference to emerging context in particular. More specifically, this chapter examines how ilehkey coordinates and directs attention to both the bodies of participants and the world they are working in. The subject material under examination in this case is cooking pedagogy, which requires systematically changing the focus between embodied action and any objects the participants are working with. It thus provides a rich site for investigating how ilehkey is organized with reference to the changing contextual configurations in which it occurs and simultaneously helps to structure.

Central to this idea is the way in which the participants' actions continually built upon what the other interlocutor had already constructed. Thus, it is not appropriate to examine utterances in isolation, but rather critical to look at how each consecutive action demonstrated an understanding of the prior one by performing systemic operations on the materials just produced by the other party. Ilehkey plays a pivotal role in this kind of interaction. First, the demonstrative functions to organize the joint attention of participants by pointing toward an object in the environment. Gesture and objects are the explicit focus of the seeing activity. Second, within the interactive framework, the participants shift their gaze to a range of phenomena, including objects in the environment as well as each other, in order to constitute and re-organize the shared perceptual world required to carry out the activities they are pursuing. They deploy multimodal resources such as prosody and gesture, which mutually elaborate each other with speech in the course of action.
Here I have demonstrated how the analysis of the deictic term might be undertaken within a framework that is not restricted to the stream of speech, but instead looks at details of how it emerges from, and reconstitutes the specific changing contextual configurations of bodies, objects and language. Building a skill requires that participants appropriately understand each other's actions, publicly demonstrate this understanding to each other, and can calibrate the novice’s emerging understanding. This phenomenon is visible when the skilled cook transfers embodied skills to a novice; as they carry out the activity, the participants build actions based on each other’s expression of *ilehkey* (‘this way’), and gesture.
CHAPTER 4

THE USE OF DEMONSTRATIVE ILHEKEY (‘LIKE THIS’)

IN SCOLDING ACTIVITY IN EVALUATION SEQUENCE

4.1 Introduction

I have demonstrated how the particular deictic term ilehkey (‘like this,’ ‘this way’) was used in organizing participants’ attention, both that of the teacher and the student, throughout instruction activity in Chapter 3. For example, during embodied demonstration, the teacher utters ‘like this’ near the turn beginning, followed by description of the action. By looking at the object while saying ‘like this,’ the teacher implies that the working hand is the explicit focus of attention. In similar fashion, the student responds to show her understanding by performance, while saying ‘like this’ and gazing at her own hand. The student is drawing the teacher’s attention to her working hand by using the deictic term and gaze. These patterns were found across both interactions in both settings, the non-institutional and institutional environments.

4.2 Honnayki (scolding) Activity

Another sequential environment where I found instances of ilehkey (‘like this’/’this way’) is what is known as a Honnayki activity. This activity was found only in data from the culinary school, not the interactions between friends described in Chapter 3. Honnayki refers to “a genre

35 This seems to be related to the age and social relationships of the participants in these two contexts. Most of the students at the culinary school were younger than the teacher. The students I am analyzing in the present chapter are
of scolding in which a younger person is justifiably shamed for her past conduct by an older one in a repetitive, affectively intensified way” (Lo & Fung, 2011, p.176). By shaming the younger person, the older person exercises their authority to instruct in the domain of social norms. The shaming can concern an event in the past, the present, or even a hypothetical situation (Fung, 1999; Fung & Chen 2001; Lo & Fung, 2011). When an older person makes a negative assessment of a younger person’s misconduct, the latter must first acknowledge his or her misconduct, and then differentiate the rhetorical questions from the real question, which requires an answer (Lo & Fung, 2011).

Here, I will show how a teacher transmits the norms involved in being a cook through a process of assessment by shaming the student via mild scolding. In this case, a young student fails to follow the instructions or institutional norms explicitly and implicitly provided to him. These involve cutting an ingredient into the right size pieces and keeping the kitchen clean. The student’s mistakes induce a corrective intervention on the part of the teacher. This correction requires first that the teacher use a particular way of seeing both the student’s body and the relevant materials present in the physical environment; and second, that the teacher recognizes the student’s performance as inappropriate, something she then expresses in a particular way.

In the present chapter, I will show two examples where the teenager students fail to

---

teenagers. She is qualified to teach lessons and even scold them when the student is making a mistake as a teacher and older person in the relationships. The sentence ending also shows the relationships. The teacher uses an intimate ending from in addressing these students whereas the young students use a polite form.

In contrast, the relationships between the student and teacher in Chapter 3 (interaction between friends) are more complicated. The student in Chapter 3 (interaction between friends) was older than the instructor. The student is few years ahead of the teacher in the graduate program as well. Although the teacher, even in a non-institutional setting, has authority to verbally correct the student’s mistakes as they carry out the cooking activity, she is not allowed to shame a person who is older than she according to Korean cultural norms. In Korea, in any context, a younger person is supposed to show respect to the older person. Because of the age difference and the social relationships between the two, the teacher always used a polite ending form in her utterances whereas the student used an intimate ending.
follow the instructions as given in a prior sequence; the teacher repositions herself in the interactional space, identifies the lapse and scolds the student. Since there is a time gap between the teacher’s demonstration as a group, and her individual feedback, she later sees the student’s dish and realizes that something went wrong in a prior step of which the objects are the remaining evidence.

As part of the evaluation activity, the teacher shows and indicates that what the student has done in the previous turn is problematic. To render this negative assessment of the student’s conduct, the teacher uses language, in particular the deictic term ilehkey (‘like this’/ ‘this way’) and grammar (e.g., why question, and negation), while mobilizing other multimodal resources such as gesture, prosody36, and tapping sound as well as the material artifacts available (see Figure 4.1 below to see the structure of the teacher’s scolding). I show the figure before the actual analysis to emphasize that there is a repetitive system in the teacher’s action.

---

36 In my cooking data, I observed that teachers frequently indicate a negative stance towards the student and the food through prosody (e.g., lengthened vowel, increased volume, and intonation at the end of an utterance) and other embodied displays (e.g. frowning face, and touching a student’s hand cooking in a wrong way). While prosody is a crucial component of human interaction, I am not going to investigate it systematically in this dissertation because it is not the main focus of this project. For a future project. I would, however, like to pay close attention to it.
Table 4.1 Structure of the teacher’s scolding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>Referential object</th>
<th>Picture frame</th>
<th>Attention-getting device/Summoning</th>
<th>Deictic term</th>
<th>Characterization of the objects</th>
<th>Question/negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pine nuts on a plate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>((showing the object)) ilehkey (‘like this’)</td>
<td>sticky</td>
<td>did you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dirty kitchen table</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Tapping sound -Pointing gesture</td>
<td>ilehkey (‘like this’)</td>
<td>if (you) work, putting (things) dirty</td>
<td>not okay!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student’s blank face</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now (attention-getting device)</td>
<td>ilehkey (‘like this’)</td>
<td>to day-dream/absent-minded/blank</td>
<td>is this time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Structure of the teacher’s scolding

4.3 Analysis of *Ilehkey* in Scolding Activity in Evaluation Sequence

In 4.3.1, the teacher makes an assessment of the student’s prior action: the task of
chopping the nuts into tiny pieces like powder. Because pine nuts are oilier than other type of nuts, they get sticky when chopped. Because of this characteristic, a cook has to master a chopping technique for this ingredient that involves a paper/kitchen towel. After providing the embodied instructions and before the student attempts to execute the action demonstrated therein, the teacher sees a problem with the pine nuts, evidence that student has made a mistake, and interrupts the flow. Then she makes a negative assessment of the student’s prior action. I will first analyze the teacher’s embodied instruction. Then I will look at (1) the teacher’s body, and (2) the language as multimodal package.

4.3.1 Pine Nuts

T’s embodied demonstration: how to spread the nut powder on the snack

*The teacher’s turn (line 1-a) in Korean continues until 1-c. For an English translation of the turn, see the third row of line 1-a.

1-a T: ((leaning her body)) ku-len taum-ey

   it-way next-at

‘After (doing) that, you spread the nut powder in a straight line, right?’

1-b  ((pointing on the nut)) cas kalwu han ((line drawing)) panghyang-ulo

   nut power one   direction-DR
Figure 4.1 The teacher’s gestures in Line 1-b: pointing and drawing a hypothetical line on the snack (The left picture: T saying “cas” (nut), the right picture: T saying “panghyang” (direction))

Figure 4.2 Snack with the pine nut powder garnish, and its position on the snack.

*The purple arrow represents the index finger gesture made by the teacher at the beginning of the turn.

1-c  ppwuli-e-cwu-e-ya toy-keyss-cyo:

spread- give-INF-if only do become-will/may-COMM-POL

2 S: ney.

yes
‘Yes.’

The teacher re-positioning herself in the interaction space

3-1 T: ((T moving to the other side of the student))

((Student shaking the plate))

3-2 [The teacher gazing at the student’s hand before her turn]

The teacher’s evaluation

*The teacher’s turn (line 3-3) in Korean continues until line 4. For an English translation, see the third row of 3-3.
3-3 T: cas kalwu cal hay-ss- *(leaning her body to the student’s plate and holding it)*

pine nut power well do-PST-

‘Did you mince the pine nuts - into really tiny pieces?’

