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Note on transcriptions

Romanization of Korean

Romanization of Korean in data and examples follows the conventions of the Yale system. The same system is also used for the titles of books, papers, academic organizations, etc. Other proper nouns, including personal names, are transcribed according to the given spelling, when available; otherwise, I apply the McCune-Reischauer system. When referring in the text to authors with Korean surnames and given names, I include the given name as well for purposes of disambiguation between the vast numbers of Korean scholars sharing the same family names.

For matters of convenience, I write all Korean names in the original Korean order of surname – given name, hyphenating different syllables in the given name, but only capitalizing the first letter of the first syllable. I apologize for instances in which this differs from the preferred system individual authors may have for presenting their names in Romanization.

Transcription of conversation data

I adopt from Lee Hyo-sang (1991: 71) the convention of transcribing Korean in “utterance units”. The “utterance unit” represents the spoken equivalent of a sentence. In Korean, this can typically be recognized by the fact that each “utterance unit” (and each sentence) is rounded-off by a speech style ending. This thus represents the most convenient unit of analysis for researchers looking at the use of speech styles, or other sentence-final endings. Apart from this, conversational data is transcribed according to a simplified version of the usual conventions of Conversation Analysis (see below).

Conventions applied in conversation analysis transcriptions

Overlapping

[discourse]
[discourse]
Latched

Pauses (short pause of 1 second or less)
  (2 second pause)
Prolongation (1 second or less)
  (2 seconds)
Interruption
Inaudible
Other actions
Phenomenon under observation

discourse=
=discourse

Abbreviations used in glosses

ACC accusative case marker
DAT dative case marker
DEC declarative
DN dependant noun
COND conditional
HON honorific form
IMP imperative
INT interrogative
MOD modality marker
NOM nominative case marker
OHON object honorific form
PLA plain non-honorific form
PAST past tense marker
POS possessive
SHON subject honorific form
SUG suggestive
TOP topic marker
VOC vocative
{T} {T} speech style
{E} {E} speech style
{N} {N} speech style
{S} {S} speech style
{Y} {Y} speech style
{P} {P} speech style

({T} {T} speech style
{(laughs))
((gets out cutting board))

→
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Objectives

This is an interlanguage pragmatics study using mixed methodology to investigate the use of Korean honorifics by second-language (L2) speakers of Korean from "Western" backgrounds. The study analyzes DCT (discourse completion test), role-play, natural conversation and interview/introspection ("learner story") data collected from 20 speakers sojourning or residing in South Korea. The data shows that these speakers, despite their proficiency in Korean, often applied honorifics in ways that differed from local "norms". I set out to determine the extent to which these differences were due to deficiencies in knowledge per se, or otherwise the result of the speakers' identities as "Westerners" and "foreigners". It was found that the competence these L2 speakers developed regarding honorifics was greatly influenced by ideologies pertaining to what it meant to "be polite" and "show respect" and – more broadly – the differences between Korean and Western modes of politeness and social behavior. In addition, the different identities available to L2 speakers of different occupational and ethnic groups were found to have important influences on the kind of "honorifics competence" that they developed.

The Korean honorifics system, of which I provide a thorough description in Chapter 2, has long been considered one of the most complex and important areas of Korean language acquisition. Regarding complexity, the structure of the Korean language forces speakers into considering their relationship with the interlocutor and sentence referents in every single utterance – an explicit choice that has no direct equivalent in many of the world's languages. Sohn (1989) quotes honorifics as amongst the reasons for Korean being classified as a category 4 language (i.e. most difficult for English native speakers) by the Defense Language Institute (DLI) in the USA.

Regarding the importance for L2 learners of mastering this area of Korean, Hwang (1975:181) notes that "very often foreigners who speak Korean [and] fail to use speech levels appropriate to the situation are treated as if they were mentally immature by Koreans." Learners of more advanced ability – such as those participating in the current study – have been shown to be particularly open to negative evaluation from native speakers. Advanced learners cannot fall back on
a lack of organizational proficiency as a mitigating factor for impoliteness and are judged more harshly by native speakers for violating norms of interaction (cf. Enomoto and Marriott 1994).

Despite the difficulty and importance attached to this aspect of Korean, the current study finds that previous research into the acquisition, development or usage of honorifics in L2 Korean to be limited (see Section 1.2 below). What research there is tends to approach honorifics merely as an organizational or grammatical feature of the language, which can be acquired in the same way, for example, as TAM markers, case particles or relative clauses. The problems that learners experience applying appropriate honorifics are treated as grammatical errors, with learner utterances being judged against rigid and prescriptive norms. In opposition to the static view of honorifics that has been adopted in previous research, the current study takes the position that use of honorifics is always and undeniably linked to social and cultural factors. From this view, the learning of honorifics does not merely constitute the learning of a language system, but the negotiation of sociopragmatic knowledge and questions of what it means to use language appropriately and to be a “polite” speaker. With honorifics indexing social roles and relationships, use of honorifics also plays an active role in the process of identity negotiation that accompanies the learning of a second language.

As well as filling a sizeable gap in the literature on Korean honorifics acquisition, this book tackles a concrete problem central to current research in interlanguage pragmatics. This problem regards the development of knowledge pertaining to pragmatics and politeness and the relationship this knowledge has to the way that L2 speakers actually use language. The interlanguage pragmatics literature suggests that acquiring knowledge regarding the contexts in which it is polite to apply pragmatics features is not a straightforward process for L2 speakers. Not only is such knowledge particularly open to transfer from the L1 (first language), but developing accurate representations is complicated by tendencies for L2 speakers to over- or under-generalize such knowledge and also for pragmatic features to be misrepresented in the language classroom. Moreover, pragmatic knowledge in itself, it would seem, is not sufficient for speakers of a second language to simply go out and use the language just like a native speaker. On this point, Siegal (1994 – acquisition of Japanese) and Du Fon (1999 – Indonesian) have claimed that learners may be unwilling to replicate local community norms when doing so would be incongruent with their own identity or “face”. Of particular significance, Du Fon’s study showed that personal beliefs regarding human interaction and politeness influence learners’ usage of pragmatic features and the way they choose to present themselves in the target culture. Given the strong connections (at least on the common sense or ideological level) between using honorifics correctly and “doing politeness Korean-style”, it was posited that the
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notion of "politeness" may represent a particularly powerful tool for explicating the attitudes towards as well as use and ultimately acquisition of honorifics by L2 learners. Put simply, could it be that L2 speakers of Korean stray from L1 norms in their usage of honorifics due to differing ways of conceptualizing what it means to "speak politely"? Such a premise seemed to hold particular weight in light of previous research such as Yoon Kyung-joo (2004) emphasizing the ideological force in Korean culture given to values such as kyenglosasang (敬老思想; 'respecting the elderly') that stress the importance of maintaining a markedly hierarchical social structure and the obvious differences with the egalitarian ideals of the Western societies from which the learners participating in the current project came from.

The goals and research questions for this book are stated as follows:

1. **Analyze the knowledge that L2 speakers have of the Korean honorifics system**
   How does the honorific competence of L2 speakers compare to L1 speakers? What factors influence the development of this knowledge?

2. **Assess the affects of social identity on the development of honorifics**
   Is the use of honorifics tied to the social identity of L2 speakers? Do different L2 speaker identities result in different usages of honorifics?

3. **Evaluate the effects of ideology regarding politeness on development of honorifics**
   To what extent do L2 speakers' conceptualizations and ideologies of politeness influence their perceptions and use of honorifics?

The structure of the book can be summarized as follows. In Chapter 2, I introduce the Korean honorifics system and the pragmatic features that influence its usage. Following this, Chapter 3 establishes the position of honorifics vis-à-vis notions of politeness and outlines the approach adopted towards politeness in the current research. In Chapter 4, I provide the interlanguage pragmatics and language acquisition framework that I use to analyze the development of pragmatic competence in honorifics. Chapters 5 to 8 constitute the data analysis chapters. I analyze four types of data collected during fieldwork in South Korea: DCT, role-play, natural conversation and "learner stories". Finally, in Chapter 9, I draw together the main themes emerging in the data, summarize the findings and discuss the implications for interlanguage pragmatics and politeness research.

The current chapter – the introduction – provides the contextual and methodological background to the study. Section 2 briefly outlines previous approaches taken by researchers looking at the acquisition of Korean honorifics. I contrast these with the interlanguage pragmatics approach adopted in the current study,
which I introduce in Section 1.3. Section 1.4 consists of an overview of methodology. Finally, in Section 1.5, I explain terminology adopted throughout the book.

1.2 Previous approaches to the acquisition of Korean honorifics

The honorifics system has proven a popular topic for those carrying out research into the acquisition of Korean. However, as mentioned above, such research has rarely been concerned with pragmatic or socio-cultural issues. In this section, I briefly review two previous approaches to Korean honorifics acquisition research: error analysis studies and textbook studies. I then consider the recent emergence of pragmatic approaches to the problem.

**Error analysis studies** employ written composition or survey data to compare learner performance against prescriptive L1 norms. Lee Ji-Young (1990), Kim-Jung-hee (1998), Park Sun-min (1994) and Lee Mi-seon (1997) use DCT data from large samples (190, 93, 81 and 24 subjects respectively) to analyze use and comprehension of honorific forms. Park Kyung-ja (1996) uses a smaller sample—eight speakers—to examine honorific forms occurring in the compositions of heritage learners. These studies successfully identify a number of key trends regarding the honorifics use of L2 speakers, as shall be discussed later in this book. However, the crucial weakness of these studies is their application of over-prescriptive norms in the judgment as to what constitutes “appropriate” honorifics usage. As an example of this, any sentences referring to fathers, grandfathers, teachers, etc. that do not include referent honorifics are treated as “errors”. As will be discussed in Chapter 2, in natural conversation, there are numerous situations in which native speakers may omit honorific forms even when referring to notable superiors. The treatment of all such sentences as incorrect thus poses serious questions as to the validity of error analysis methodology for the study of honorifics acquisition.

**Textbook studies** have concentrated on analyzing the honorifics that appear in Korean language teaching materials and commenting on their authenticity or usefulness. Choo Mi-ho (1999) strongly criticizes textbooks for “intimidating students” though continuous comments that honorifics are “enormously complex and difficult” without providing any systematic explanation of how the system actually works! (Choo 1999:78). Lee On-kyeong (2005) compares the honorifics featured in five textbook series with that appearing in Korean TV dramas and criticizes the former for its lack of authenticity. Kim Soo-jong (1999a, 1999b) and Fousser (2005) consider the order in which different honorific forms appear. Yeon Jae-hoon (1996) is particularly critical of the confusing terminology used in the presentation of honorifics in Korean textbooks. Going beyond these studies,
Brown (2010a) argues that the “inauthentic” presentation of honorifics in Korean textbooks betrays certain preconceptions regarding the way that “foreigners” may perceive and use honorifics, a point which I return to in this book’s concluding chapter. Although these studies provide a useful critique of the treatment of honorifics within KSL, they tell us little about how these forms are actually acquired.

In recent years, pragmatics has begun to assert an influence in Korean language acquisition research, and this has slowly been reflected in the emergence of a more function-oriented approach to honorifics. Han Sang-mee’s (2005: 102–108) study of pragmatic failure and communication problems in staged NS-NNS interactions includes a lengthy section on honorifics. Andrew Byon includes discussion of the role of honorifics in his extensive work into Korean requests both in native speaker (2006) and non-native speaker (2002, 2004) DCT data. Byon (2003) furthermore looks at the role of the speech style ending -yo as a tool for socialization in teacher-student conversations in Korean language classes for heritage speakers. Yoon Keum-sil (1996) and Kang (2003) consider the function of honorifics in Korean-English code-switching by bilingual Korean-Americans. Both studies claim that switches from English into Korean can be explained by the circumstantial need to (re-)confirm Korean power or distance relationships and Korean identity. No other researchers to date have applied naturally occurring data to investigate the honorifics use of non-heritage learners.

Explicit discussion of methodology for teaching honorifics has also been infrequent, although the topic is broached in Byon (2000, 2007). Byon (2000) emphasizes the importance of interaction, authentic texts and linking classroom learning to the needs of language learners and their real-world experiences, while Byon (2007) discusses specific methodology for the teaching of the “polite” and “deferential” styles. I return to the arguments made by Byon in the conclusion chapter, where I discuss the implications of the study for how honorifics should be taught in the KSL (Korean as a Second Language) classroom.

1.3 An interlanguage pragmatics approach

Conceived in the early 1980s (Barron 2003: 3), interlanguage pragmatics is a discipline concerned with “the study of nonnative speaker use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge” (Kasper and Rose 1999: 81). Put simply, it is the study of “how to do things with words’ (Austin) in a second language” (Kasper 1998: 184). As pointed out by Barron (2003: 27), interlanguage pragmatics has two parent disciplines: cross-cultural pragmatics and second language acquisition (SLA). For better or for worse, the influence of the former is often felt more keenly than the latter. In other words, researchers have more often looked at language use rather
than acquisition directly and have talked of "speakers" and "users" rather than "learners" (Barron 2003:27). Moreover, interlanguage pragmatics has developed an approach quite distinct from that of mainstream SLA.