[T’s body alignment] T leaning her body to the plate and holding the bowl

3-4 kop-key cal taci-ess-eyo?

delicate-so well mince-PST-POL

3-5 T: *(the teacher shaking the plate)*
[T shaking and looking at the object]

Negative assessment on the student's action in a prior action

→ 4 T: way:: ilehkey ttekcikey taci-ess-e::,

why this-way sticky mince-PST-INT

‘Like this, Why did you mince (the nuts), all sticky like rice cake? = The powder sticks together as a big chunk?’
5 T: ung;,

yes

‘Huh?’

((T starts mincing the student’s nuts using a kitchen towel))

4.3.1.1 Teacher’s Instruction as a Directive

The sequence begins with the teacher’s directive: “spread the pine nut powder in a straight line on the snack, as a garnish” (line 1). The teacher’s instruction is accompanied by concurrent pointing gestures in the air at the beginning of the turn (Figures 4.1 and 4.2 above). These pointing gestures within the teacher’s turn form a series with two different functions. First, at the turn-beginning, by pointing at the nuts, while saying “nuts”, the teacher introduces the topic of the activity, lets her recipient know the focus of visible attention, and locates the particular area of concern on the tiny snack (about 2cm x 5cm x 0.3cm). The teacher’s pointing functions as a departure for constructing the demonstrating activity (from the teacher’s perspective), and the watching activity (from the student’s perspective). Second, by moving her index finger and transforming the pointing into an imaginary line, she explicitly shows what the student has to do as a next action: “spreading,” and how he has to perform it: “in a straight line” (line 1-b).

The teacher verbally utters the phrase “straight line” with the accompanying gesture in line 1-b. Thus here, the teacher’s talk and gesture mutually complete each other. This is to let the
novice know the focus of attention and how to conduct the next relevant action for achieving the goal of the interaction: to place the garnish using the specific amount (ten pine nuts), size (powder), shape (in a straight line) as instructed in the cookbook and test rules.

The teacher’s shifting gaze within a turn is another interesting phenomenon within the embodied instruction activity. She first looks at the pine nuts at the turn beginning. She then looks at the student during the “straight line” phrase in the middle of the sentence. This shift of gaze from the object to the student’s face is to verify the student’s understanding, and to let the recipient know that it is now his turn to manifest comprehension.  

### 4.3.1.2 Teacher’s Scrutiny of the Object and Her Body

Note that the teacher first leans her body toward the nut plate that the student is holding (line 3 and Figure 4.3 below), before expressing her evaluation (line 4). She gazes at it from a distance at the turn’s beginning, positioning herself closer to the object as turn progresses (line 3). She even takes the plate from the student at the turn-ending position, and shakes it back and forth to see the powder better. She is able to better check the behavior of the powder by moving her body and shaking the result of the student’s prior action with her hand. As the teacher shakes the plate, the nuts spread out. Indeed, her moving body exhibits engagement with a material artifact in the world as part of the organization of human cognition (Goodwin, 2010).

---

37 The teacher’s directive ends with *ci-yo*: a combination made up of a committal *ci* and polite *yo*, which is similar to a tag question in English. The sentence ending elicits the student’s minimal response and helps the pair move on to the next action cooperatively, like a continuer (The phenomena relevant to the tag question are addressed in the next chapter, so I will minimize their discussion here to preserve the focus of this analysis).
Figure 4.3 The teacher’s engagement in the evaluation activity as displayed by her body.

Teacher’s assessment as a multimodal package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential object</th>
<th>Attention-getting device</th>
<th>Deictic term</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sticky pine nuts</td>
<td>Why</td>
<td><em>ilehkey</em></td>
<td>sticky</td>
<td>did you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘Like this’</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intonation at the end of the sentence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Teacher’s scolding as a multimodal package (a)
As her next action, the teacher presents her evaluation; the teacher indicates to the student that what he has done in his prior turn is wrong and fails to meet the criteria for care on which the execution is judged. For this, she uses language (the deictic and grammar), gesture with the object, and prosody (intonation, and increased volume) all at the same time. She does not explicitly point out that it is wrong. However, her action as a multimodal package is rich enough to show how what he has done is inappropriate. The teacher’s evaluation consists of the deictic ilhekey (‘like this,’ ‘this way’) along with the gesture, the why question format, and her characterization of the object (“big chunks”). For the purposes of analysis, I will look first at the deictic term.

The ilhekey (‘like this,’ ‘this way’) has two functions in the turn. First, the ‘this way’ organizes the student’s attention on the object, as shown in the previous sections. The teacher’s concurrent body movement also supports this function of the deictic; at the beginning of the turn, the teacher begins to turn her body away from the plate toward the student. Then she puts the object in front the student’s face while saying ilhekey and holds her body position. Her bodily position, together with the deictic expression tells him that the object is the explicit focus of attention.

Second, the deictic refers to a prior action of the student: chopping nuts incorrectly (the student’s pine nut powder is not fine enough. Also, the nut pieces stuck together due to their high oil content because they were insufficiently blotted. The teacher has issued an instruction to chop the nuts on a piece of paper, so that the paper can absorb the oil). The nuts are the visible public outcome of the student's prior action. So the deictic ties the chunky nuts in the current turn with
the student’s action of chopping incorrectly in a prior turn. After scrutinizing the object (line 3),
the teacher expresses her evaluation, shifting her gaze from the object to the student’s face in
order to communicate with him (line 4).

Note that the teacher employs a rhetorical question format and further shows that she is
scolding through her stance. In the field of conversation analysis, a questioner narrows the
epistemic gap with the answerer by using interrogatives and asking for an account from the
interlocutor (Heritage, 2007a). Also participants use this particular format to challenge an
interlocutor who is designated as responsible in cases of blaming, criticizing and shaming
(Bolden & Robinson, 2011).

In my data, the teacher uses the rhetorical why interrogative as a way to tell her student
that he has done something wrong and to further nuance her stance on the matter; the teacher is
here criticizing the student in a mild way for ignoring the her instruction and expects him to learn
a lesson from the experience. This question, taken together with the lengthened way, (‘why’) and
increased volume, allows the teacher to emphasizes her negative stance.

In response to the teacher’s scolding, and reinforced through prosody, grammar and
gesture, the student seems to indicate embarrassment and shame. He covers his eyes with his
hand, avoids eye contact and does not follow up on the teacher’s previous action. After a brief
continuer (‘huh?’), she finishes the scolding activity, and returns to the instruction activity. She
demonstrates what the student has done wrong by showing the correct way (line 7). Chopping
the nuts on a kitchen towel, she shows him how to effectively mince the nuts to powder, and
corrects his prior mistake.
To sum up the example in Section 4.3.1, the repetitive sequential pattern within the teacher’s evaluation of the student’s action proceeds as follows: (1) The teacher re-positions her body to see the student’s food better by leaning her body into the student’s plate and shaking it. (2) The instructor sweeps her gaze over the local environment; this includes the student’s dish, the other person’s body, and the kitchen table. (3) In justifying her negative evaluation, the teacher uses gestures, language (the deictic term *ilehkey* ‘like this,’ grammar such as the rhetorical question and negation and characterization of action). (4) The teacher shows the food made by the student, such as the snack and powder, as evidence of the student’s mistake.

In addition, the teacher’s multimodal resources in producing the negative assessment are made possible by the followings sequence and components. First, the teacher repositions herself within the interactional space, then she gazes at the object. After that, the scolds the student by showing the problematic objects in the local environment as evidence of the mistake, gesturing at the object and using language.

4.3.2 Messy Table

We have examined the scolding pattern as a way of socializing a novice as a competent member of the cooking community. The pattern is (1) the teacher’s repositions herself in the relevant interactive and spatial field, (2) her gaze shifts to the student’s dish followed by recognition of the mistake, (3) teacher’s correction via language with other multimodal resources. In addition to the sequential level pattern, there was also a system organized by grammar within the teacher’s utterance at a micro-level, which was (1) Why and deictic as attention-getting device, (2) characterization of the action, and (3) prosody and showing the object as evidence of the student’s mistake. I will provide another example to prove that this evaluative sequence,
intertwined with seeing, body language and objects are systemic. Also, the teacher’s sentence structure is organized in a systemic way by grammar. I will analyze the teacher’s body and utterances alongside other multimodal resources such as gesture, sound and facial expression.

In the following example, the student fails to keep the kitchen table clean, one of the major criteria for passing the test indicated in the guidelines (see the footnote for guidelines provided by the Korean government).38 There could be several reasons why this should be included in the guidelines, both common sense and for health and safety. A kitchen is a place where food is made. It should therefore be clean because people must be able to eat what is prepared there without getting sick. There are also dangerous tools such as knives and fire. If a knife is hidden under unorganized ingredients, the cook can hurt him or herself. However, I think cleanliness can also be seen as a crucial way to show competence as a cook. If a person has experience in the kitchen, he or she will have enough time not only to work on the food, but also to attend to other chores.

01 T: i-lehkey hay kaci-kwu
   this-way do have-and
   ‘Like this, Do it and’

02 T: ((leaving the kitchen table to pick up a plate))

---

38 An examinee needs to get 60 points to pass the cooking demonstration examination. There are three major criteria: (1) cleanliness and safety, which is worth 10 points (e.g., organizing and cleaning the kitchen table), (2) embodied cooking skills for 60 points (e.g., using tools and trimming ingredients in the proper way, and cooking according to the correct steps), and (3) the final dishes for 30.
03  ceysi kulus-ey nay-l tlay-ey-nun ((coming back with the plate))

presentation plate-at put-will when-TC

‘When you put (your food) on the presentation plate’

((glancing at the kitchen table))

04  T: ((tapping the chopsticks to make a sound and making a gesture to draw a circle on the table))
In lines 1-3, the teacher is trying to demonstrate and teach two things: (1) how to make
the food, and (2) how to place the food on the plate in a particular way. In line 1, she organizes the student’s attention on her working hand with the food by using the deictic term ilehkey (‘like this’/‘this way’) at the beginning of the utterance in her demonstration, saying “Like this, do it,” which was explained in details in the previous chapter. The ‘and’ at the end of the utterance indicates that her mini-narrative about physical demonstration will be continued in the next turn but she leaves the student an opportunity to pick up a plate. In line 3, she resumes narrating her action and acting the part of a test-taker who is preparing to submit the food on the plate to the judges in a hypothetical situation. She comes back to the student with the plate to teach how to organize the food on the plate.

4.3.2.2 Body, Seeing and Recognizing the Evidence of Mistake

Before the teacher’s verbal scolding (line 5), notice that the teacher moves her body into a position where she has visual access to the table and then recognizes its condition (in contrast, in line 2, she has her back to the table as she looks for a plate, and thus cannot see the table). The messiness is a violation of the kitchen rules which requires a correction. It seems as though the teacher did not previously recognize that the kitchen table was messy, despite being present in the interactional space with the student. This is because at that moment, the bowl was the explicit focus of visual attention in the previous ongoing activity, a demonstration of making the food that the participants were engaged in; thus, they ignored other elements on the kitchen table. Once the teacher withdrew from the bowl and disengaged from the ongoing activity, she was able to view the table as the focus of a new activity and to evaluate the student’s action in a prior turn based on the general rule of kitchen: not to mess up the kitchen table.
4.3.2.3 Scolding as Negative Assessment and Multimodal package

Once the teacher shifts her gaze to the table, she recognizes the mess and identifies it as dirty. This needs to be corrected, and she points to this as evidence of the student’s misconduct. In order to make a negative assessment of the student’s mistake in a prior turn (lines 4-5), the teacher uses various resources during her turn in lines 4-5. She first organizes the student’s attention on the object aurally, by tapping, visually through a pointing gesture, and by employing the deictic term. The assessment adjective then follows. She makes a frowning face and explicitly warns the student that he will be “really scolded” in line 7. In the following paragraphs, I will thoroughly explain each component in sequential and grammatical order (see Table 4.3 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential object as evidence of the mistake</th>
<th>Attention getting device</th>
<th>Deictic term (Verbal attention-getting device)</th>
<th>(1) Characterization of student’s action (2) assessment adverb</th>
<th>Negation</th>
<th>Other elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirty kitchen table</td>
<td>-Tapping sound</td>
<td>Like this</td>
<td>(you) work, putting (things) messy</td>
<td>Not okay.</td>
<td>-Teacher’s frowning face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Pointing gesture at lots of tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Prosody (rising intonation, and a lengthened vowel at the end of)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.3.1 Transformation of Chopsticks as a Teaching tool, rather than a Tool for eating

First, the teacher organizes the student’s attention around what she sees as a focus of attention, because the student does not know what she is going to do next. The teacher and student need to be on the same page and looking at the same object in order to carry out the activity together. In order to point out the many dishes that he randomly left on the table, she uses different attention-getting devices that exhibit different qualities. Notice that by using the chopsticks she employed for making food in the previous activity, she creates two resources accumulatively and consecutively: (1) tapping sound, and (2) an extended gesture (I call this an extended gesture because the chopsticks are longer than her fingers and the gesture with chopsticks is bigger and easier to see than one using hands alone).
The way the teacher uses the chopsticks here shows her professional identity and competence as a teacher. Chopsticks are originally designed to hold small pieces of food in Asia. Asians use them when they move food into their mouths or when they make food, for instance in mixing ingredients or moving them into plate. However, here, the teacher uses them as an instructional tool to show something other than food (I find the function of the chopsticks here similar to the way the conductor of an orchestra uses a baton, sometimes pointing at a particular section of the orchestra to let them know that it is now their turn. A conductor may also sometimes tap on the score during rehearsals to stop an orchestra playing and make comments).

For two pedagogical reasons, chopsticks seem to the teacher to be more efficient than using her own hand in this sequence. First, she can correct things immediately; she was already holding chopsticks in the prior turn, so it is quicker to perform any action involving her hand with them. If she puts the chopsticks on the table, it takes more time, not to mention being distracting. Also, the tool functions better than her hand, because she can make a sharp sound, which is easier to hear, and a large gesture, which is easier to see because it is big. Here she has to highlight a large space with a lot of dishes, rather than a single object, so the greater the length of the chopsticks, the bigger the circle she can draw, without moving her whole arm.

To summon the student’s attention, the teacher first taps the kitchen table twice to make a sound. This could imply that the teacher is the authority figure in the community to control the younger student. This behavior recalls that of a parent scolding a child or someone lower in a hierarchy, not the reverse. Once she has secured the student’s attention by sound, she specifically points, making the gesture with chopsticks, to highlight certain things on the kitchen table. She points out all the plates the student didn’t organize and uses them as evidence before embarking on her next action: explaining the rationale behind her scolding.
4.3.2.3.2 Teacher’s Language

Now, I will consider in detail the teacher’s language in line 5 (Table 4.4 below), analyzing each word from the turn’s beginning, which starts with the deictic term ‘like this’ (see Table 4.4 below). Similar to the pine nut example evoked earlier (Section 4.3.1 in p. 75), the deictic term raises two aspects of the student’s incompetence. First, it points out the table, full of dishes and tools, which is problematic in and of itself, and the teacher organizes the student’s visible and cognitive attention on the current situation. Second, the deictic term also refers to the student’s action, using too many dishes without planning or organizing. The teacher specifically points out the dishes on the kitchen table as evidence of the student’s mistake in a prior action, so he can see and understand what he has done wrong. Although he was present amidst the mess, he failed to recognize this as something wrong, because of lack of professional vision (Goodwin, 1994), or knowledge of the cooking rules.

05 T: i-lehkey cicepunha-key noh-ko ha-myen an tawy.
   this-way dirty-to put- and do-if not-do not be okay:INT
   'Like this, (you) shouldn’t work by leaving (things) messy (on the kitchen table)'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic term (Verbal attention getting device)</th>
<th>(1) Characterization of student’s action</th>
<th>Negation</th>
<th>Other elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like this</td>
<td>(you) work, putting (things) messy</td>
<td>not okay.</td>
<td>-Teacher’s frowning face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Prosody (rising intonation, and a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lengthened vowel at the end of the teacher’s utterance)

Table 4.4 Teacher’s language

After securing the student’s gaze on the problematic area, the teacher verbally makes a negative assessment, affirming that the situation is no good. The assessment adverb, sloppy, being the equivalent of “putting things dirty” comes first to characterize the student’s problematic action. This enables student to see and recognize the prevailing condition as dirty with the professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) of a cook. The assessment of something as dirty or not is quite subjective. Some parents with young children might consider the current kitchen acceptable, if they are used to their children making things messy. However, at least for this type of institutional context, the current level of disorder is considered a mess and the student must learn the expectations of this community in order to show his competence and pass the examination.

After the assessment adverb, the teacher registers that the student’s action in the prior turn was “not okay,” in addition to indicating the object as evidence of a mistake in the current turn (line 5). In order to show her negative stance, she also makes a frowning face, moving her eyebrows down, screwing up her eyes, and pushing out her lips.

After the subsequent nodding (in line 6), a claim of acknowledgement, the teacher incrementally adds to the scolding, and explicitly warns the novice she is going to “really scold” him starting ‘tomorrow’ (line 7); he had best not make the same mistake again once he learns the lesson today; implicit is a promise that she will forgive him for the current mistake. By
suggesting a different time frame, “tomorrow,” rather than today, and using the intensifier “really,” she mitigates her negative stance, and suggests that today’s correction is a mild scolding, but conveys in an intensified way that the same mistake in the future will not be allowed. Thus, the student must not just acknowledge the consequences now, but should remember the lesson in the future as well. The sentence ender ke-ya (‘will be’) also supports the negative stance of the speaker. When used as an imperative, “ke-ya,” it implies that the speaker is admonishing the listener (Yae, 2012).