From an interlanguage pragmatics perspective, language learning is not seen just as a cognitive process that takes place inside the heads of individuals, but as a socially constructed activity that cannot be separated from the context in which it takes place. Interlanguage pragmatics increasingly feeds into theories of socialization (Ochs 1988) and the tradition of sociocultural theory (Vygotsky 1986; Luria 1976; Leontyev 1981 and more recently Wertsch 1991, 1998). Linguistic development occurs - not just through memorizing, practicing or even exposure to the target language - but ultimately through participating in the "community of practice" in which the language is spoken (Lave and Wenger 1991) and learning the associations between linguistic structures and social meanings that exist in this community (Cook 2008:33). According to Lave and Wenger (1991), such participation begins with the "peripheral participation" that is afforded to newcomers or less competent members; linguistic development takes place as the novice transitions to become a more competent member of the community. In this view, language is situated and negotiated in social interaction with linguistic knowledge being inextricably connected to socio-cultural knowledge.

The view that language development is intrinsically connected to social factors, context and interaction permits the adoption of different methodologies to more traditional SLA research. In its early stages, interlanguage pragmatics relied heavily on the DCT (Discourse Completion Test) to explore the production of pragmatics, particularly speech acts. Although DCTs remain popular, in more recent years, a strong movement has emerged towards using naturalistic methods that capture the contextual dependence of language use and the co-construction of meaning from a more emic (i.e. user-oriented) perspective. The application of conversational analysis (CA) has proven particularly relevant since the publication of the seminal paper by exponents Firth and Wagner (1997). However, both CA and the approach it advocates remain controversial for SLA traditionalists (see Kasper 1997; Long 1997; Poulisse 1997; Gass 1998). In particular, cognitive theorists have questioned whether the study of language use can really tell us anything about how languages are actually acquired - language use and language acquisition are "apples and oranges", as Gass (1998) claims.

Despite such opposition, the research of language use as a window on how languages are learned has resonated well with those pursuing a more pragmatically or socially oriented perspective on language acquisition. Indeed, the popularity of CA in state-of-the-art interlanguage pragmatics research was underlined at the 17th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning (University of Hawaii, March 26-28 2007), where over half of all papers presented utilized
some form conversational data.\textsuperscript{1} CA supporters such as Markee (2000) and Block (2003) have also hit back at those criticizing the suitability of CA for SLA. According to Markee, researching “language in action” is directly relevant to the study of how languages are acquired if we accept the view that cognition and learning are not solely individual phenomena, but are also socially distributed. The current book supports this perspective and adopts a belief that critical research into the way languages are used by L2 speakers may provide crucial evidence for the processes involved in their development and learning.

One key point on which interlanguage pragmatics differs from more traditional grammar-focused SLA is the treatment of “errors”. In pragmatics, the term “error” has been replaced by “failure” to recognize the fact that the “rules” of pragmatics tend to be probable rather than categorical (Thomas 1983). However, the treatment of such failures is complicated by two concerns. Firstly, whereas in the study of L2 grammar, errors may be treated as having more or less equal importance, the same cannot apply for pragmatic failures. Some instances of pragmatic failure may represent language use that is “different”, but not necessarily negatively marked. Other instances, however, may result in a loss of face for the interlocutor or stigmatization of the speaker as ignorant, rude, etc.

In addition, whereas comparison of L2 grammatical performance against L1 usage is – at least largely speaking – unproblematic, the application of such “norms” to pragmatics is akin to opening a can of worms. The first problem is establishing the “norm”. Not only is inter-speaker (not to mention inter-group) variation keenly felt in pragmatics, but intra-speaker variation is also widely attested. In other words, an individual speaker may choose to perform the same speech act, etc. in different ways on different occasions, even when contextual factors remain the same.

The second problem is that whereas L2 learners may often aspire to L1 norms when it comes to grammar, the same is not necessarily the case for pragmatics. L2 speakers may actively choose to stray from L1 norms when, for example, adhering to such linguistic behavior compromises their conversational goals, identity or ideologies. In interlanguage pragmatics, the L2 learner is no longer seen as a “deficient communicator … striving to reach the target competence of an idealized NS [native speaker]” (Firth and Wagner 1997: 295) but as a speaker in his/her own right capable of exploiting language for his/her own ends. As a result, even though interlanguage pragmatics studies may compare the performance of L2 speakers with that of native speakers, it is recognized that L2 speakers may possess logical cultural, social or strategic motivations to differ from native speaker norms.

\textsuperscript{1} Based on paper abstracts in conference proceedings, 63 out of 108 papers used or appeared to use some form of CA methodology.
1.4 Overview of methodology

I now provide an introduction to the participants and data collection techniques employed in this book. More specific information regarding methodology is included in Chapters 5–8, where the different datasets are analyzed.

1.4.1 Participants

20 second-language (L2) speakers from “Western” backgrounds and 40 first-language (L1) speakers provided data for this book. In addition, 18 L2 and 47 L1 speakers participated in pilot studies in which the DCTs and role-plays were developed. In this section, I provide details regarding the 20 L2 speakers who provided the bulk of data for this project. All of the participants had studied Korean to an advanced level and were residing in Seoul at the time of data collection. Tables 1, 2 and 3 list specific information regarding the individual participants in the current study.

It should first of all be noted that, although I label the participants in the study as being from “Western” backgrounds, my use of “Western” does not entail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>white British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>white Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>white Austrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CHOL</td>
<td>exchange student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>MA student</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>white Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>visiting PhD student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>white Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>MA student</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>MA student</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>white American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>voice actor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>uni. Eng. teacher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Korean/white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>high sch. Eng. teacher</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Korean/Afro-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>high sch. Eng. teacher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>high sch. Eng. teacher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
any particular ethnicity or nationality. Rather, I use the term in a broad sense to include those educated and raised in (as well as strictly native to) European, American and Australasian countries. Although "Westerner" was not necessarily the only or even the primary term by which all of these participants would describe themselves, the results of the project show that the socialization that all of these speakers had undergone in Western society had shaped (or at least had played a major role in shaping) the assumptions they held regarding human interaction. In terms of nationality, the following national groups were represented: USA (9 participants), UK (2), Canada (2), Australia (2), Japan (2), New Zealand (1), Austria (1), and Ukraine (1). In terms of ethnic background, half of the participants were “heritage” learners of Korean descent (see below). Crucially, the
Table 3. Summary of participants (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Socializing, friendships</th>
<th>Motivations for taking up Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>Kor friends, some with exchange students (Eng/Kor)</td>
<td>Korean girlfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>Japanese exchange studs (in Kor), some with Kor friends</td>
<td>parental pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>Kor friends, some with exchange students (Eng/Kor)</td>
<td>Korean brother-in-law; interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-C.</td>
<td>both Kor and exchange students (Eng/Kor)</td>
<td>extended family pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>exchange students (Eng/Kor), some with Kor friends</td>
<td>linguistic interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>exchange students (Eng/Kor), some with Kor friends</td>
<td>interest in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>Kor friends, girlfriend, some with exchange students (E &amp; K)</td>
<td>interest in Korean films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>Kor friends, girlfriend, some with exchange students (E &amp; K)</td>
<td>interest in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>exchange students or Kor-Am friends (E &amp; K), some with Kor</td>
<td>affirm Korean identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-C.</td>
<td>almost entirely with Kor friends</td>
<td>talk with Korean family, friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>non-Kor friends, Tibetan husband, some with Kor friends</td>
<td>communicate, interest in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>interest in Korea, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATT.</td>
<td>both Kor and non-Kor friends, including Kor fiancée</td>
<td>communicate, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>with both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>communicate, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>with both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>for fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>with both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>reaffirm Korean identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>with both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>talk with Korean family, friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>with both Kor and non-Kor friends</td>
<td>reaffirm Korean identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS.</td>
<td>mostly with non-Kor friends</td>
<td>parental pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>mostly with non-Kor friends</td>
<td>talk with Korean family, friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

two Japanese nationals had lived in the UK from secondary school age and had therefore received lengthy socialization in a Western context. All of the participants with the exception of the one Ukrainian had been educated at universities in English-speaking countries (UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand). The interview sessions revealed that the Japanese, German and Ukrainian speakers claimed an advantage over the English speakers when it came to honorifics use based on the fact that their native languages had a developed honorifics system (in the case of Japanese) or a T/V second person pronoun distinction (in the case
of German and Russian). However, the data does not show any strong evidence that these speakers were more accurate users of honorifics. In fact, the analysis suggests that even the Japanese speakers struggled to apply honorifics according to strict hierarchical patterns due to the influence of the more horizontal Western social structure in which they had been socialized. These Japanese speakers both admitted that they experienced at least some difficulty in applying honorifics in Japanese as well, having been absent from their native country for an extended period of time.

The 20 L2 participants reflect a variety of backgrounds and learning experiences. However, for purposes of general analysis I divide them into two broad occupation groups: (1) exchange students and (2) professionals (workers and graduate students). Analysis of the data shows that these two contrasting occupation-based identities had the largest impact on the kind of competence in honorifics that speakers developed and was more influential than other aspects of their identity, including their ethnicity. Not only did these two groups differ in their purposes for being in Korea and learning the language, but also in the roles available for them in Korean society (see Chapter 4), age and period of sojourn. The exchange students were aged 19–25 and were at least six months into what was typically either a one- or two-year stay in Korea. The professionals were aged 25–35 and had all lived in Korea for between two and five years, except for two participants who had been in Korea for nine years. The exchange students had all learned Korean intensively before coming to Korea and were enrolled in a full-time Korean language program at a well-known university in Seoul. The professionals group included five graduate students, who were either enrolled in post-grad programs or were visiting researchers, and five workers, who were all employed in English language-related work such as teaching, editing and voice-acting. These participants had generally learned Korean in South Korea through a combination of evening classes, private study and naturalistic learning. Although most speakers in this second group had learned Korean "longer", this did not necessarily correlate with higher proficiency. The exchange students enjoyed the advantages of having more apparent aptitude for language study (for the majority, Korean was a third or fourth language), receiving more intensive Korean language training and of being in an environment more conducive to establishing casual friendships with Koreans.

As mentioned above, the participants included equal numbers of heritage and non-heritage speakers. All of the heritage speakers had enjoyed some exposure to Korean from an early age, but had had to (re)-learn the language as adults through

---

2. The Ukrainian participant reported that his first language was Russian rather than Ukrainian.
KSL (Korean as a Second Language) classes. Eight of the heritage learners were of pure Korean ancestry; two were of mixed ethnicity (Korean/German-American and Korean/African-American). Except for these two mixed-ethnicity speakers and one of the pure Korean ethnicity speakers, the remaining heritage speakers benefited from near-native control of pronunciation. However, the impression of fluency that this created proved deceptive in that it masked a knowledge of vocabulary, advanced grammar and pragmatics equal or at times inferior to that of the non-heritage speakers. The “heritage speaker” identity entailed a higher expectancy that speakers would follow local interactional norms and also resulted in more chances to interact with Koreans. However, heritage speakers are shown not always to be willing or able to make the most of such apparent advantages. I discuss the connection between different ethnic as well as occupational identities and the opportunities for participation that they entailed in more depth in Chapter 4. My decision to analyze the data primarily in relation to occupational group and only secondarily in relation to ethnicity is motivated by the fact that the latter was shown to have the largest influence on honorifics use. However, I include discussion of key differences between heritage and non-heritage speakers throughout the data analysis.

Regarding the language proficiency of the speakers participating in the study, as mentioned above, all had studied Korean to an advanced level. In terms of ACTFL proficiency guidelines, analysis of the recorded data shows that the proficiency level ranged from advanced low through to advanced high. Within these general parameters, however, there is reason to think that the competence of the heritage learners may have differed somewhat to that of the non-heritage speakers. Firstly, as mentioned above, the heritage learners generally commanded more native-like pronunciation, but were equal or weaker than the non-heritage speakers in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pragmatics. In addition, it may have been the case that the heritage learners were not as strong as the non-heritage learners in terms of reading and writing proficiency, which I did not assess.

It is important at this stage to comment on the relationship that the researcher maintained with the participants in the project. During the period of data collection, I was based in Seoul as a visiting research student. From this position, I tried as much as possible to present myself to the participants as a fellow student of Korean and as a fellow “foreigner” striving to cope with life in Korea. Where possible, I consciously avoided casting myself in the role of an “expert” or “teacher” or, more broadly, of someone who might be judgmental or critical of the participants’ language abilities or use.

I believe that my success in presenting myself in this way made a positive contribution to the data I was able to collect. During the interview sessions that I held with participants (see below), the participants, in general, appeared willing
to talk freely and frankly to me about the way they perceived the use of honorifics and about the experiences they had had in Korea, perhaps in a way they would not have done to a "teacher" or "expert" (or possibly to a native speaker of Korean). Ultimately, since I had also previously undergone similar experiences to these speakers (in addition to the year I spent in Korea for the data collection for this project, I had also previously spent five years living in Seoul, 1998–2003), my identity and the relationships I formed with the participants helped establish an "emic" approach to the data collection and subsequent analysis.

1.4.2 Data collection

The current study applies a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods and a cross-sectional research design. In this section, I outline the mandate for choosing these approaches and describe the data collection techniques that I applied.

The application in this study of quantitative and qualitative techniques is in line with the growing movement towards recognizing "mixed methods" as "a third approach in research methodology" alongside the use of quantitative or qualitative methods in isolation (Dörnyei 2007:42). According to Magnan (2006), mixed methods accounted for a sizeable 6.8% of research papers published in *The Modern Language Journal* for the period 1995–2005. Amongst the main proponents is Zoltan Dörnyei (2006, 2007, 2010), who argues that "it is possible to combine qualitative and quantitative methods in a way that brings out the best while cancels out the weaknesses of each method" (Dörnyei 2006). In other words, a combination of the two can fuse the precision and reliability of the former with the thick description of the latter. In addition, the fact that mixed methods allow for triangulation of data collected through different methodologies is thought to improve validity.

The application of mixed methods also correlates well with the movement in SLA research towards viewing language and its acquisition as a "complex dynamic system" (Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008). According to Dörnyei (2010), the use of mixed methods "suits the multi-level analysis of complex issues, because it allows investigators to obtain data about both the individual and the broader societal context". Along similar lines, Dörnyei (2007:45) argues that complex issues can often be best understood "by converging numerical trends from quantitative data and specific details from qualitative data".

I now comment on how these advantages of mixed methodology were factored into the research design of the current project. Quantitative data was collected by means of a discourse completion test (DCT), sat by both L1 and L2
speakers. This allowed for analysis of accurate baseline data regarding the honorifics competence of L2 speakers in comparison with L1 counterparts (Chapter 5). The general trends discovered in this data are then fleshed out through the analysis of qualitative data in Chapters 6–8, which furthermore allow for the contextualization of L2 honorifics usage with regards to the social identities and “politeness ideologies” of these speakers. Three kinds of quantitative data were collected: role-plays (Chapter 6), recordings of natural interactions (Chapter 7) and learner stories (Chapter 8). All of this L2 data was backed-up by interviews/introspection sessions, during which I questioned participants regarding their learning and use of honorifics. Comparison of the different data sets allows for triangulation of the findings; for example, collation of the elicited DCT and role-play data with the natural interactions enabled me to establish the extent to which performance on these tasks reflected real-world usage. The general structure of the study opens out from a quantitative analysis of L2 honorifics use in controlled environments into a qualitative study of how such uses are constructed through the socialization of these speakers into Korean society.

Table 4 summarizes the different data sets and the chapters in which their analyses can be found. In addition to the data collection outlined in the previous paragraph, it was also necessary to collect samples of L1 conversational data to use in Chapter 2. These were obtained through recordings of TV programs and also by observing natural interactions. Extracts from the natural interactions and learner story data collected for this project also appear in Brown (2010b).

I now comment on the adoption of cross-sectional rather than longitudinal methodology. This decision was based on key advantages of the latter vis-à-vis the time frame and topic of the current project. Kasper and Rose (2002:76) list the following strengths and weaknesses of cross-sectional research design:

**Strengths:**
1. Comparatively quick to conduct
2. Comparatively cheap to administer
3. Limited control effects as subjects only participate once
4. Stronger likelihood of participation as it is only a single time
5. Large samples enable inferential statistics to be used
Weaknesses:
1. Do not permit analysis of causal relationships
2. Unable to chart individual variations in development or changes and their significance
3. Omission of a single variable can undermine the results significantly
4. Unable to chart changing social processes over time
5. Only permits analysis of overall, net change at the macro-level through aggregated data

Of the "strengths" listed above, numbers (1), (3) and (5) were crucial in my decision to choose cross-sectional methodology. Regarding point (1), cross-sectional methodology allowed me to collect data from speakers of different occupations and ethnicities and discuss differences in their patterns of language use. The variety that I discovered amongst these 20 speakers convinced me that studies focusing on smaller samples might well be unrepresentative of wider patterns.

Considering point (3), by choosing cross-sectional design I managed to avoid the danger of control effects. This was particularly important given the high potential for such effects present in previous research that has investigating the acquisition of politeness. Although studies such as Siegal (1994) and Du Fon (1999) provide rich accounts of pragmatic development, the fact that participants are highly aware of the topic under investigation appears to be a serious question for validity. In these studies, the researcher meets the subjects regularly to discuss their pragmatic performance, creating a constant dialogue regarding linguistic politeness. It seems reasonable to suggest that this dialogue acts to increase the participants' awareness of politeness in their speech and thus affects their linguistic performance. Even in my cross-sectional project, several subjects who I contacted for follow-ups reported that my study had made them more conscious of their use of honorifics. Heritage learner Alice, for example, reported to me that she was speaking "more politely" and that she was trying to use the deferential {P} speech style more (see Chapter 2). Similarly, graduate student and part-time martial arts instructor Holly commented that she was speaking "a lot more politely" and taking much more notice of the honorifics use of others.

Finally, the use of cross-sectional methodology permitted the use of quantitative as well as qualitative analysis and also the aggregation of honorific tokens in the conversational analysis. Unlike Siegal (1994) and Du Fon (1999), my study focuses on the development of certain grammatical forms and lexical substitutions rather than the global acquisition of politeness. The use of a larger sample of subjects and cross-sectional methodology was thus better suited to the particulars of this particular piece of research.

I shall conclude this section by outlining the cycle of data collection that this project involved. The DCTs were initially developed over the summer of 2005 and
earlier versions were trialed via e-mail and to students at a renowned university in Seoul in the autumn. The role-plays were developed and tested over the winter of 2005/2006. The main period of L2 data collection was carried out in Seoul from late February 2006 to June 2006. Finally, the last round of L1 DCT data and recordings were collected in June and July 2006.

1.5 Terminology

To round off this introductory chapter, I pause briefly to sketch a few key points of terminology that are used repeatedly in this book.

In this book, "second language" (abbreviated to "L2") should be understood as general term that encapsulates all "additional" or "other" languages, be they second, third, fourth languages, etc. Particularly when referring to pedagogical concerns, I also use "target language" as an alternative term. When referring to the general learning of such languages, I alternate between the terms "language learning" and "language acquisition"; however, when discussing pragmatics more specifically, I generally adopt "pragmatic development" as a more appropriate term. I refer to participants in my study primarily as "speakers of Korean as a second language" rather than "learners". The term "learner", I believe, is better suited to studies that focus on language acquisition and development in pedagogical settings. In studies of language acquisition outside the classroom, it is more appropriate to recognize the users of an L2 as "speakers" or "users" in their own right rather than perpetual "learners".

The Korean honorifics system (abbreviated to "Korean honorifics") is the term that will be used to encapsulate hearer honorifics (or speech styles), referent honorifics (subject and object honorifics) and terms of address in the Korean language. The term is neutral in that it encapsulates speech styles and address forms that are plain or intimate (and index low social distance), as well as those that are deferential or formal (and index high social distance). This usage, however,

3. "Additional language" or "other language" are the two alternatives to "second language" suggested by Rampton (1997). "Second language" is criticized for being inappropriate for situations in which learners may already know two or more languages. Moreover, the term harbors an inherent bias towards monolingual cultures in a world where multilingualism is actually more common than monolingualism.

4. On this very point, Cook (2002) comments as follows: "A person who has been using a second language for twenty-five years is no more an L2 learner than a fifty-year-old monolingual speaker is an L1 learner. The term L2 learner implies that the task of acquisition is never finished ..."
contrasts with my application of "honorific" (adjective) or "honorific forms" which refer only to forms that index high social distance. Forms that index low social distance will be termed "non-honorific" or "non-honorific forms". I also use the Korean folk terminology "contaymal" (존댓말 - 'respect-speech') and "panmal" (반말 - 'half-speech') to refer to honorific and non-honorific language respectfully. The kind of politeness that canonical uses of honorifics are tied up with is referred to as "indexical politeness" (signaling appropriate relationships to addressees, referents and bystanders), which contrasts with "modulation politeness" (mitigating or reinforcing propositional content, illocutionary force or speaker responsibility/involvement – cf. Caffi 2007) (see Chapter 3). Finally, I refer to the knowledge that L2 speakers have of honorifics as "honorific competence.

---

5. As pointed out by Wang Hahn-sok (1986: 367) and Lee Hyo-sang (1991: 139), the way that "panmal" is used as a folk term to refer to non-honorific language in general is broader than its use by linguists to refer to just the {E} speech style (see Chapter 2). Although the latter is likely to be the original meaning (in that the {E} speech style can be considered "half-speech" as no ending as such is added), I adopt the term in its folk meaning in this book.
 CHAPTER 2

The Korean honorifics system

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the organizational features that make up the Korean honorifics system. The description primarily acts as a point of reference for observations made in future chapters regarding the development of honorific competence by L2 learners. However, in itself, the chapter aims to provide a description of Korean honorifics that is not only highly detailed but also in tune with the way honorifics are used in modern South Korean society. Discussions include new analyses of problematic points of classification and feature authentic examples from recorded and observed interactions.

The chapter is structured as follows. After defining "honorifics" through recourse to cross-linguistic examples in Section 2.2, Section 2.3 describes the component parts of the Korean system, including hearer honorifics, referent honorifics and forms of address. Section 2.4 then puts these components together, discusses how they interrelate and then discusses factors that typically influence the application of Korean honorifics. As an appendix to the chapter, I conclude in Section 2.4.3 by detailing key differences between the Korean system of honorifics and the system found in Japanese, which has attracted more attention in the literature to date.

2.2 Defining honorifics

In this book, I follow a broad definition of honorifics as "resources for indexing the relative position of interlocutors, referents and bystanders either in the lexicon or the morpho-syntax of a language" (definition my own). As such, honorifics are a central part of social deixis or indexicality. The former is defined by Levinson (1983: 89) as "the term for those aspects of language structure that encode the social identities of participants, or social relationships between them, or between one of them and persons or entities referred to" The latter refers to roughly the same phenomenon, but in the broader framework of contextually dependent communication and thought (Levinson 2004: 97).
Rather than conveying propositional meaning and having "truth value", honorifics belong to the realm of "expressive meaning" (Potts 2005; Sells and Kim 2006). Potts (2005:182–185) posits that the expressive meaning of honorific forms is the expression of "social superiority". Although I agree that "social superiority" is one of the meanings most commonly associated with the normative application of honorifics, I am doubtful that this can account for a wider range of honorifics usages, particularly those less canonical. The underlying "meaning" of honorific forms is probably more abstract, perhaps best captured by "separation" or "distance". The absence of honorifics, on the other hand, expresses meanings such as "connection" and "closeness". As shall be discussed in detail below (Section 2.4.2), these abstract meanings produce context-specific perlocutionary effects (including but not limited to feelings of superiority or respect) depending on the context in which they are used.

Honorifics can be divided into three categories: (1) referent honorifics, (2) hearer honorifics and (3) bystander honorifics. Referent honorifics index the relationship between the speaker and referents within the sentence (or otherwise the relationship between different referents). The referent may be the hearer him/herself or otherwise a third person. Hearer honorifics directly index the relationship between the speaker and the hearer and do not require the hearer to appear as a sentence referent in order to appear. Bystander honorifics index the presence of specific onlookers at the scene of a speech event. These forms are appropriate for speaking in the presence of the bystander in question, but are not necessarily appropriate when speaking about or to him/her. Although Korean has a highly developed system of referent and hearer honorifics, there are no true bystander honorifics. Let us solidify the definitions of these three modes of honorification by referring to a few cross-linguistic examples.

Referent honorifics are broadly attested in the world's languages, chiefly by means of alterations in the use of second person pronouns and reference terms for third persons. Speakers of languages such as French or Russian must choose between two second-person pronouns (French tu/vous; Russian ty/vy) depending on their relationship with the hearer. In Vietnamese, this choice is more complicated as there are as many as seven different pronouns (mày/mây, mi, câu, bầu, do, anh, ông – Ahn Kyong-hwan 2002: 241). As well as deferential ways to address the hearer or referent, languages also have self-humbling forms by which the speaker refers to him/herself. In Thai, for example, the speaker will replace the first person pronoun chan with the more humble phom or even by kha '(lit.) servant' or kha chau '(lit.) master's servant' (Shibatani 2006:383). Similarly, in Iranian Persian,

---

1. This definition is broader than that preferred by some linguists. Lee and Ramsey (2000) and Goddard (2005), for example, limit the term honorifics only to referent honorifics.
the speaker may refer to himself humbly as *baondeh* 'slave', *chaker* 'servant' or *jan nesar* 'person ready to sacrifice himself' (Assadi 1980).