4.4 Conclusion

In the present chapter, I have shown how grammar, body and objects organize participants’ attention and actions. In particular, I have demonstrated how the deictic term, ilehkey (‘like this’/’this way’), is used show the negative stance of a participant in addition to functioning as an attention-getter. This is found in the scolding activity at the culinary school, where the teacher makes a negative assessment of the student’s action in a prior turn. In this sequence, the teacher first repositions her body to see the object better. Then she sees and recognizes it as wrong. In order to teach the practical norm as a cook and professional vision (Goodwin, 1994), the teacher deploys multimodal resources such as tapping sounds, facial expression, and prosody as well. The student’s acknowledgement follows, showing that he understands the consequence in the context through his talk or body. Indeed, talk, the body and object are intertwined in the material world.
CHAPTER 5
THE USE OF COMMITTAL SUFFIX CI IN THE TEACHER’S TAG QUESTION AND THE STUDENT’S ANSWER IN INSTRUCTIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzes the interactional usage of the teacher’s tag question, expressed as a turn-ending particle: the Korean committal suffix *ci* (‘right?’ in English) and the student’s subsequent acknowledgement *ney* (‘yes,’ ‘okay’) in cooking instruction at a professional culinary institute. More specifically, the expert gives instructions in multi-unit turns like mini-narratives and inserts the suffix at the end of her utterance systemically. Then the student’s response follows. The particle was frequently found in the teacher’s utterances together with the deictic adverb *ilehkey* (‘this way’/ ‘like this’), analyzed in the previous chapter. In the teacher’s utterance, the *ilehkey* was placed near the turn-beginning, whereas the suffix was placed at the turn-ending (e.g., this way you have lines [on the garlic] this time, *ci*).

I will explore how the linguistic feature and question and answer sequence are deployed to achieve a pedagogical and institutional purpose by the participants. I will argue that the expert uses these items to segment chains of instructions into manageable pieces, marking boundaries; this helps novices receive and recognize visible and verbal information (e.g., embodied skills, knowledge on objects such as ingredients and tools), which moves to the next activity in the process. To make my arguments clear, I will show the overall flow of the sequences, rather than making a detailed analysis of nonverbal cues such as gestures and gaze, as in the previous chapters, although these are important.

In this chapter, I will analyze the data that I collected at a culinary institute, whereas in
the previous chapter I analyzed interaction between friends as well (see Chapter 2 for detailed information on the culinary school). The material for this chapter are data from two sessions taught by one teacher (Sun: pseudonym) at the culinary institute. In these data, I selected Sun’s one-on-one interactions with one particular student (Cho: pseudonym). I chose this particular individual among other students because he was representative of a “novice”: he had never taken formal cooking classes before, and seemed not to have previous knowledge of practices used in the cooking community. Thus, in detailed step-by-step fashion, the expert talked and showed him how to use his body and tools in accordance with the characteristics of the ingredients (e.g., how to use a knife and each hand to cut garlic in a particular way, a sequence which will be analyzed in this chapter).

In the following sections, I will briefly review a previous study on the transfer of knowledge (Goldberg, 1975) and summarize how the expert gives cooking instruction to the novice within the progress of the activity. I will also explain why the concept of “transfer” is problematic in embodied activities. After the presentation of a theoretical framework follows the section on Korean grammar concerning ci. Then the data will be presented through three examples: “how to trim an ingredient,” “how to see a knife,” and “feeling bad.” Next, ku-ci (be so-COMM) ‘be like that’ will be analyzed as an interrogative in the two examples: “a thumb,” and “a reason for chopping” (There are two types of tag questions, using ci [e.g. (1) statement+ci, (2) statement+kuci] and they will be explained grammatically in the next section.

5.2 Transfer of Information and Receipt of Information

Goldberg (1975) first examined sequences of cooking instructions from radio shows to see how participants receive and transpose information. However, because the participants were
limited to exchanges by phone, where they are not present in the same interactional space, certain particularities emerge in how instruction is given in a teacher’s turn and how instructed actions are executed or receipt of the information is communicated in the student’s turn. These patterns helped participants progress in the activity.

For example, after the instructor transfers information regarding embodied action and the amount needed of each ingredient on the phone (e.g., “a spoonful of vanilla,” p. 270), the students then indicates that she has received information by (1) repeating the teacher’s lexical item in a prior turn, or (2) saying “okay”, “mhm”, and “alright”, which Goldberg calls continuation markers (p.277). Goldberg argues that each instruction is broken down into smaller sub-instructions and these “transfer of information-receipt of information” (I/R) sequences occur with linkages, like chains. The recipient’s response functions to signal the instructor that s/he does not have any problem in understanding/hearing, and it punctuates the sequence as well as material that they were working on. Thus, the activity may continue to the next sequence.

5.3 Gaps in the Literature

Although Goldberg's (1975) study was innovative in studies on talk in interaction by expanding the scope of the research area from everyday conversation to cooking instructions, the data is audio only (it has not been long that using video data has become common in the field of Conversation Analysis). However, in the case of cooking instructions, bodies and objects play an important role. Audio data alone does not capture what is happening beyond the stream of speech. Goodwin (2010) argues that participants make use of their bodies, the material world and the environment to build courses of action. This is especially clear in an activity such as cooking. Human bodies are central to the organization of attention in learning practices and knowledge is
composed of skill (Ingold, 2001). A novice learns how to pay attention to the subject matter by looking, hearing and touching in a particular way. This is contrary to the anthropological approach of Dan Sperber (Ingold, 2001), which views knowledge as information and reading the recipe as a textual process.

Building on these studies, I want to expand the scope of the field on how skills are acquired by studying interactions beyond the stream of speech. This study expands understanding of embodied instructions, and human cognition as an embodied process. Human bodies and pedagogy are complicated and there are many layers to be studied.

5.4 Korean Question System and the Committal Suffix *ci*

In Korean, sentence enders determine whether sentences are declarative, interrogative, propositive or imperative (Sohn, 1999). Yoon (2010) studied the various types of Korean questions and answers and their social functions. According to her (2010), Korean has three types of questions: (1) the “yes-no” polar type, (2) the “wh” type, and (3) the alternative questions (“if not”). Within the category of “yes-no” polar questions, there are three types morphologically: (1) declarative, (2) interrogative, and (3) tag questions. Speakers use questions to request information, to initiate repair, to request confirmation, to offer assessment/opinion when seeking agreement from their interlocutors, and to make an assessment/request/offer.

In order to understand the formulation of Korean tag questions, it is essential to first comprehend the sentence-terminal suffix *ci*. There have been abundant studies on the particle. When used in an interrogative, the suffix *ci*- is similar to the English tag question (Sohn, 1994; Lee 1999), and indicates that the speaker is seeking confirmation or agreement for what he or she
strongly believes (Lee, 1999). By using the suffix, the speaker can indicate his judgment of the subject matter to a listener (Ooe, 1958; Ko, 1976).

The suffix can be used in any sentence type, such as declarative, interrogative and imperative, and its meaning depends on the interactional context (Lee, 1999). Lee (1999) refers to this sentence ender as committal, because it implies that “the speaker is biased or leaning toward committing himself/herself to or believing in the conveyed message and emphasizes that belief” (p. 246). He also emphasizes the role of context, such as the goal of the interaction. The displays of politeness employed when the speaker expresses what he believes in, and how much he believes/is committed to the message.

There are two ways to formulate tag questions using the committal marker *ci* (Lee, 1999). The first is to complete a full sentence and then add a separate anaphoric verb/adjective *ku(leha)* (‘be/do so’) together with the committal ci at the end, as in, for instance, *ku-ci* (‘be like that’/‘right?’) (Yoon, 2010). The other type involves placing the committal at the end of the main statement instead of making another tag question, such as *ku-ci*. The latter is called a “pseudo tag question” (Suh, 2006; Yun & Lee, 2007). Pseudo tag questions are more prevalent than separate tag questions (Yun & Lee, 2007; Yoon, 2010), and tag questions are formulated in a positive form more frequently than a negative form (Kim, 1999).

5.5 Analysis on *Ci* in the Teacher’s Tag Question and the Student’s Answer in Instructions

Achieving mutual understanding and joint action presupposes that actors recognize what the other participant in an interaction knows (Tomasello, 2008; Heritage, 2013). In Section 5.5.1, I will look at how the teacher employs a linguistic resource, the committal suffix *ci*, in a question
(line 10) to ensure this. How does the particle function within the embodied demonstration of how to see and to trim garlic in a particular way?

5.5.1 The Visible Outcome/Recognition of the Teacher’s Action

The mode of instruction is that the teacher first provides a reason for doing, attending to what will be shown next. Within this process, the student must carefully study the teacher’s actions and attend to changes in how tools and objects are used to accomplish the activity. As a novice does not have a professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) as a cook, action lodged within larger complex of acquired knowledge and skill may not be obvious to him. Acquiring solutions reached by predecessors, the teacher transmits such knowledge and skills to the novice by talk and body.

1. cs_yb garlic

01 T: manul-un mence sse-nun ke pwa-pwa.((slicing))yo-lehkey

garlic-NM first slice-RL thing see-try-INT. this-way

‘Look at (how I) slice garlic first. First, finely finely like this.’

02 mence yalb-key yalb-key.

first thin-so that thin-so that

[demonstrating a wrong way in the air]

03 i khu-n sangtay-eyse taci-lye-ko ha-myen ne:mwu

this big-RL condition-in mince-INF-and do-if extremely
'(If you) try to mince in this big condition, (you have)

04  son-i manhi ka-canh-a.
      hand-NM much go-COMM-INT
      a lot to do.'