Some languages show variation of other lexical forms as part of a system of referent honorifics. Javanese is particularly renowned in this respect, containing alternative forms in virtually every area of speech. For example, there are three different lexical items meaning 'now': *saiki* (ngoko or low speech), *saniki* (madya or middle speech) and *samenika* (krama or high speech) (Geertz 1960: 249). Thai also includes a system of lexical honorifics. There are four different verbs for 'eat': *sawee* (royal language; used with royal family), *reprrathaann* (deferential; used to superiors), *kin* (neutral; used to equals and inferiors), *ddeek* (vulgar; used informally amongst males) (Richards and Sukwiwat 1985).

Complex as honorification by lexical substitution may seem, in Korean and Japanese, verbal inflection is actually the more salient part of the system. In Korean and Japanese, subject as well as hearer honorification is encoded by adding verb endings. Honorification through verbal inflection is not widely attested in the world's languages. However, in Dzongka (spoken in Bhutan), the form *-la* can be attached to the predicate to index hearer honorification (Wenger 1982: 89). Furthermore, in Hindi the honorific lexical form *farmanaa* attaches to some verbs to generate honorific forms (Wenger 1982: 92). In the South American Amerind Language Quechua (spoken in Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador and Argentina), the inflectional ending *-ri*- is also said to index subject honorification (Kim Dong-so 2005: 121).

In most other languages, hearer honorification is limited to alternate forms of the vocative. In English, for example, whether a speaker addresses or refers to someone as John, John Smith, Professor Smith or "Smithy" will depend on whether the speaker is this person's work colleague, a stranger, a student or a friend from childhood. These alterations in terms of address are particularly well attested in languages with highly developed honorifics systems. In Kannada (Dravidian language spoken in India), the titles *Sri* (for males) and *Smt* (for females) precede the name when addressing most people outside the family. These are used in conjunction with the suffix *ji*, which is another term of respect (Wenger 1982: 97). It is also thought that hearer honorification may be indexed through the sound systems of languages. Corum (1975) provides evidence that honorification in Basque is achieved through segmental phonology. Brown and Levinson (1987: 187) comment that prosodics are central to the expression of self-humbling in Tzeltal.

*Bystander honorification* is found in Javanese and some Australian aboriginal languages. Javanese features the phenomenon of *basa kedaton* ('court language') - special honorific forms that are used by all men in the presence of the Prince. The fact that these are purely bystander honorific forms and not referent honorifics can be attested by the fact that they are not used either when addressing the Prince.
or when discussing him in his absence (Wenger 1982: 75). In Dyirbal (Aboriginal language spoken in Queensland), speakers must switch to specific variations of the language known as “mother-in-law language” and “brother-in-law language” whenever so-called “taboo” kin, namely the mother-in-law or brother-in-law, is in earshot (see Shibatani 2006 for further discussion).²

Although honorifics is a cross-linguistic phenomenon, it is important to recognize that some languages (such as Korean, Japanese and Javanese) possess far more developed honorifics systems than other languages. However, there is no clear answer as to why this should be the case. At the layman level, the existence of honorifics in Korean is frequently connected to the influence of Confucianism and the hierarchical, relational social structure that this has entailed. Although the development and systematization of honorifics probably has much to do with the promotion of neo-Confucian ideology, the actual existence of honorifics in the Korean language appears to predate the spread of Confucianism to Korea. According to Baek (1985), Korean honorifics were probably used in ancient times when referring to gods and kings and the use according to strict Confucian social hierarchy developed much later. Irvine (1998:52), in her comparison of the honorifics systems of Javanese, Wolof, Zulu and ChiBemba, concluded that no correlations can be found between the existence of honorifics in a language and any particular form of social structure. Rather, these relationships only flourish at the ideological level – in “the complex systems of ideas and beliefs through which people interpret linguistic behaviors”. I return to discussion of these ideologies in Chapter 3.

Besides social motivations, tentative connections could also be posited between the typological structure of the Korean language and the existence of a developed honorifics system. Firstly, the development of honorifics may be facilitated by Korean’s agglutinating structure. This typological property allows for the addition of honorific endings to each and every verb in a way that would not be possible in isolating languages. Secondly, the fact that Korean is a pro-drop language lacking a true third person pronoun and morphological marking of person in the predicate may be of relevance. In such a language, referent honorification may play the secondary role of disambiguating deleted NPs. According to Wenger (1982:168), such factors may explain why languages such as Japanese and Korean have more developed honorifics systems than, for example, Indian languages originating from cultures with strict caste systems.

² For extensive cross-linguistic studies of honorific phenomenon, see Levinson (1978), Head (1978) and Wenger (1982). For more general discussions of honorifics as a cross-linguistic phenomenon, see Levinson (1983: 89) and Shibatani (2006).
2.3 Component parts of the Korean honorifics system

The following description of Korean honorifics follows the distinction between hearer honorifics (Section 2.3.1) and referent honorifics (Section 2.3.2). Since Korean forms of address can commonly be used for both hearer and referent honorifics, these are considered under a separate section (Section 2.3.3). I complete the account by describing other phenomenon that, although not always considered to be "honorifics", show similar patterns of variation between contayma (‘honorific speech’) and panma (non-honorific speech) (Section 2.3.4). The description is limited to the Seoul standard and does not provide discussion of honorifics in regional dialects.3

2.3.1 Hearer honorifics (speech styles)

Hearer honorifics primarily index the relationship between the speaker and the addressee or immediate audience. In Korean, hearer honorification is achieved by a system of inflectional endings, or “speech styles”, that attach to the predicate. As Korean is a verb-final language, these endings round off the sentence. Contemporary Korean is commonly said to contain six speech styles.4 Several of these styles have different endings for declarative, interrogative, imperative and hortative forms (see Table 5).

Table 5. Korean speech styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English name</th>
<th>Korean name</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Hortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{P} / “deferential” style</td>
<td>hapsyo-chey</td>
<td>-(su)pnita</td>
<td>-(su)pnikka?</td>
<td>-(u)psio</td>
<td>-sipsita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Y} / “polite” style</td>
<td>hayyo-chey</td>
<td>-a/eyo</td>
<td>-a/eyo?</td>
<td>-a/eyo</td>
<td>-a/eyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{S} / “semiformal” style</td>
<td>hao-chey</td>
<td>-(s)o</td>
<td>-(s)o?</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-psita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{N} / “familiar” style</td>
<td>hakey-chey</td>
<td>-ney</td>
<td>-na?/-nunka?</td>
<td>-key</td>
<td>-sey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{E} / “intimate” style</td>
<td>hay-chey</td>
<td>-a/e</td>
<td>-a/e?</td>
<td>-a/e</td>
<td>-a/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{T} / “plain” style</td>
<td>hayla-chey</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-ni?/-nu(nya)?</td>
<td>-(e)la/-kela</td>
<td>-ca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. For discussion of honorifics in Korean dialects, see Lee Ki-gap (2003). Among the differences noted is that whereas the Seoul standard contains six speech styles, some dialects (including Gyeongsang and Jeju) feature only three. For description of the use of honorifics in North Korea, consult Yeon Jae-hoon (2006).

4. Although most linguists recognize six styles, there are some variations on this model. Ko and Nam (1985) regard the {Y} and {E} styles as belonging to a separate dimension and omit them from their model of speech styles. Other traditional approaches still include the hanaita-cey speech style that is now obsolete in contemporary spoken language. Paek Pong-ja (1999: 37) omits the {S} hao-cey style from her discussion of speech styles due to the fact that it is rarely used in conversation in contemporary South Korean society.
In this book, I will primarily refer to these speech levels by the Roman letters shown in the first column of Table 5. Adopted from Sohn Ho-min (1986), these letters correspond broadly to the initial sounds of the endings in declarative mode. The use of these letters is, I believe, preferable to names such as “deferential”, “polite”, “familiar” and so forth, which attempt to specify the function of these styles. The problem with such a system is that it cannot capture the relative nature of speech style use. For example, although the “polite” style may represent a “polite” way to address non-intimates in many informal situations, when used in a formal setting such as a job interview or academic presentation it may be too casual and therefore not so “polite” at all. Furthermore, when used to an intimate or status inferior, the “polite” style would be “over-polite” and thus distant, sarcastic or even rude. The Korean names for the speech styles displayed in the second column of figure 1 are similar to the system of Roman letters in that they do not specify a set function for the speech styles. They are composed of the imperative forms of the verb hata 'do' in the style in question plus the Sino-Korean element -chey (體) 'body, substance, style, real'.

Several linguists have attempted to organize these speech levels according to semantic features, typically ± DEERENCE and ± FORMALITY. Suh Cheong-soo (1984) and Sung Ky-chull (1985), for example, offer the two-dimensional model shown in Table 6. This model has been widely criticized for its perception of “formality” and “informality” as static properties of Korean speech styles. As pointed out by Lee Won-kyu (1991), the application of the so-called “formal” speech styles is not restricted to formal settings, as the model would suggest. However, the recognition that the so-called “informal” {Y} and {E} somehow work differently to the other speech styles represents an important distinction. Unlike the other speech styles, {E} and {Y} are compatible with a number of epistemic modal pre-final endings marking the status of information, such as -ci-/canha- (shared information – Chang Kyung-hee 1995), and -ney- (newly perceived information – Lee Hyo-sang 1991). In addition, only {E} and {Y} can occur with the volitional -lkey and the connective endings -ko and -nuntey. The fact that such meanings cannot be so easily expressed in the other speech styles is probably what has led them to be associated with “formality” by grammarians, rather than actual restriction of such styles to formal contexts.

Table 6. The ± DEERENCE and ± FORMALITY model of Korean speech styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ FORMALITY</th>
<th>- FORMALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ DEERENCE</td>
<td>{P}</td>
<td>{Y}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{S}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEERENCE</td>
<td>{N}</td>
<td>{E}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{T}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the current study, I do not adopt static semantic descriptions such as deference and formality. Instead, as previously mentioned, I view different honorific forms and combinations of honorific forms as indexing degrees of “separation” and “connection”. In present-day Seoul Korean, the {P} and {Y} speech levels are used to index “separation” and {E} and {T} are used to index “connection”; for convenience, I therefore follow Chang Suk-jin (1996) in referring to the former two levels as “honorific” speech styles and the latter two as “non-honorific” speech styles. This division also reflects the Korean common-sense distinction between contaynal (‘respectful speech’) and panmal (‘informal, intimate speech; lit. ‘half-language’). As for the {S} and {N} speech styles, these appear to be falling out of usage, at least in the Korean of young speakers in Seoul. Broadly speaking, honorific speech styles are used unilaterally by status inferiors to status superiors and bilaterally between the unacquainted or unfamiliar. Non-honorific styles are used unilaterally by status superiors to status inferiors and bilaterally between friends and the well-acquainted. In the following sections, I briefly summarize the usage and characteristics of each Korean speech style in turn.

2.3.1.1 Use of the {T} style
The non-honorific {T} style has two distinct usages: (1) as an intimate or plain non-honorific speech style used between intimates of similar age/rank or by superiors to subordinates and (2) as a generic style used in writing to a general non-specified audience.

When reciprocated between intimates or used by superiors towards subordinates, {T} is often considered “lower” than the more widely used {E} speech style. However, closer examination of the literature suggests that this perception may only apply to certain sentence types, particularly interrogatives. Choo Mi-ho (2006:136) points out that the -ni and -(nu)nya interrogative endings may not be suitable for asking questions to intimate superiors (such as parents or older siblings), even when these people have consented to the reciprocal use of panmal. Similarly, according to Lee and Ramsey (2000:255), although a husband may use {E} and {T} to his wife, the use of the -ni and -(nu)nya interrogative endings would be “offensive” as he would be treating her “like a child”.

Lee and Ramsey (2000:254) also report that although college students of the same age may quickly...

5. As with most anecdotal evidence, the appropriateness of {T} in such interactions is debatable. According to other Korean native speaker informants, it may actually be acceptable for a husband to use -ni and -(nu)nya to his wife. However, for wives who address their husbands in panmal, the -ni and -(nu)nya endings may be more problematic. Either way, these observations support my general point that the use of {T} in interrogatives is somehow more sensitive than in declaratives and indexes a more noticeably “lower” level than {E}. 
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drop into *panmal*, use of *-ni* and *-(nu)nya* are awkward at first. It may be that this perception of the interrogative endings of the *{T}* speech style as being “lower” than *{E}* result from different discourse pragmatic functions. On this point, Lee Hyo-sang (1991:455) claims that these endings – and *-nya* in particular – tend to be used in rhetorical questions or when the speaker is somehow negatively predisposed towards the information in question.