05  S:  ney.
      Yes.
      ‘Yes.’

      ((slicing the garlic))

06  T:  kulayse cak-key almayngi-lo mantul-e-cwu-nun-ke-ya. Ca:

      ((slicing the garlic again))

      so small-so that bits-DR make-INT-give-RL-thing-INT. Well
      ‘So (you have to) make it into small bits. Then’

* The teacher’s turn (line 6) in Korean continues until line 10. For an English translation of the turn, please see the third line of line 6-8. The target grammatical feature ci is at line 10 at the end of the turn in Korean.

      ((pointing at a knife))

07  →  (i-lehkey)  i kkuth pwupwun-un seymilha-n cakepha-l ttay
      this-way this end part-TC delicate-RL work-PRS when
      ‘(This way) this end part is used for a delicate task,'

08  →  ssu-nun ke-ki ttaymwun-ey yo-lehkey na-ka.
      use-RL fact-NOM reason-at this-way go-INT.
so it (=the knife) goes (this way).”

09 → ku taum-ey

it next-at

‘Then’

10 → i-lehkey han-pen kyel-i naka-ss-ci=

this-way one-time line-NM go-PST-COMM

‘This way you have cuts (on the garlic) this time, right?’

[ Holding the garlic and showing it to the student ]

11 S: → =ney.

yes

‘Yes.’
12-a  T:  =kulem yey-ney-tul-ul tolye-se yeki-se ssel-e-cwu-key
    then these-group-PL-AC turn-INF-so here-at slice-INF-give-so

* The teacher’s turn (12-a) continues to line 12-b. For an English translation, see the third row of line 12-b.

12-b  →  toy-myen ettay? te cak-un almayngi-ka toy-ci.

that make if? more small-RL bit-NM Become-COMM.

‘Then (if you) turn these rows around and slice them from here, how are they?
(They) become smaller pieces, right?’

[Showing how to slice garlic]

13  S:  →  ((nodding))

14  S:  →  =ney.
yes.

‘Yes.’

15  T: ➔  te cak-key mantul-e-cwu-n taum-ey,
more small-so that make-INT-give-RL next-at
‘After you make them smaller,

16  ➔  ku taum-ey yeki-se (0.2) ((chopping))i-lehkey tacye-cwu-nun-ke-ya.
it next-at here-at this-way chop-INT-give-RL-thing-INT.
and then, from here, this way chop it.’

5.1.1.1 Showing and Reasoning

Instruction begins with the teacher’s directive to “try to look at” how she “slices” garlic to the student (line 1). Then teacher gives an account (in lines 1-4) of why she has to “slice garlic into thin pieces” (line 1) before “chopping” (line 16). The rationale is that it is easier to chop into tiny cubes later, when the bits are already small. She also explains and shows how to use a specific part of the knife, “the tip” for this delicate job, differentiating it from other parts such as a body (line 08).

The organization of the teacher’s utterance helps the student to keep the focus of attention on the cuts of garlic. As her next action, the teacher asks a question, “This way, you have cuts (on the garlic) this time, right?” (line 10) by employing the ci-ending (Table 5.1 below). Note that the teacher builds the utterance, beginning with the deictic term ilehkey (‘this way’) and ci at the end. The end of the utterance is accompanied by the teacher showing the object: the teacher
holds the ingredient, and places it closer to the student’s face to exhibit the lines on the garlic.

The demonstration requires an organization of embodied attention. In this way, the teacher tries to organize the student’s attention to the visible outcome of her action in line 8b.

The teacher is bringing the category and the subject in the world being categorized together using language (deictic term at the turn beginning in lines 7,8 and 10 and committal suffix at the turn ending), gesture and objects, similar to the arguments in the previous chapter. By doing so, the teacher is showing lines in the garlic through language description of what to see; she indicates that the lines are the explicit focus of the seeing activity now, not the garlic in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 10</th>
<th>The deictic term</th>
<th>The description on the visible outcome of the teacher’s action</th>
<th>Committal suffix in a question format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ilehkey (this way)</td>
<td>have lines (on the garlic)</td>
<td>ci (right?)</td>
<td>![Showing the object by holding it with a hand]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lines 12-a and 12-b | (1) yey (these) | Then (if you) turn these (rows) around and slice them from here, how are they? (They) become smaller pieces | ci (right?) |
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5.1.2 *Ci* as a Part of an Interactive Co-operative Process and Boundary Marker

Notice that the teacher adds the committal *ci* as a tag question at the turn ending (line 10). *Ci* is a part of an interactive co-operative process. After drawing the student’s attention to the referential object by using the deictic term at the turn beginning, the teacher uses the suffix *ci* at the turn ending to categorize what is to be seen there and the student must recognize what he is being shown (Table 5.1). She requests that the student also see and specifically recognize the visible outcome of the teacher’s prior action (lines 10). The question format is useful for forcing a minimal response from a recipient (lines 11). As the student shows his recognition of the teacher’s action, participants are able to terminate one activity and shift to the next relevant one. A similar pattern is repetitively found in lines 12-16 in chains of instructions (Goldberg, 1975); the deictic term and committal suffix as a tag question frequently were used together in the teacher’s utterance.

Table 5.1 The teacher’s language organizes the student’s attention around the object

| (2) | yeki (here) | [Showing how to slice the object with a knife] |

[Showing how to slice the object with a knife]
(1) The teacher’s action (slicing the rows) and showing the outcome (small bits) + the tag question *ci* in line 12-a and 12-b

(2) The student’s answer: nodding+ the acknowledgment ‘yes’ (line 13-14)

(3) The teacher’s next action and the verbal description on her action: chopping (line 15-16)

In terms of sequential organization, the teacher uses the suffix *ci* (lines 10 and 12-a and 12-b) as a boundary marker to show the termination of each action. *Ci* connects two different actions in the current and prior turns within the same activity, which is cutting the garlic. Here, action literally means the physical enactment. The teacher builds up her action step by step so that the novice can follow her. She verbally explains her physical action with details and shows the visible outcome of her action on the object. Then she inserts *ci* to see if the student is still looking at the object during her multi-unit turns; the participants see objects and events in front of them in a particular way and shape that professional vision (Goodwin, 1994) through language.

For instance, the teacher uses various verbs to describe her movement in her demonstrations; she inserts *ci* between them: (1) *nakata* (go) to describe movement of the knife (lines 8) and lines on the garlic (line 10)- holding and showing the sliced garlic to the student+ *ci* (line 10)-(2) *tolita* (turn) to describe the different position of the garlic on the chopping board (line 12-a)- (3) *toyta* (become) to describe the shape of garlic (line 12-b)- *ci*- (4) *tacita* (chop) in line 16.

Acting upon the student’s minimal response “yes” in line 11, which is an assertion of
acknowledgment, the teacher moves to the next physical practice: “turning the long rows of garlic into a different angle” and “making long rows into tiny cubes” (line 12a). The student’s answer functions like the continuers “uh huh” in conversation (Schegloff, 1982). The student’s answer does not mean that (s)he is able to perform the action so acknowledged; it is a claim of understanding regarding the teacher’s physical action and its outcome, not a demonstration of his understanding (Heritage, 2007b). Rather it indicates that (s)he is recognizing and paying attention to the teacher’s object that they are currently working on and understands its significance. That is because he has not displayed an understanding by performance on the garlic yet (Schegloff, 1982). The student’s minimal response indexes the cognition of participants and allows the pair to cooperatively carry out the next relevant action (line 12).

Another significant question remains, however. Why does the teacher use the committal ci- suffix in a question format in particular? First, this grammatical structure conveys a teacher’s epistemic supremacy and is useful for forcing a minimal response from a recipient. The committal implies that the teacher is extremely certain about the information she is conveying at the moment, that is: what to do and where to see on the object. The speaker emphasizes her confidence in the accuracy of the information by using a Korean committal ci- and expecting a minimal confirmation from the recipient (Lee, 1999). By exchanging this minimal response for agreement and visual recognition of the particular object, the participants mutually and publicly agree that they are able to shift to the next step.

Like the committal, the question form mobilizes support for a pedagogical assertion by the teacher, who possesses a K+ (more knowledgeable) epistemic status (Heritage, 2013). The

---

39 Sacks’ original discussion of “showing understanding,” or so-called demonstrations of understanding, occurred in his lectures (1992, p. 141). In one-on-one interaction between friends, the student showed understanding by performance right after the teacher’s demonstration and corrections (see Chapter 3 on the deictic term) for comparison.
teacher is certain that there are lines on the garlic, and she furthermore knows how to look at the material in the world as a competent member of culinary society. She is in the K+ (more knowledgeable) position (Heritage, 2013) within the information domain relevant to the embodied skills needed at a cooking institution.

On the other hand, the teacher is in the K- (less knowledgeable) position regarding a student’s subjectivity. Whereas the teacher has professional knowledge of how to use the body and tools and how to see kitchen materials, (s)he does not know whether the student understands the instruction. Thus, from the teacher’s perspective, the student’s acknowledgment is needed both in order to gradually build mutual understanding, and to permit progress to the next relevant action.

The formulation could also mean that the teacher assumes the person being instructed has sufficient understanding to recognize what is shown. Thus, the teacher progressively builds on the student’s understanding so that the student is prepared for what will come next such that each step is a prerequisite for the next step.

In brief, the participants build up action through cooperative questions and responses in a set of sequences; the teacher asks a student to look at the object or the teacher’s hand and to recognize her embodied action and its effect on the object, which here consist of a knife, a pot and garlic. In most of these cases, the teacher’s requests to recognize the physical action are framed as yes-no tag questions. Then, the student co-operatively responds with “yes,” which functions like a continuer to expedite an activity in progress (Lee, 2011).
5.5.2 The Visible Outcome/Recognition of the Teacher’s Action +ci + a Deictic + Pointing Gesture

In this sequence, I will analyze how the teacher employs a question with turn final ending ci-, coupled with a deictic and pointing gesture, in order to instruct the student how to see and recognize the length of objects as a cook with proper professional vision. For this, she provides instruction on how to see and use the measurements on a knife (Figure 5.1 below). The task of a student in this sequence is to see and understand how thick “0.2-0.3cm” is, equivalent to 0.07-0.11 inch, in order to slice cucumber into that specific size (lines 2-3). While bringing the knife in front of the student’s face, she comments on the size ("from 0.2 to 0.3 cm is not too thin, nor too thick" line 4), which is rather vague.

![Figure 5.1 Measurements on a knife](image)

Figure 5.1 Measurements on a knife 40

---

40 Since the size of the measurements was too small to be seen in the data, I found the picture of a knife similar to the one that the participants used. Retrieved from
1. yb_01_radish_4:40
02 T: ( ) key ani-la, yey-lul (kkakkta-ka) chaysse-nun yensupha-nun-ke-ya.

( ) Thing not-IM, this kid-AC bring slice-RL practice-RL-thing-INT.

‘not ( ), (we are) practicing slicing this (=a cucumber).’

03 wuli-nun kecin chay-lul 0.2 na 0.3 sseynchi-lo ssel-e.

we-NM about slice-AC 0.2 or 0.3 cm-DR slice-INT.

‘We (have to) slice it into about 0.2 or 0.3 cm’

((showing the knife in front of the student’s face))

04 0.2eyse 0.3 sseynchi-nun nemwu yalpci-to anh-ci-man nemwu

0.2 from 0.3 cm-NM much thin-too NEG-COMM-but much

‘From 0.2 to 0.3 cm is not too thin, nor not too thick.’

05 twukkep-ci-to anh-a.

thick-COMM-too NEG-INT

((pointing at the measurement on the knife))

06 → yeki ssaynci-lo ta nawai-ss-ci?

here cm-DR all appear-PST-COMM

‘You see here cm (in measurement), ci?’

07 S:→ ney.

Yes.

http://www.daisomall.co.kr/shop/goods_view.php?id=0000214027&NaPm=ct%3Dinnnpu1c%7Cci%3D4965f96334
ed4fc40bbfe30110fc640b64ddf428%7Ctr%3Dsls%7Csn%3D116152%7Chk%3Dacfd657b55007a5c15911bee9b6ca72bb994ab73

112
‘Yes’

((slicing))

08 T: → 0.2 sseynchi-lo sse-si-o ha-myeon-un han yo cengto?(0.4)lo ssel-e-

0.2 cm-DR slice-POL-IM do-if-TC so about this degree to slice-INF-

‘If you are told to cut 0.2 cm, then slice it about this much’

09 → cwu-myeon tway.=

give-if become-INT.

10 S: =((nodding))

11 T: → yalp-ci?=

thin-COMM

‘(0.2-0.3 sliced cucumber is) thinner, ci?’

12 S: → ((nodding))

13 T: =sayngkak-pota,

think-than

Than (you) expected’

14 T: yo-lehkey hay-se 0.2 sseynchi chayssel-myeon tway.

this-way do-so 0.2 cm slice-if INF

‘Do this way so slice it into 0.2 cm.’

As a next action, the teacher asks a question: “you see here cm (in measurement), right?”
with *ci*-committal, pointing at the measurement on the knife with her index finger (line 08). Through the pointing action and the deictic “here,” the teacher signals that the student now has to pay attention to the measurements printed on the knife. The deictic and pointing gesture galvanize the attention of both parties, directing it to the tool, so that they can carry out the activity. She tells the student where to look. The measurement on the knife helps the novice recognize the object, and transforms the abstract number of the teacher’s utterance into concrete and physical material in the world. Reinforced by a committal *ci*-ending and the rising intonation at the end, the student’s acknowledgment follows (line 13). After the student claims to have understood how thin 0.2-0.3cm is from listening to the teacher’s explanation and seeing the size on the knife-tip, the instructor starts “slicing this much” and uses pieces to illustrate the talk. Speech and body mutually elaborate each other in the embodied demonstration (Goodwin, 1994).

The instructor deploys the sentence terminal suffix *ci* with a question at action boundaries. The teacher’s actions change before and after the *ci*. She “shows” the knife (line 4) and “points” at the measurement (line 6), using the *ci* question to indicate what the student should see. After the *ci* particle, she moves to a different action, “slicing” (line 8). Thus the particle not only indexes the cognition of participants who know how to see the material in the world as a competent member of a kitchen staff, distinguishing them from those who do not, but it also indexes participants’ actions.

Similar to the previous *ci* pattern (line 6), another committal *ci* combined with question follows in chains of *ci* instructions, in line 11 (“[The 0.2-0.3 sliced cucumber is] thinner, *ci*”), to which the response is the student’s nodding (line 12). Then she adds an increment “than you expected” (line 13). This action forces the student to recognize the actual outcome of the previous action of slicing the cucumber in “0.2-0.3 cm.” By using this grammatical feature, the
instructor makes sure she secures the student’s subjectivity and assessment, which is that 0.2 and 0.3cm of sliced cucumber is “thinner than the student had thought.” The teacher does not have epistemic authority over the student’s subjectivity, however. Although, as a skilled person she knows how thin 2 mm is and how to slice the cucumber that particular size, whether the student perceives the sliced cucumber to be thin or not is the student’s epistemic domain, and therefore the teacher is in a K- epistemic position regarding this matter. The student’s expression of recognition helps the teacher shift from the K- position back to the K+ position, by moving on to the next relevant activity in the kitchen.

In section 5.5.2, the participants transform an abstract thought into a concrete outcome by carrying out layers of activities and building mutual understanding step by step; first, they try to understand the vague size “0.2-0.3 cm” by listening to the teacher’s utterance. They then look at the measurement on the knife to see the actual length of “0.2-0.3cm.” Then, the student watches how the teacher slices the cucumber into that size. Finally, the student learns to recognize that 0.2-0.3 is thinner than it sounds.

5.5.3 Hypothetical Situation +ci to Explain Logic

In section 5.5.3, I will show that the teacher instructs the student to recognize not only physical action/outcome, which is observable in the present, but also the their previous subjective experience in the past, which is not observable.

28 T: ca, (icey) ((gathering bits on the chopping board))
well, (now)
‘Then, now’

’Then, what’s left (on the chopping board) too.’

[The teacher’s right hand using the knife to gather the garlic bits]

‘So this-way-DR chop-INT-give-INT.
‘So chop them this way’.

‘(When you’re) eating, if (you) taste big chunks of garlic,
(you) feel bad, ci?’
32 \rightarrow \text{S: ney. hhh ((smiling))}

yes.

‘Yes. hh’

The teacher instructs the student to “gather” the garlic pieces on the chopping board (line 28), and chop them into tiny pieces (line 30). By verbal expression with physical demonstration,
she makes actions being instructed reasonable and accountable. Then she asks a question with committal ci- about the student’s subjective experience, namely, that he “felt bad” when he bit into a big chunk of garlic” (line 31). In order to accomplish mutual understanding as to why they are undertaking to chop garlic so delicately (line 28 and 31), the teacher asks the student to focus on a general characteristic of garlic, and to recognize its strong taste as something negative in cooking community practice as a type, not as his personal preference. The logic is that in order to avoid strong taste of garlic as a cook, one should chop it. She then solicits agreement in the student’s turn (line 32).

Note that the teacher here assumes that the student would make a negative assessment of the big chunks of garlic as a member of a cooking community, and she is certain of the response, as shown and supported by ci-committal, which shows her epistemic superiority as an expert in the field who knows better. What the student actually experiences is not relevant; what is the issue here is the public organization of experience within the community rather than each individual’s personal experience and preference.

Thus, the assessment is made based on the instructor’s knowledge as a cook, and not the individual experience of the participants; as the class is the student’s first session in the cooking class, she does not know his personal experience regarding the size of garlic. She has not explicitly asked a question about his preferences where garlic is concerned, either. Some people prefer big chunks of garlic to small ones when they desire a strong taste. However, here, she has knowledge as a professional cook and evaluates big chucks of garlic something as negative. Thus, she requests that the student recognize the “bad feeling” of biting big chunks as a working hypothesis.
In fact, whether the student likes a big chunk of garlic or not is irrelevant to the teacher, as she only requires the student’s acknowledgment for pedagogical purposes. She needs the student’s “yes” to see he understands the logic and grasps how seeing and performing the action this way (line 30) is not embedded within individual psychology, but the public practices of a community (In order to avoid the “bad” experience of biting into big chunks, garlic must be minced into tiny pieces), an acknowledgement which indexes cognition of the two parties and enables them to move on to the next step.