In declarative mood, distribution of *{E}* and *{T}* seems to be controlled by other pragmatic or even morphological concerns rather than expressions of “connection/separation” per se. As noted above, *{T}* cannot occur with a variety of pre-final endings, particularly those expressing epistemic modality. Speakers will thus have no option but to switch to the *{E}* style should they wish to apply such modals. In addition, when such endings are not required, the choice between *{E}* and *{T}* appears to be influenced by the information status of the proposition in question. Lee Hyo-sang (1991:414-419) notes that whereas *{E}* occurs with information that is pre-stored as factual knowledge, the -*ta* declarative ending of *{T}* is used when the speaker conveys newly perceived or retrieved information that is particularly noteworthy for the hearer. This use of *{T}* to index newly perceived information also extends to the expression of exclamation (Choo Mi-ho 2006). This most typically occurs with adjectives (which in Korean operate similar to verbs and indeed are often referred to as “descriptive verbs”) such as *yeyppu-ta!* (‘how pretty!’), *masiss-ta!* (‘how delicious!’) and *sikkulep-ta!* (‘how noisy!’).

The final use of *{T}* is as the generic written style when addressing a general audience. *{T}* is the style used in newspaper reports, magazine articles and in the narratives of novels. In such cases, the interrogative and imperative forms differ from the *{T}* used in spoken Korean: -(nu)*nka* replaces *-nil-(nu)nya* as the interrogative and -*la* replaces *(e)la* as the imperative.

2.3.1.2 *Use of the* *(E)* *style*

In contemporary Seoul Korean, *{E}* has become the most commonly used non-honorific speech style, although, as mentioned above, it may frequently alternate with *{T}*. In addition, simply by suffixing *-yo* to the *{E}* ending, the honorific *{Y}* speech level can be formed. In part thanks to the simplicity of this morphological process, *{E}* and *{Y}* have become what Lee and Ramsey (2000:260) describe as “the twin pillars of the speech style system of modern Korean”. The addition or omission of the *-yo* ending is the aspect of the honorifics system to which Korean speakers are most sensitive and which is most commonly taken to demarcate the boundary between *contaymal* (‘honorific language’) and *panmal* (‘non-honorific language’).
Choo Mi-ho (2006: 135) and Hwang Juck-ryoon (1975: 89) both comment that the usage of {E} (and other non-honorific speech styles) to non-intimates (particularly strangers) is disappearing in modern Korean society. Regardless of age or status, it is becoming less common for an adult stranger to address another adult stranger using {E}. As Choo (2006: 135) claims, “even the president of Korea is not supposed to use panmal to waitresses.” However, my own data shows that this kind of practice does still occur, such as in the following example:

(1) Observed example: Passenger in his 50s uses {E} to bus driver when asking to be let off between bus stops.

1 passenger accessi, yeki naylye cw-e
       ‘driver, let me off here-{E}’
2 peyl nwuly-ess-nuntey mwun way an yel-e
       ‘I pressed the bell, so why don’t you open the doors-{E}’
3 driver yeki-ka cenglyucang ani-pnita
       ‘this is not a bus stop- {P}’

In the above example, the selection of a non-honorific speech style by the passenger could be seen as a deliberate attempt by the speaker to manipulate social distance and assert his authority over the bus driver (thus legitimizing his request to be let off between bus stops). Nevertheless, the fact that the bus driver responds in honorific speech (rather than objecting to being addressed in this way) shows that this usage of {E} to subordinate strangers is not wholly inappropriate, especially for speakers of middle age and above.

Perhaps the most noticeable shift in the use of {E} is that this is now the most common speech style for children to use to their parents. This practice, once limited to children of pre-school age, now often extends through adolescence and even into adulthood. The fact that parents increasingly prefer to be addressed in panmal rather than contaymal shows an increase in the effects of “solidarity” on the use of Korean honorifics (see Section 2.4.2.2).

6. In contrast to this observation, it has frequently been reported in the South Korean media that the current (2010) South Korean president Lee Myung-bak has a tendency to address adult strangers in panmal. For example, in one article appearing on the Internet, it was noted that Lee used expressions such as “acwumma, han can ha-y” (auntie, have a drink-{E}) towards peddlers at a market that he visited http://bbs2.agora.media.daum.net/gaia/kin/read?bbsId=K150&articleId=579237). However, the fact that he was generally criticized for this behavior both by the media and the general public lends some support to Choo’s argument that this no longer represents “appropriate” linguistic behavior.
2.3.1.3 Use of the \{N\} style
The \{N\} style is commonly associated with "authority" and "formality". Usage is chiefly limited to males and tends to be non-reciprocal. For this speech level to be acceptable, the speaker should be significantly older than the hearer. Relationships in which this may occur include a teacher to his former (now adult) student or a father-in-law to his son-in-law.

In contemporary Korean society, the situations in which \{N\} can be comfortably used are becoming increasingly rare. The formality, hierarchism and masculinity that this style indexes are increasingly out of tune with the more casual and democratic nature of modern Korean society. The complete absence of the \{N\} style either in the L1 or L2 data for the current study is further evidence that this speech style is doomed for extinction.

2.3.1.4 Use of the \{S\} style
The \{S\} style is another power-laden style that is falling out of usage, at least in spoken Korean. In a survey of the speech style of 224 speakers of various ages and backgrounds, Noma (1996: 22) found that 86.7% of speakers did not use this level at all. To younger speakers, the use of \{S\} can sound high-handed and even insulting (Sohn Ho-min 1986: 397).

However, despite the fact that \{S\} has all but died out in spoken Korean, its usage still flourishes in Internet language. Lee Jung-bok's (2004) study of messages left on the bulletin board of a photography website found that \{S\} accounted for 35.6% of all predicate final endings and was particularly widely used in messages written by males in their 20s and 30s. According to Lee (2004: 245), the success of \{S\} in Internet language can be put down to three factors: (1) it is short and economical; (2) it emphasizes the power and authority of the writer; (3) it shows more reserve than \{E\} or \{T\}. Regarding the second factor, Lee discusses how speakers use the \{S\} speech style to emphasize that their advice or comments are more believable than those of others.

2.3.1.5 Use of the \{Y\} style
\{Y\} represents the most universal of the Korean speech styles in that it can be used both with superiors and with those of similar or younger age (when intimacy is low). In addition, as previously noted, it can occur in combination with a variety of pre-final endings, including epistemic modals. This speech style can be heard in a wide range of daily interactions: storekeepers reciprocate it with customers and strangers use it on the street when asking for and giving directions. However, it can sound too casual if repeatedly used either in formal settings or in interactions with notable status superiors.
The polite style is constructed by adding -yo to the {E} panmal ending. Perhaps because of this, the absence of -yo at the end of any utterance has become a signal of panmal. Therefore, speakers will often add -yo to the end of non-sentence final conjunctive endings, nouns and other parts of speech. In the following examples, the speaker adds the -yo ending after a noun phrase (a), a conjunctive ending (b) and a question pronoun (c).

(2) Broadcast data: Female announcer uses {Y} after various parts of speech (from Yenyey Today, ETN)
   a. taum sosik-un-yo
      'and now for the next news item-{Y}’
   b. pangpwuk kyeyhoyk-ul chwuysohay-ya ha-yss-ko-yo
      'and she had to cancel her planned visit to North Korea-{Y}’
   c. way-yo?
      'why-{Y}?’

2.3.1.6 Use of the {P} style
Of all the speech styles, {P} indexes the greatest degree of “separation”. Although {Y} is sufficiently “polite” in the majority of situations, there are a number of contexts in which {P} is preferred.

First of all, {P} is used as the primary speech style in formal “scenes”. In order for an air of formality to be perpetuated, increased code structuring and consistency are required in the (linguistic) behavior of participants (see Section 2.4.2.3). Repeated use of the longer -(su)pnita endings in place of the morphologically simpler -yo acts as a strong signal that the participants are operating within a formal frame. Examples of contexts in which {P} is solely or predominantly used include TV programs (news, documentaries, sports coverage), speeches to a large audience and other public discourse.

Elsewhere, {P} alternates with {Y} when speaking contaymal. It should be noted, however, that {P} is generally only used when the addressee is a status superior, rather than a non-intimate status equal or inferior. If this condition is satisfied, speakers may vary their rate of {P} depending on the degree of status difference. Interactions with notable superiors, in particular, often demand at occasional use of {P}. Using {P} is also considered to sound more masculine (King and Yeon 2009: 202) and is thus used at a higher frequency by males (Lee Ju-haeng 2005:47).

Due to the fact that {P} cannot occur with epistemic modal endings, this speech style ending tends to accompany strong statements of factual new information, while {Y} is used with common knowledge, conjecture and personal comments (Lee Chang-soo 1996; Eun and Strauss 2004; Strauss and Eun 2005).

Such patterns are most evident in TV presenter talk. In the following extract from a TV program reporting celebrity news, the female presenter uses {P} in lines 2, 4 and 6 when delivering new factual information regarding the private life of Paek Seung-ju, the new presenter of the TV show Sangsang Plus. However, note the use of {Y} (accompanied by the epistemic modal -ci-) in the first line when the presenter asks the listeners if they had been shocked by the widely reported "old news" of the sudden marriage of Noh Hyun-jung, the former presenter of the same show. The use of {Y} (with the connective ending -nuntey) in line 3 can also be explained through the fact that this utterance basically repeats what has already been said or implied and adds no new factual information as such.

(3) TV program reporting celebrity news (Yenyey Today, ETN broadcasting)

1 presenter No Hyen-ceng anawunse-uy kyelhon sosik-man-ulo-to sasil manhi-tul nolla-si-ess-ci-yo?
'I bet you were surprised just by the news of Noh Hyun-jung's marriage-{Y}!

2 kulentey i-wa hamkkey sangsangphulesu-uy say cinhayngca-ka toy-n Payk Sung-cwu anawunse-ka yel-ay cwung-im-ul kopaykhay-yess-tako ha-\textit{pnita}
'but now the new presenter of Sangsang Plus, Paek Seung-ju, has also confessed to being in the throws of passionate love-{P}''

3 Payk Sung-cwu anawunse ayin issta. yey: ilkan suphochu-ka cenhako iss-nun sosik-i-ntey-\textit{yo}
"presenter Paek Seung-ju has a boyfriend". This is the news reported in Ilgan Sports-{Y}''

4 No Hyen-ceng anawunse-uy twuy-lul i-e KBS sangsangphulesu-uy saylowu-n anpang cwuin-i-n twoyn Payk Sung-cwu anawunse-ka ayin-i iss-ta-nun kes-ul kongkayhay-ss-tako ha-\textit{pnita}
'they say that Paek Seung-ju, who took over from Noh Hyun-jung as the host of KBS's Sangsang Plus has a boyfriend-{P}''

2.3.2 Referent honorifics

Comprised of subject honorifics (Section 2.3.2.1) and object honorifics (2.3.3.2), referent honorifics are the part of the honorifics system that indexes the relationship between the speaker and the grammatical referents in the sentence or between different grammatical referents. These referents may either be the hearer him/herself or a third person. During the data analysis chapters of this book, I only consider referent honorifics use in situations where the referent and hearer are the same entity.
2.3.2.1 **Subject honorifics**

Subject honorifics index the relationship between the speaker and the grammatical subject of the sentence. In Korean, subject honorification is achieved through the application of (1) the “honorific marker” *-si-* and (2) vocabulary substitutions.

2.3.2.1.1 *The honorific marker -si-*. The so-called “honorific marker” *-si-* is a prefinal inflectional ending that attaches to the verb stem. Note the inclusion of this marker in example (4a) below expressing the speaker’s respect for his/her grandfather, compared to its absence in (4b) when the subject is a younger sibling:

(4) a. halapeci-ka o-si-ess-eyo
    grandfather-NOM come-SHON-PAST-DEC-{Y}
    ‘grandfather has come’

b. tongsayng-i o-ass-eyo
    younger-sibling-NOM come-PAST-DEC-{Y}
    ‘younger brother/sister has come’

Traditionally, subject honorification has been explained as a grammatical process of “honorific agreement”. In other words, the inclusion of *-si-* in sentences such as (4a) is seen as being “triggered” by honorific properties of the subject noun-phrase, in this case *halapeci* ‘grandfather’. From this perspective, inclusion of *-si-* in (4a) is grammatically obligatory in the same way as, for example, the addition of *-s* or *-es* is mandatory in English when the subject is third-person singular.