In the teacher’s question line 31 (“when you’re eating, if you taste big chunks of garlic, you feel bad, ci?”) to solicit the student’s response in line 32, the teacher uses various resources such as gaze and gesture together with a question with ci-suffix. Questions, epistemic asymmetry and gaze tend to mobilize response from a recipient (Stivers, 2010). While the teacher is looking at the working object at the beginning of the utterance, she shifts her gaze to the student’s face in the middle of the utterance (picture in line 32). This gaze invites the recipient’s response, verbal acknowledgement, laughter and smiley face.41

5.5.4 Kuci: a Boundary Marker to Shift from One Activity to Another

In the previous sections (5.5.1, 5.5.2, and 5.5.3), I have demonstrated how the “statement+ci (as one sentence)” format is used to bound sequences, checking students’ understanding of a prior action by the teacher before moving to the next, and I have shown that this presupposes such understanding. The format was used not only in physical demonstration to show in the

41 Although gaze, laughter and smiling face are interesting, I am not going to analyze them in detail here. In this chapter, ci is the main focus; I want to examine the flow of the sequence here without distracting readers with other phenomena even though they are present in the data.
present situations, but also hypothetical situations, to support the logic underpinning a current action.

Now, I will examine how the other tag question type “statement+kucī” (separate tag question) functions, by means of two examples. Through ku-ci, (line 5), a tag question unit that stands alone, the teacher uses the ci- suffix as a boundary marker to shift from one activity to another. After that, I will briefly compare how the two types of questions function differently.

In the following example, the teacher explains how to peel using a sharp knife. She emphasizes that it is important to support the knife with the right thumb, while holding the carrot in the left hand (line 5). By performing the action this way, a cook can control the speed of the knife and prevent injury to the hand.

2. **cs_yb_knife_carrot**
   
   (Student washing a carrot with hot water)

01 T: i-lehkey kkakkta-ka
   
   this-way peel-and
   
   ((taking a carrot from a student))

   ‘Peel this way and

02 kuliko ttukewun mwul-lo ha-nun key ani-la can mwul-lo
   
   then and hot water-DR do-RL thing not cold-DR
   
   (use) cold water instead of hot water’

03 T:→ ((demonstrating a wrong way in the air with a gesture))
ca:yo-lehkey\textsuperscript{42} kkakkta-ka son thak((action)) pi-myeon ettehkey hae.

well this way cut-DC hand just cut-when how do.

‘Then, (if you) cut this way and you cut your hand, how are you going to do?’

((looking at the student))

04 S: (nodding) ney

okay

‘Okay’

05 T:→ ku-ci.

be so-COMM.

‘Right?’

((Demonstrating how to cut a carrot with a knife))

5a→ ca: yo son-ulo cwungsim-ul cap-a-cwu-la kulyss-e: ca

well this hand-DR center-AC hold-INT-give-IM it-PST-INT well

‘Then (I) told (you) to balance with this hand. Then.’

06 aray-se wi-lo ka-nun key ani-la yo son-ulo i kel cap-a-cwu-nun-
down-from up-DR go-RL thing not-IM this hand-DR this-thing hold-
INT-give-RL-

‘Do not use knife from down to up part. Hold this (=a knife) with this hand.’

07 ke-ya.

thing-INT.

\textsuperscript{42} I explain the differences between proximal i (this) and yo (this) in Chapter 3 (p. 36).
Figure 5.2 The teacher supporting the knife right the right thumb, holding the carrot with the left hand.

To help understand the logic of why a cook has to use the right thumb, the teacher first demonstrates a wrong way and compares to it the right way.\(^{43}\) In line 3, while demonstrating one wrong way of “not supporting the knife with a right thumb” in the air, the teacher asks a question (“Then, [if you] cut this way and you cut your hand, what are you going to do?”). This is to warn of the dangerous consequence of the action, if the right thumb is not used; the student will cut his finger. At the end of the turn, the teacher shifts her gaze from the object to the student’s face. By doing so, she makes relevant the student's response and checks his understanding within the participation framework. In response to the teacher’s explanation, the student immediately shows

\(^{43}\) In corrective teaching sequences, teachers frequently quote students’ bodies in order to contrast correct and incorrect performance (Keevallik, 2013). In dance class, as students’ body movements are momentary and fleeting, a teacher recreates the perished movement of a student's prior turn by bodily quotation of the student's performance. The teacher performs correction of the bodily quoting as soon as she identifies the student's problematic area, so that she can connect the sequence to her pedagogical purpose. Decomposition, highlighting and exaggeration are common techniques that teachers use.
his understanding of danger by nodding and acknowledgment in line 4.

Presupposing mutual understanding as to the function of the right thumb from the student’s response in line 4, the teacher uses *ku-ci* to mark a boundary between the two activities (line 5). This action is intended to show the termination of one action sequence, demonstrating “an incorrect way” to explain the function of the right thumb. A boundary account (Tulbert & Goodwin, 2011) in lines 5a-7 follows after the boundary marker (“Then (I) told (you) to balance with this (=right) hand… Hold this (=a knife) with this hand”). The teacher is moving on to a new sequence, “a correct way of peeling the carrot.” This *ku-ci* functions to segment two different activities within the instructions. After the terminating marker, while peeling the carrot in a correct way, she emphasizes her instruction (line 6-7) by rephrasing her previous utterance (5a).

The teacher uses *ku-ci* instead of the visible outcome/recognition of the teacher’s action+ci in this case, as the teacher has nothing to show or let the student recognize (c.f., In 5.5.3 the teacher has the visible object to show [e.g., chopping garlic] or to connect to the student’s epistemic domain [e.g., tasting garlic]). The teacher is demonstrating the wrong way to peel in the air in a prior turn before *ku-ci*. As she is performs the demonstrations in the air, rather than peeling an actual carrot, she does not have physical outcome to show and cannot use the format “showing action/visible outcome +ci” format.

**5.5.5 Kuci: a Marker to Terminate One Sequence of an Instruction and Move on to the Next Ingredient**

Similar to the previous *ku-ci* sequence in Section 5.5.4, *ku-ci* in Section 5.5.5 is used as a
marker to terminate one sequence of an instruction and move on to the next ingredient.

cs vb garlic

30 T: pap mekta-ka manhi ssip-hi-myen kipwun nappu-ci?
    rice eat-while much chew-CAS-if feeling bad-COMM
    ‘(When you) eat meals, if you taste big chunks of garlic, you feel bad, ci?’

31 S: ney. hhh
    yes.
    ‘Yes. hhh’

32 kulayse cak-key almayngi-lo mantul-e-cwu-nun-ke-ya. ca:
    So small-so that bits-DR make-INT-give-RL-thing-INT. well
    ‘So that’s why (we make the garlic) into small pieces. Then’

33 S: ney.
    yes.
    ‘Yes’

34 T: kulayse kop-key taci-e-cwu-nun-ke-ya.
    so, delicate-so chop-INF-give-RL-thing-INT.
    ‘So, (you have to) mince them delicately.’
The teacher is demonstrating how to chop garlic into tiny pieces, and explaining why they need to do that in lines 30-32 (“a person could feel bad when he bites into a big chunk of garlic”). Then, she emphasizes the action of “mincing delicately” (line 34) by rephrasing the previous utterance from line 32 (“making the garlic into small bits”). After the teacher’s detailed explanation, the student shows his understanding by nodding. After ku-ci in line 36, the teacher moves on to the next step: instruction on how to trim green onions. By using ku-ci, she implies that now that she is finished with the garlic and is commencing instruction involving a different ingredient, green onions.

The two types of ci, (1) statement+ci as one sentence and (2) statement+ additional kuci, function similarly in marking sequence boundaries. However, the former type of ci endings creates boundaries within work on the same object across multiple turns. The tag question implies that what is done in the first action is a prerequisite for the next one. For example, while working on the same garlic, she demonstrates how the garlic gradually changes into tiny pieces step-by-step for the novice, and inserts ci in the middle.

In contrast, kuci, a tag question unit that can stand alone, is employed to create
boundaries between two different activities in terms of ingredients. For example, the teacher uses *kuci* when she is finished working on the garlic, and teaching how to work on green onions (see Figure 5.2). Another minor difference is that *ku-ci* does not necessarily require student’s acknowledgement, whereas the previous *–ci* ending is systematically followed by the student’s acknowledgment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working object in Activity 1</th>
<th>Boundary marker</th>
<th>Working object in Activity 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5.5.4</strong></td>
<td>None in demonstrating incorrect way in the air</td>
<td><em>kuci</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5.5.5</strong></td>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td><em>kuci</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.2 How *kuci* is used across activities with different ingredients*

### 5.6 Conclusion

In sum, the present chapter attempts to test the interactional functions of a tag question with committal *ci* in Korean at a cooking institution. It is found that in some cases, the particle functions to help the student recognize the action/visible outcome of the teacher’s action in a prior turn. That is because the novice now knows how to see the world or how to use his body. The student has to recognize the professional negative stance toward the garlic, as well as observable physical things present in the kitchen.

The grammatical feature reinforces the student’s claim of recognition, and indexes different actions in boundaries. In this way, the teacher receives information from the student and
moves back to the K+ position as an epistemic authority (Heritage, 2013). By incrementally taking into account what each other is expected to know, the two participants can build up intersubjectivity gradually in order to properly carry out the activity. *Ku-ci* is used as a marker to terminate one action and moves to another action. Also, the teacher uses multimodality including gaze, pointing gestures, and holding and showing the material for pedagogical purpose.

The present study opens up areas for future study; analysis of nonverbal components, such as gesture and prosody, are needed, as cooking activity involves physical interactions between participants and materials in the local environment. It would be interesting in the future to examine the rising intonation of the teacher’s question ending, which elicits the student’s response, and to look at how prosody influences the student’s immediate following action. Also, *ca* (‘well’) in turn-beginning position is another particle to pay attention to, as the teacher frequently uses it to segment instruction activities.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of the Dissertation

This dissertation has attempted to analyze how Korean grammar organizes the attention, talk, bodies of actors and objects in the course of co-operative interactions. Participants build action by performing operations on what others have said or done in a prior turn (Goodwin, 2013). I investigated one-on-one cooking lessons in two different contexts: (1) interactions between two friends, and (2) interactions between a teacher and students at a professional cooking school in Korea (see Chapter 2 for a comparison of the two contexts). I was inspired to pursue this topic for my dissertation by theories and studies from diverse fields (e.g., CA, linguistic anthropology, cognitive science, Korean linguistics), grounded in my belief in the interactionist perspective (Streek, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). Human interactions, especially those that include both talk and the body, are intrinsically complex, and can be studied using a range of techniques developed in different fields.

In the current study, the participants under consideration are engaged in courses of action, while at the same time monitoring both each other’s bodies (Goffman, 1964; M. H. Goodwin, 1980; M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013), and relevant objects in the material world. These focal objects are constituted through unfolding action, and interactions that encompass both talk and actions being performed by participants’ bodies. All of these are embedded in specific activities (e.g., the teacher’s chopsticks flipping the fried fish, the better to see and evaluate, the student’s leaning torso approaching the boiling pot with rice to smell it better). Moreover, the current state
of certain objects is seen as demonstrating the competence/incompetence or the success/failure of
the person who produced them (e.g., sticky garlic powder indicating improper use of the paper
towel). Therefore, I examine not only interactions beyond language, but also how people
interact with each other via relevant items such as tools and ingredients in the world around them.

Chapter 3 demonstrated how ilehkey (‘like this’/‘this way’) near the beginning of a turn
organized the attention of participants in instructions within interactions between friends. It was
found that both teacher and student used the deictic term with reference to the working hand.
Several patterns appeared in the teacher’s utterances.

First, the teacher used the deictic term at the beginning of the turn, looking at her working
hand during her physical demonstration. The deictic term and the shifting gaze point at the
working hand to tell the novice where to look and to show that the hand is the explicit focus of
attention. Second, within the teacher’s turn, there was a systemic pattern as well. The sentence
was composed of (1) the deictic term, (2) a verbal description of the action broken down
sequentially, as well as an actual demonstration. Talk and the body supported each other in the
teacher’s instruction utterance. Third, a system emerged to govern the shifting gaze. The teacher
would look at her own hand while uttering the deictic term and then look at the student’s face to
check her understanding and cue her that it was then the student’s turn to perform.

On the other hand, the student used the deictic term to show her working hand and
understanding. The student looked at her working hand during her performance, uttering the
deictic as the teacher did, but for a different reason. Both participants used the deictic term to
refer to their working hand. Through the deictic term, the interlocutors showed each other how to
do something, and demonstrated understanding on what others were saying or doing.
Chapter 4 explored how the same deictic term (‘like this’/‘this way’) is deployed between a student and teacher in a professional culinary setting. In an evaluation sequence, the deictic term was used to point out two things: the student’s mistake in a prior turn and the student’s food, evidence of the mistake in a current turn. The deictic organized the student’s attention and indicated a negative stance of the teacher towards the student alongside other resources, such as a tapping sound, pointing gesture and particular grammatical structure (deictic term at the beginning, characteristic of action).

In chapter 5, I showed how the suffix *ci* at the end of the teacher’s utterance, similar to an English tag question, works as a boundary marker in demonstration. The teacher demonstrated how to handle small tasks such as how to see a knife, and how to trim garlic, while continuing her mini narrative. She described the concurrent action, where again, talk and body support each other, and her rationale for performing particular actions. By reinforcing acknowledgement, although in the form of a claim of understanding, the teacher was able to make sure the participants were on the same page, and therefore cement one action to another.

6.2 Future Studies

For my future studies, I would like to examine the interactive process of calibrating both sensory experience and moral dimensions in the assessment of food. In my data, I observed that a skilled person and novice negotiate what constitutes a successful property of the food in the assessment activity by using different sensory experiences, such as taste (Ochs, Pontecorvo, & Fasulo, 1996), touch (M. H. Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013), and aesthetic criteria such as thickness, and color (Goodwin, 1997).

Crucially, the qualities of the food (e.g., thickness of fried fish, color of soup) are seen as
reflecting the competence of the person who produces them. This reflects the moral dimension of the student as a member of the cooking community. For example, the student’s food is not a mere object, but functionally demonstrates the student’s understanding and skill. Thus, if the food is not good, it means that he or she is not a good student. Constant comparison between good and bad examples of food are made by the teacher to help a novice understand how to improve, and manifest his skills in the form of food. Through these practices, the students learn how to evaluate food as a competent cook; they acquire the practices required to both create food with proper taste, size, thickness, etc. according to the norms they will be evaluated on, and to receive their certification as cooks.

Also, I would like to investigate intonation in interactions. Prosody is a crucial interactional resource and has benefitted from important analysis from a number of scholars (Couper-Kuhlen, 1986; Selting, 1996; Wells, B. & Peppe, 1996). The prosodic contour of a particular token shows a stance of a speaker (Local, 1996; Muller, 1996). In my cooking data, I observed that teachers frequently indicate their stance towards the student and the food through prosody and other embodied displays. Therefore, it would be meaningful to study how prosody functions as one of the communicative resources in the midst of interactions.

While I Investigated ilehkey and ci, the examples are rather limited. Therefore, it would be more convincing in a future study to add a frequency analysis, particularly as concerns the use of various and differing deictic expressions in Korean.

6.3 Concluding Remarks
I have analyzed how the Korean deictic term, ilehkey (‘like this’), organized the attention of participants in ways that made possible the acquisition and calibration of crucial embodied skills. Moreover, the teacher’s committal particle ci (right?) at the turn-ending position revealed that grammar organizes interactions. People act upon the world together, meaning they have to locate consequential phenomena and be in a position where everything that the teacher has proposed should be done has been done. Using video-data, I showed the importance of embodiment and context by investigating not only talk, but also the actors’ bodies and interactions with objects in the kitchen setting. In cooking sequences involving demonstration and evaluation, the actor’s bodies and tools in the local environment played an important role as the participants constantly see and monitor each other’s bodies in order to carry out the cooking activity. Before they take action, competent participants must scrutinize objects through not only vision but also touch and other sensory modalities in order to achieve a form of professional vision (Goodwin, 1994), and the embodied skills of a cook.

The current study broadens our understanding of interactions in several fields, including Korean linguistics, talk-in-interaction, and cultural studies. Also, the study contributes to a broader discussion of workplace interactions: how an expert trains a novice to become a competent member of the society. Through a lamination of speech, body (e.g., hands, leaning torso, eyes and tongue), and manipulation of objects, the participants demonstrated their understanding of embodied skills. The study provides a framework for the analysis of deictic terms that moves beyond the stream of speech. Indeed, further multimodal studies in diverse settings and languages should be conducted in order to better understand the mechanisms underlying complicated human interactions that are entailed in processes of instruction.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE KOREAN GLOSS (Sohn, 1999)\textsuperscript{44}

AC = Accusative particle; COMM = Committal; DC = Declarative sentence-type suffix; DR = Directional particle; IM = Imperative sentence-type suffix; INF = Infinitive suffix; INT = Intimate Speech level or suffix; NOM = Nominalizer suffix; POL = Polite speech level, suffix, or particle; PRS = Prospective modal suffix; PST = Past tense and perfect aspect suffix; QT = Quotative particle; RL = Relativizer or adnominal modifier suffix

\textsuperscript{44} I added COMM.
APPENDIX B

LIST OF TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Transcription conventions are those outlined by Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974)

[ ] Point of overlap onset

] Point of overlap termination

= No gaps between two turns

. Falling intonation

? Rising intonation

, Continuation intonation

(0.4) Length of silence in seconds

(.) Short pause

word Emphasis

:: Stretching of the sound

- Cut-off

(?) The speaker said something, but the transcriber cannot hear

(word) The transcriber’s best guess on a word
fff Outbreath

(( )) The transcriber’s description of action
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