Studying *-si-* from an agreement perspective has produced interesting results regarding the behavior of *-si-* at the sentence level (particularly in multi-verb and “double nominative” constructions – see Lim Dong-hoon 2000 and Yun Sungkyu 1993). However, the treatment of *-si-* as being grammatically triggered in this way is unsatisfactory from a pragmatic perspective. The first problem with the “honorific agreement” theory is that *-si-* is frequently used even when the “honored being” does not appear to be the subject per se. Even when talking about a teacher or grandfather’s body parts, ailments, clothes and possessions, speakers may add *-si-*:

(5) a. halapeci-kkeyse swuyem-i manh-usi-ta.
    grandfather-NOM:SHON whiskers-NOM plenty-SHON-{T}
    ‘grandfather has many whiskers’ [subject = ‘whiskers’]

b. halapeci-kkeyse son-i congki-ka na-si-ess-ta
    grandfather-NOM:SHON hand-NOM boil-NOM appear-SHON-PAST-{T}
    ‘grandfather has had a boil appear on his hand’ [subject = ‘boil’]
In sentences such as (5a) where two referents are marked in nominative case, linguists such as Yeon Jae-hoon (2003) take the appearance of -si- as proof that halapeci 'grandfather' is the true subject of the sentence. Alternatively, Yun Sung-kyu (1993) suggests that -si- agrees with the broader grammatical category of "topic" rather than subject per se. Readers are referred to these two works for full discussion.

From a pragmatic perspective, the more serious problem with the theory of "honorific agreement" is that the inclusion of -si- is not always as "obligatory" as prescriptive grammatical accounts would claim. First of all, deciding whether a topic/subject requires subject honorification often cannot be determined without recourse to pragmatic factors. Although -si- might be expected as a matter of course in combination with referents that contain the honorific suffix -nim (see Section 2.3.3 below) such as sensayng-nim ('esteemed teacher') or referents such as halapeci 'grandfather', whether it occurs with terms that are higher but not necessarily respectful such as oppa ('older brother of a female') cannot be determined without further contextual information (Choe Jae-woong 2004:552). In addition, as pointed out by Peter Sells and Kim Jong-bok (Sells and Kim 2006:176; Kim and Sells 2007:310), some nouns such as the wh-phrase nwu(kwu) 'who' and the non-argument pronoun amuto 'anyone' have no specified honorific properties, but nevertheless can occur with -si- in certain contexts.

Even in cases where the status of the subject as a “honored being” is unquestionable, whether -si- is actually included or not seems to depend on whether the subject and hearer are the same person and – if they are not – on the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. When subject and hearer are the same, -si-tends to be more faithfully used. However, when the referent is a third person, the relationship between the actual interlocutors and other contextual factors comes into play. First of all, at least traditionally, it is considered more appropriate to omit -si- when the subject referent is of lower status than the listener (even when the subject is “higher” than the speaker) – a phenomenon known as apconpep (壓尊法 ‘restriction of respect’). For example, when a speaker is talking to his/her grandfather about his/her paternal uncle, it would be more appropriate to omit -si-:

c. halapeci-nun pang-i khu-si-ta.7
   grandfather-TOP room-NOM big-SHON-{T}
   'grandfather's room is big' [subject = 'room']

7. Examples adapted from and inspired by Yun Sung-kyu (1993) and Nam Ki-shim (2001).
(6)  halapeci,  khunapeci-ka  [? ka-si-ess-supnita / ka-ss-supnita].
    grandfather, uncle-NOM  [? go-shon-past-{P} / go-past-{P}]
    'grandfather, uncle has gone'

However, as observed by Suh Cheong-soo (1984) and Shin Gi-hyun (2001: 289), Korean speakers increasingly find it “difficult and confusing” to follow the prescriptive rules of *apconpep*. Alternatively, when speaking with elders and superiors, younger speakers prefer to use as many honorifics as possible when referring to other status superiors as a new strategy to increase the “politeness” of their speech.

In contemporary Korean, whether -si- is included when talking about a third person seems to rely on other contextual factors. Firstly, whether or not the subject being referred to is actually present at the speech event is a deciding factor. The studies of Lee Jung-bok (2002) show that -si- is more likely to be retained when the person in question is actually in attendance. If the subject is not present at the speech event, whether the hearer is part of the same in-group seems to come into play. Lee Jung-bok (2002) shows that speakers frequently omit honorifics when referring to their parents within the family group but will use honorifics when referring to their parents outside the family, even when speaking to close friends. However, in other instances, being of the same in-group may necessitate increased care with honorifics. University students, for example, appear to be more careful to use -si- when referring to their professors or *senpay-nim* (‘seniors’) when talking with other students in the same department rather than when talking with students from other departments. If the referent is not known by either speaker, -si- is most likely to be dropped. Speakers do not need to use referent honorifics when talking about the president, famous scholars or historical figures (Lim Dong-hoon 2000:98).

Finally, it should be noted that -si- occurs with greatest frequency in imperative sentences. When speaking *contaymal*, Korean speakers will frequently add -si- to imperatives for all addressees, even if they omit it in corresponding declarative and interrogative sentences. This is most noticeable in the {P} speech style, where the -upsio imperative ending is rarely heard in modern Korean without -si-; indeed the imperative ending is listed as -sipsio (-si- + -upsio) by several publications (including Sohn Ho-min 1999 and Lee and Ramsey 2000). The fact that -si- has become conventionalized in imperative sentences is the most obvious sign that the Korean honorifics system is sensitive to degrees of imposition (see 2.4.2.4 below and Chapter 3).
Table 7. Verbs with special subject honorific forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>issta</td>
<td>kyeysita*</td>
<td>'stay'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cata</td>
<td>cwumusita</td>
<td>'sleep'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cwukta</td>
<td>tolasita</td>
<td>'die'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mekta</td>
<td>capswusita</td>
<td>'eat'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aphputa</td>
<td>phyenchanhusita**</td>
<td>'be ill'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* kyeysita only replaces issta when the meaning is 'stay, reside' rather than 'have, possess'.

** phyenchanhusita replaces aphputa when talking about illness which involves the entire body rather than pain in a particular part, at least according to traditional descriptions (but see discussions in this section).

2.3.2.1.2 Vocabulary substitutions. The system of subject honorifics also includes a limited set of verb, noun and particle substitutions. Some of these substitutions display the same distribution as -si-; others are used only when talking about considerable superiors and noin (老人; "elders" – a term that generally refers to people who are over 60). In the following discussion, I refer to elements with the former distribution as "universal" and those with the latter as "restricted" or "highly restricted".

A limited set of verbs that express situations involving the human body (such as eating and sleeping) have a separate honorific verb stem. These honorific verbs, which are listed in Table 7, naturally include the honorific marker -si- in their stems. These forms all show the same distribution as the honorific marker -si-, except for capswusita ('eat:HoN') and phyenchanhusita ('be ill:HoN'). These have more restricted applications, at least in the speech of younger generations. Brown (2010d) shows that only 34.69% of Korean university student participants use capswusita at all, and then only to notable elders such as professors. Otherwise, participants preferred to use tusita (the verb tulta 'to take' with the honorific marker -si-) or the expression siksa hasita ('have a meal', with the honorific marker -si-). As for phyenchanhusita ('be ill:HoN'), although participants used this for notable superiors, they preferred aphpusita ('be ill:PLA', with the honorific marker -si-) as a honorific form to other addressees. The use of aphpusita as a honorific form was traditionally limited to the discussion of pain or ailment in a specific part of the body; Brown (2010d) shows that this usage has spread to talking about the entire body.

As well as special honorific verbs, there also exists a limited set of honorific nouns that replace the plain noun (see Table 8). The majority of these noun substitutions are restricted to notable superiors and elders, the exceptions being pwun and malssum. As noted by Choo Mi-ho (2006:142), the use of honorific
Table 8. Nouns with special subject honorific forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>salam</td>
<td>pwun*</td>
<td>'person'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal</td>
<td>malssum**</td>
<td>'words'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip</td>
<td>tayk</td>
<td>'house'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pap</td>
<td>cinc</td>
<td>'meal'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayngil</td>
<td>sayngsin</td>
<td>'birthday'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nai</td>
<td>yensey</td>
<td>'age'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilum</td>
<td>sengham</td>
<td>'name'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyeng</td>
<td>pyenghwan</td>
<td>'disease'</td>
<td>very restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>chia</td>
<td>'teeth'</td>
<td>very restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* pwun can also replace myeng as the honorific counter for people.
** malssum differs from other honorific nouns in that it can be used when talking about oneself (see Section 3.2.2 below).

forms such as yensey and sayngsin are reserved for those of a certain age. Hearers in their 30s, for example, may react negatively to being asked their yensey, sayngsin or sengham, as it leaves them "feeling old".

The final part of Korean subject honorification is the substitution of -kkeyse for the subject particle -i/-ka.\(^8\) This honorific particle can only attach to a human referent occurring in nominal position, typically when this "honored being" is referred to by a honorific form of address (see Section 2.3.3). As noted by Sells and Kim (2006:322), consistent with the application of the forms of address to which it attaches, -kkeyse relies solely on the relation between the speaker and the referent and is not influenced by concerns with apconpep ('restriction of respect; see above). Moreover, the application of -kkeyse seems to be extremely sensitive to the formality of the speech event. When used in informal scenes, it gives the feeling of "overdone honorification" (Lee and Ramsey 2000:242).

Given the optional nature of the honorific -kkeyse and some of the other vocabulary substitutions described above, subject honorification can operate on a number of levels. The same propositional content can often be expressed on at least three degrees of honorification. In the following, (a) shows addition of -si-only, (b) shows the use of honorific verb substitution and (c) shows verb substitution and particle substitution:

---

8. As well as substituting -i/-ka, -kkeyse can also be used in conjunction with the topic marker -nun: -kkeyse-nun.
(7) a. hyengnim-i manhi aphu-si-eyo
b. hyengnim-i manhi pyenchanhusi-eyo
c. hyengnim-kkeyse manhi pyenchanhusi-eyo

older brother very ill

'esteemed older brother is very ill' 9

In the above, all sentences are "honorific" and appropriate for referring to a status superior. However, as more honorific elements are added, the sentences become "more honorific", a phenomenon which Choe Jae-woong (2004: 554) dubs "honorific strengthening." As Choe points out, the fact that subject honorification can be increased and is thus not a binary system represents one further argument against treating honorification as grammatical agreement.

2.3.2.2 Object honorifics

Korean object honorification is generally cited as being non-productive (Yun Sung-kyu 1993: 18) and limited to the lexical substitutions listed in Table 9. In contemporary Korean, there is no object honorific verbal suffix equivalent to the subject honorific marker -si-. 10

The application of object honorifics differs in a vital way to that of subject honorifics. The latter primarily indexes the social distance of the referent appearing in subject position in relation to the speaker (except according to traditional considerations of apconpep). With object honorifics, the comparison is made not

Table 9. Lexical items with special object honorific forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>cwuta</td>
<td>tulita</td>
<td>'give'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pota</td>
<td>poypta*</td>
<td>'see'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teylita</td>
<td>mosita</td>
<td>'accompany'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mwutta</td>
<td>yeccwuta</td>
<td>'ask'</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>malhata</td>
<td>aloyta</td>
<td>'speak'</td>
<td>very restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td>malssum</td>
<td>'words'</td>
<td>universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>-eykey</td>
<td>-kkey</td>
<td>'to' (dative)</td>
<td>restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*poypta can also replace mannata as the verb 'to meet'.

9. Additional "levels" could be created in this example by replacing the honorific term of address hyengnim with the non-honorific hyeng.

10. However, in Middle Korean the language did have a verbal suffix (-sop-) that functioned as an object honorific marker. -sop- was as widely used as -si-; indeed the two morphemes worked in tandem (Lee and Ramsey 2000: 295). In Modern Korean, -sop- metamorphosed into an integral part of the -(su)pnita {P} speech style hearer honorific ending.
Table 10. Honorific benefactive constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain benefactive</th>
<th>Honorific benefactive</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa cwuta</td>
<td>sa tulita</td>
<td>'buy something for someone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poye cwuta</td>
<td>poye tulita</td>
<td>'show something to ('for') someone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ponay cwuta</td>
<td>ponay tulita</td>
<td>'send something to ('for') someone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pakkwe cwuta</td>
<td>pakkwe tulita</td>
<td>'change something for someone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selmyenghay cwuta</td>
<td>selmyenghay tulita</td>
<td>'explain something for someone'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

only with the speaker him/herself, but always with the hearer as well (except in the case of the particle -kkey). In other words, for object honorifics to appear, the object must be socially superior both to the subject/topic referent as well as the speaker (Yun Sung-kyu 1993: 18). Thus, in the following example, using the object honorific verb tulita ('give:OHON') is inappropriate. Although the object referent ('father') is “higher” than the speaker, it is not higher than the subject referent ('grandfather').

(8) halapeci-kkeyse ku kes-ul apeci-kkey
    grandfather-NOM that thing-ACC father-DAT:OHON
    [?? tuli-si-ess-eyo / cwu-si-ess-eyo].
    [?? give:OHON-SHON-PAST-{Y} / give-SHON-PAST-{Y}]‘grandfather gave it to father’

Although object honorification in contemporary Korean is often described as a nonproductive process, some productivity can be observed in the behavior of the object honorific verb tulita ('give:OHON'). First of all, tulita can also replace cwuta as an auxiliary verb ('give:PLA') when the latter appears in benefactive constructions; a few common examples are shown in Table 10. The final example in the table is of the Sino-Korean verbal construction selmyeng-hata, composed of the Sino-Korean noun selmyeng (説明) and the dummy verb hata ('do'). With Sino-Korean verbal constructions, tulita can also be used even when the meaning is not benefactive. In such cases, hata is dropped entirely and tulita becomes the main verb. Table 11 lists common verbal constructions that are created as a result.

2.3.3 Forms of address

Address terms can index both hearer and referent honorification, depending on whether the term appears as (1) a vocative free form of address or (2) as a bound form of address. Vocative free forms appear outside of the syntactic structure of the sentence; they may either precede or succeed the sentence or be inserted
Table 11. Honorific constructions with Sino-Korean nouns and *tulita*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mal-hata</td>
<td>malssum tulita</td>
<td>'speak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cenhwa-hata</td>
<td>cenhwa tulita</td>
<td>'phone'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yenlak-hata</td>
<td>yenlak tulita</td>
<td>'contact'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selmyeng-hata</td>
<td>selmyeng tulita</td>
<td>'explain'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cilmwun-hata</td>
<td>cilmwun tulita</td>
<td>'question'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sakwa-hata</td>
<td>sakwa tulita</td>
<td>'apologize'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaksok-hata</td>
<td>yaksok tulita</td>
<td>'promise'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kito-hata</td>
<td>kito tulita</td>
<td>'pray'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pwuthak-hata</td>
<td>pwuthak tulita</td>
<td>'request'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamsa-hata</td>
<td>kamsa tulita</td>
<td>'thank'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeypay-hata</td>
<td>yeypay tulita</td>
<td>'worship'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insa-hata</td>
<td>insa tulita</td>
<td>'greet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyengko-hata</td>
<td>kyengko tulita</td>
<td>'warn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poko-hata</td>
<td>poko tulita</td>
<td>'report'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chwukha-hata</td>
<td>chwukha tulita</td>
<td>'congratulate'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at certain junctures. Bound forms of address, on the other hand, fall within the syntactic structure of the sentence and may either denote the listener or a third party referent. The following example contrasts the use of the vocative free form (*minho-ya*) with the pronoun *ne*, which is a bound form of address appearing in subject position.

(9) Min-ho-ya, ne eti ka-ni?

Min-ho-voc. you where go-INT:{T}

'Min-ho (free form of address)! Where are you (bound form of address) going?'

In (9), these two forms of address cannot be substituted for each other; the vocative form FN+ya cannot appear as a bound form and the pronoun *ne* cannot be used as a free form. However, these represent exceptions rather than the rule. The vast majority of Korean terms of address can appear both as free and bound forms.

The system of address forms in Korean is varied and complex. What complicates matters from the outset is that the use of personal names and pronouns tends to be restricted to addressing status equals and inferiors. Perhaps for this reason, Korean has developed an elaborate system of titles, kinship terms and teknonymic forms. The following list summarizes the major patterns of address in Korean, inspired by Park Young-soon (2004:221) and aided by Lee and Ramsey (2000) and Braun (1988). It is extensive but not exhaustive and does not
attempt to capture the complex nuances and restrictions that the use of many of these forms implies. Pronouns are not included in the list, but are discussed separately below.

**Kinship terms (used to family members):**

1. deferential kinship term
2. plain kinship term
3. intimate kinship term
4. kinship term + vocative -a/-ya
   - EX: apenim — 'esteemed father'
   - apeci — 'father'
   - appa — 'dad'
   - nwuna-ya — 'older sister-voc'

**Fictive kinship terms (used to non-family members):**

5. fictive deferential kinship terms
6. fictive plain kinship term
   - halapenim — 'esteemed grandfather'
   - acessi — 'uncle'

7. fictive kinship term + vocative -a/-ya
   - enni-ya — 'older sister-voc'

**Teknonymic terms:**

8. deferential teknonym
9. plain teknonym
10. intimate teknonym
   - Min-ho apenim — 'Min-ho's esteemed father'
   - Min-ho apeci — 'Min-ho's father'
   - Min-ho appa — 'Min-ho's dad'

**Personal names:**

11. surname + title + nim
12. surname + plain title
13. loan word title + surname
14. full name + ssi
15. surname + ssi
16. given name + ssi
17. full name + (fictive) kinship term
18. surname + (fictive) kinship term
19. given name + (fictive) kinship term
20. full name + kwun/yang
21. surname + kwun/yang
22. given name + kwun/yang
23. full name
24. given name
25. given name + vocative suffix -a/-ya
26. given name + vocative suffix -i
27. given name + vocative -i + vocative -ya
   - Kim Pucang-nim — 'esteemed department head Kim'
   - Kim Pucang — 'department head Kim'
   - Misu Kim — 'Miss Kim'
   - Kim Min-ho-ssi — 'Kim Min-ho + ssi suffix'
   - Kim Min-ho-si — 'Kim + ssi suffix'
   - Min-ho-ssi — 'Min-ho + ssi suffix'
   - Kim Min-ho-hyeng — 'older brother Kim Min-ho'
   - Kim hyeng — 'older brother Kim'
   - Min-ho hyeng — 'older brother Min-ho'
   - Kim Min-ho kwun — 'Kim Min-ho + kwun suffix'
   - Kim kwun — 'Min-ho + kwun suffix'
   - Min-ho kwun — 'Min-ho + kwun suffix'
   - Kim Min-ho — 'Kim Min-ho'
   - Min-ho — 'Min-ho'
   - Min-ho-ya — 'Min-ho + voc'
   - Min-suk-i — 'Min-suk + voc'
   - Min-suk-ya — 'Min-suk + voc + voc'

**Titles:**

28. plain title
29. title + nim
   - pucang — 'department head'
   - pucang-nim — 'esteemed department head'

* Forms marked with an asterisk can only be used as vocative free forms of address.
As shown in the above list, Korean address forms include the repeated use of a number of productive suffixes: 

- *nim*, *-ssi*, *-a/ya*, *-i*, *kwun* and *yang*. The first of these, *-nim*, is a honorific particle that attaches to titles and some kinship terms, rendering these deferential. In the case of titles, inclusion or omission of *-nim* indexes whether the hearer is superior to or inferior to the speaker; the *-nim* form is always used in the former case. The suffix *-ssi* does not attach to titles but to personal names. Although *-ssi* indexes a certain degree of “separation” – and indeed is never used amongst intimates – it can hardly be deemed honorific or deferential. This is probably due to the fact that it can only attach to personal names, which, as stated above, are not commonly used to status superiors. *-a/ya* and *-i* are both vocative suffixes used to subordinates or intimates. The former attaches to given names, some intimate kinship terms and some terms of endearment, *-a* following a consonant and *-ya* following a vowel. *-i* can only attach to given names ending in a consonant; in such cases, it can also be further suffixed by *-ya* (pattern 27 above). *Kwun* and *yang* can be suffixed to any personal name, the former being used to address a man and the latter for a woman. Both are only appropriate for addressing young people of inferior status, with the use of *yang* being particularly restricted.

There are many situations in which Korean speakers use kinship terms in a fictive sense or apply teknonymic terms. Intimates of marginally older age are referred to by terms that translate as ‘older brother’ (*hyeng* – used by men; *oppa* – used by women) and ‘older sister’ (*nwuna* – men; *enni* – women). *Enni* can also be used either reciprocally or non-reciprocally in service encounters between younger female shoppers and store clerks. When addressing regular customers in restaurants, hairdressers and bars, staff may also use kinship terms such as *imo* ‘maternal aunt’ and *samchon* ‘uncle’ (Kang Hui-suk 2002). Older blue-collar workers are commonly referred to as *acessi* ‘uncle’ and *acwumma* ‘aunty’. Turning our attention to teknonymy, this is the phenomenon whereby interlocutors are addressed in relation to their children. This includes forms that translate as ‘Min-ho’s father’ and ‘Min-ho’s mother’ (patterns 8–10 above). These are frequently used not only by schoolteachers when addressing parents but also by casual acquaintances such as neighbors. In addition, teknonyms represent a common way for married couples with children to address each other, using the name of the oldest child.

I now discuss one area of address terms that was omitted from the above description: pronouns. The discussion covers three main areas: (1) first person pronouns and terms for referring to one’s own family, (2) second person pronouns and pronoun substitutions and (3) terms used for referring to third person referents.

Korean contains both plain and self-humbling expressions to refer to oneself and certain members of one’s family. The plain first person pronouns *na* (singular) and *wuli* (plural) are replaced by *ce* and *cehuy* respectively when interacting with status superiors or in formal settings. A set of humble expressions also exist
Table 12. Humbling expressions for wife and children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humble</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clpsalam (lit. ‘house person’)</td>
<td>waiphu (loan – Eng. ‘wife’)</td>
<td>pwuin</td>
<td>‘wife’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manwula</td>
<td>anay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ttalnyen (‘daughter’ + ‘wench’)</td>
<td>ttal</td>
<td>ttanim (ttal+nim)</td>
<td>‘daughter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ttalcasik (‘daughter’ + ‘offspring’)</td>
<td>atul</td>
<td>atunim (atul+nim)</td>
<td>‘son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atulnom (‘son’ + ‘wretch’)</td>
<td>atul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atulcasik (‘son’ + ‘offspring’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tona (豚児 – lit. ‘pig’ + ‘child’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for married men to refer to their wife and for couples to refer to their children, as listed in Table 12. At least traditionally, the humble forms in the table are used when talking about one’s own family, in particular in front of status superiors. The plain forms can be used to talk about one’s own family to those of similar or lower status and to talk about the families of those of similar or lower status. Finally, the honorific forms are used when asking or talking about the families of status superiors. Although Korean once contained a developed system of self-humbling expressions (or “humilifics”), this extra lexical layer has now all but disappeared. Even the humble expressions listed in Table 12 above are rarely used by younger generations, who tend to prefer the plain forms.

In the current study, I follow Park Jeong-woon (2005) in the recognition of five second-person pronouns in Korean: ne, caney, tangsin, kutay and caki. The usage of all five of these forms is heavily restricted. ne is the most commonly heard in contemporary Korean, but usage is limited to intimate friends, status inferiors and children. Caney may be used by those in positions of authority when addressing status inferiors. The use of tangsin is appropriate between married couples (although this is most common when they reach middle age) and some other intimate relationships. When it is used outside of intimate relationships, it tends to constitute a deliberate signal of disrespect and can be highly insulting (Lee and Ramsey 2000: 226). However, tangsin is on some levels perceived as the most generic second person pronoun – the closest to the English “you”. For this reason, it may appear in advertising and book titles when referring to an unspecified “you”. King and Yeon (2009: 60) and Lee and Ramsey (2000: 227) further note that tangsin is sometimes applied as a ubiquitous “you” in foreigner talk. In contemporary

---

Korean, **kutay** is rarely used in face-to-face interaction, but does sometimes appear in letters and literary works (Cho Choon-hak 1982). **Caki**, however, represents a recent development in the Korean honorifics system. This Sino-Korean **caki** (自己) is actually a reflexive pronoun which has only recently started to be used as an intimate second-person pronoun primarily between young couples. Park Jeong-woon (1992) shows that this pronoun can also be used non-reciprocally by older female speakers to younger adult female speakers.

As the above description suggests, none of these five second-person pronouns is appropriate for addressing a status superior or non-intimate adult. When dealing with superiors and non-intimates, Korean speakers will therefore avoid pronouns entirely and maintain the use of a personal name, title or kinship term throughout the interaction. The complexity of choosing an appropriate form of address is mitigated to some extent by the fact that Korean is a pro-drop language in which sentence referents can often be omitted. When a pronoun substitute cannot be avoided, speakers will often resort to the most generic forms of address such as **halmeni** ('grandmother'; generic address form for elderly woman), **acessi** ('uncle'; male blue collar workers) or **haksayng** ('student'; those of university age or below). The most universal of such forms is probably **sensayngnim** (lit. 'teacher'), which can be used as a polite form to most adults.

To complete the jigsaw that is the Korean honorifics system, I turn my attention to terms used to refer to third person referents. Korean has no third person pronouns per se; however, there is a system of pronominal expressions translating as "this/that person" which can be used as generic ways to refer to third persons, as shown in Table 13. Although the third of these expressions **ku ay** literally translates as 'that child', it can also be used to refer to intimates or status inferiors. As for **ku nom**, this expression is sometimes used casually by males when referring to intimates, inferiors and their own children; however, it can also become a term of depreciation. Besides pronouns, third persons can be referred to by the terms of address listed at the beginning of this sub-section (excluding those containing vocative suffixes).

Table 13. Third person pronominal expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronominal expression</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku pwun</td>
<td>'that person' honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku salam</td>
<td>'that person' plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku ay</td>
<td>'that child'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku nom</td>
<td>'that wretch'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ku translates as 'that'. This demonstrative can also be substituted for * (‘this’) or ce (‘that ... over there’) as appropriate.
2.3.4 Beyond honorifics

The definition of Korean honorifics is traditionally limited to the elements discussed in the previous three subsections. However, closer inspection of previous research shows that it is not unusual for authors to extend descriptions to other items and even to general discussions of suitable behavior to superiors and elders. This section discusses these phenomena that exist on the borderline of "honorific" language.

There is a range of vocabulary substitutions in Korean which show some alternation between contaymal and panmal but that are rarely considered as true "honorific" phenomena. As a first example, Yun Sung-kyu (1993) describes annyenghi ('peacefully') as a honorific vocabulary substitution for kal ('well'). This classification is seemingly based on the following alternations in the set greetings below, (a) showing the honorific and (b) showing the non-honorific greeting.

(10) a. annyenghi ka-si-eyo b. kal ka
   peacefully go-SHON-{Y} well go-{E}
   'good bye.' [lit. 'go peacefully'] 'good bye.' [lit. 'go well']

(11) a. annyenghi kyeysi-eyo b. kal iss-e
   peacefully stay:SHON-{Y} well stay-{E}
   'good bye' [lit. 'stay peacefully'] 'good bye' [lit. 'stay well']

(12) a. annyenghi cwumwusi-eyo b. kal ca
   peacefully sleep:SHON-{Y} well sleep-{E}
   'good night' [lit. 'sleep peacefully'] 'sleep well'

Despite this evidence, whether annyenghi represents a true "honorific" form is questionable. Firstly, whereas honorific substitutions are generally similar in referential meaning to their plain counterparts, there is an obvious difference in meaning between annyenghi 'peacefully' and kal 'well'. Secondly, the substitution is limited to the greetings listed above; annyenghi cannot replace kal (or vice-versa) in other utterances.

Yun (1993) also includes coysonghata (罪惶 - sorry, literally 'I feel guilty') as a honorific substitution for mianhata (未安 - sorry, 'I feel uncomfortable') as performative verbs of apology. Although the former is certainly more formal than the latter, speakers do not seem to strictly differentiate between these two forms on the grounds of their relative position with the interlocutor. Another vocabulary item showing alternation between contaymal (honorific speech) and panmal is the substitution of ney/yey ('yes') for ung. The casual ung appears to be a strong marker of non-honorific speech to which Korean speakers are quite sensitive.
Indeed, the “learner stories” presented in Chapter 8 include one incident of an L2 speaker receiving a particularly violent reaction for misusing this term.

Besides speech style endings and the ‘honorific marker’ -si-, the use (or at least frequency) of other verb endings may vary between honorific and non-honorific speech. One important example is the choice of volitional markers. Whereas speakers may, in more casual language, apply the marker -lkey, this ending is not considered deferential enough when addressing notable superiors, particularly in leave takings and other set expressions. Instead, in such situations, the ending -keyss- is preferred. Thus, the following leave taking expressions for addressing a friend (a) and a superior (b) differ not only in speech style but also in the volitional marker applied:

(13) a. mence ka-lkey
    first go-vol-{E}
    ‘I will go first’

b. mence ka-keyss-supnita
    first go-vol-{P}
    ‘I will go first’

One additional phenomenon that some linguists (Lim and Chang 1995: 375; Han Gil 2002: 30) include under discussions of honorifics is “the principle of unlimited response”. In the examples below, although these sentences are all in the {P} speech style and all contain the -si- honorific marker, (b) and (c) are said to be more “honorific” than (a) in that they are more indirect, “polite” and allow more freedom for the listener in choosing his/her response.

(14) a. ili-lo o-si-psio
    here-inst come-shon-imp:{P}
    ‘come here’

b. ili-lo o-si-ci anh-usi-keyss-supnikka?
    here-inst come-shon-NEG-shon-mod-int:{P}
    ‘wouldn’t you come here?’

c. illi-lo o-si-ess-umyen ha-pnita
    here-inst come-shon-cond do-dec:{P}
    ‘it would do if you came here’

The description of indirect forms as being more “honorific” clearly blurs the lines between indexicality and what has traditionally been described as “strategic politeness”. Although (b) and (c) may be more “polite” (when applied in the appropriate context), can they really be considered more “honorific”? I shall explore the
position of honorifics within politeness theory in more depth in Chapter 3. For
the moment, I note with interest that honorifics are not disassociated with such
broader concerns of politeness.

Apart from non-honorific *panmal*, there appears to be a wide range of casual
expressions that are considered as universally unsuitable for use towards notable
superiors, particularly *noin* (elders). In Lee Ji-young’s (1990) analysis of L2 honor­
ifics use and Lee Jung-bok’s (2006) study of Korean high school students language
use, the discussion moves from honorific forms to other expressions the authors
considers unsuitable for using in reference to status superiors. Lee Ji-young (1990)
corrects learners for describing a father’s baldhead as being “*hwulengkkacin*”
(‘bald’, ‘slap head’) and for saying that a teacher was “*tulaknallakhata*” (‘flitting
back and forth’). Similarly, Lee Jung-bok (2006: 219) is critical of the use of the
vaguely derogatory “*cis*” (‘behavior’) for referring to a teacher’s actions. These ex­
amples are interesting in that they suggest that the need to use respectful language
when talking to or referring to notable status superiors extends to other areas of
speech beyond “honorific” verb endings and vocabulary substitutions.

Finally, it has also been claimed that *kontaymal* ‘honorific language’ and *pan­
mal* ‘non-honorific language’ differ in terms of prosody. Winter and Grawunder
(2009) found that utterance in *kontaymal* were clearer, quieter, lower in pitch
and monotonous, whereas *panmal* utterances were characterized by loudness
and a higher and more varied pitch. As pointed out by Winter and Grawunder
(2009), the impression of loudness associated with *panmal* is increased through
the pitch variation, according to what is known as the vibrato effect. Winter and
Grawunder (2009) also found that utterances made in *kontaymal* were 58% longer
than comparative utterances made in *panmal*, this extra length being accounted
for primarily by a 52% increase in “wordiness” Although these matters require
further research, the possible (and fascinating) conclusion is that prosody and
other factors may play an (equally) important role as morphological and lexical
marking in the differentiation between honorific and non-honorific speech.

### 2.4 Putting the honorifics system together

Until now, this chapter has considered the various parts of hearer and referent
honorification chiefly in isolation. It has not provided a centralized account of
how these different forms interact and has not discussed systematically the con­
ditions under which honorific (and non-honorific) forms are typically applied. I
now address these issues by discussing the interrelationship between the different
parts of the honorifics system (Section 2.4.1) and giving an account of the major
factors that influence their application (Section 2.4.2).
Figure 1. Distribution of hearer, subject and object honorifics

2.4.1 Interrelationship between component parts

The account now looks at the relationship between hearer and referent honorification and also between terms of address and verbal honorifics. This section will therefore illustrate how the Korean honorifics system works together as an integrated whole.

When hearer and referent are separate entities, hearer and referent honorifics work independently. In the most complex of situations, in the same sentence the speaker may have to index relationships with as many as three people: hearer, subject referent and object referent, as displayed in Figure 1. A brief synopsis of the sentence in Figure 1 reveals no less than nine honorific elements. Grandmother, the object of the sentence, is shown respect through the honorific form of address halmenim ('esteemed grandmother'), the honorific dative particle -kkey ('to'), the honorific noun malssum ('words') and the honorific verb tulita ('give'). Father, the subject of the sentence, is granted deference through the honorific form of address apenim ('esteemed father'), the honorific nominative particle -kkeyse and the honorific pre-final inflectional ending -si-. Finally, mother, the hearer, is honored through the honorific form of address emenim ('esteemed mother') and the so-called “deferential” {P} speech style ending. Note the distribution of the different honorific elements in the sentence structure with object honorification occupying the innermost layer, followed by subject and then hearer honorification.

In cases where the referent and the hearer are the same, referent honorifics and speech styles work together to provide fine-grained honorification. When asking a question about a hearer's actions or thoughts or ordering a hearer to do something, the speaker has to decide what mixture of speech styles and referent honorifics is appropriate. The following example shows the possible combinations of inclusion/exclusion of the subject honorific inflectional ending -si- with the four most common speech levels used in contemporary Seoul Korean:
(15) a. eti ka-si-pnikka? {P} speech style + subject honorifics
    b. eti ka-pnikka? {P} speech style
    c. eti ka-si-eyo? {Y} speech style + subject honorifics
    d. eti ka-ayo? {Y} speech style
    e. eti ka-si-e? {E} speech style + subject honorifics
    f. eti ka-a? {E} speech style
    g. ? eti ka-si-ni? {T} speech style + subject honorifics*
    h. eti ka-ni? {T} speech style

'Swhere are you going?'

Some of these combinations are more common than others. When addressing status superiors and adult non-intimates, (a) and (c) – which contain both referent honorifics and honorific speech styles – are widely used, with the former being more appropriate in formal scenes. For intimates and subordinates, (f) and (h) are the most generic forms, as they contain no honorific elements. The remaining four combinations mix honorific and non-honorific elements and thus have more limited applications. (b) and (d) combine honorific speech styles with the omission of referent honorifics. Of these, (d) may be used to address non-intimates who are known or appear to be of equal or lower status than the speaker. (b) – which combines the highest speech style with omission of referent honorifics – is more limited and would perhaps only be suitable when addressing a status inferior in a highly formal situation. Sentences (e) and (g) contain referent honorifics, but non-honorific speech styles. Although sentence (g) is particularly unusual, there are some environments in which (e) is appropriate. A senior professor may use this when addressing a junior professor, showing respect for the junior’s position as a fellow professor while at the same time maintaining his/her superior status. Similarly, a daughter may use this to her mother, indexing a combination of respect for her mother’s status with a high degree of intimacy. The fact that these combinations are possible and the social meanings that they adopt show that the referent honorific marker -si- is more sensitive to “power” factors and speech levels are more sensitive to “distance” or “formality”.

I now consider the relationship between terms of address and speech styles. Several linguists have proposed pragmatic co-occurrence restrictions between these elements, including the framework of Park Young-soon (2004: 230), which I have summarized in Table 14. Although the framework is far from comprehensive, it serves as a useful guide to which forms of address generally occur with which speech styles. It is also of pedagogical use since, as pointed out by Park Sun-min (1994), speakers of Korean as a second language are often unaware as to which forms of address combine best with each speech style. However, in
natural discourse, these so-called “co-occurrence constraints” are much more fluid than the model suggests. Yoo Song-young’s (1998) study of broadcast data shows that honorific terms of address may frequently occur with non-honorific speech styles and vice-versa in specific contexts. For example, although Park claims that surname+plain title is only congruent with {S} and {N}, Yoo (1998: 173) contends that it may actually occur with any speech level in certain pragmatic environments. For example, a senior teacher addressing a junior teacher in front of students or their parents may use surname+plain title with the {P} speech level. In such cases, the use of the plain title reflects the superior power of the speaker, whereas the application of the “deferential” {P} style marks the formality of the occasion and provides the impression that the speaker is treating the hearer in a “professional” way in front of others.

(16) Kim sensayng, ku selyu chiw-ess-supnikka?
Kim teacher, those papers tidy-PAST-{P}
‘Mr(s). Kim, have you tidied up those papers?’

Table 14. Co-occurrence between speech styles, terms of address and pronouns (Park 2004)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech style</th>
<th>Co-occurring terms of address</th>
<th>Co-occurring pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{P}</td>
<td>1. deferential kinship term</td>
<td>5. fictive use of deferential kinship term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. surname + title + nim</td>
<td>29. title + nim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Y}</td>
<td>1. deferential kinship term</td>
<td>2. plain kinship term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. fictive use of deferential kinship term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. deferential teknonym</td>
<td>9. plain teknonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. surname + title + nim</td>
<td>29. title + nim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{S}</td>
<td>12. surname + plain title</td>
<td>28. plain title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. intimate teknonym</td>
<td>caney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{N}</td>
<td>3. intimate kinship term</td>
<td>12. surname + plain title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. intimate teknonym</td>
<td>25. given name + vocative suffix -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. given name + vocative suffix -i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{E}</td>
<td>3. intimate kinship term</td>
<td>4. kinship term + vocative -a/ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. intimate teknonym</td>
<td>caneyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. given name + vocative suffix -i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{T}</td>
<td>25. given name + vocative suffix -a/ya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although the information presented here is faithful in essence to Park (2004), I have made slight adjustments to the classifications to be consistent with the description in earlier sections of the current chapter. The numbers preceding the different forms of address correspond with the numbers used for these different patterns during their initial presentation in Section 3.3.
2.4.2 Factors influencing honorifics use

As mentioned previously in this chapter, I view honorific forms as devices for indexing "separation" and non-honorifics as resources for indexing "closeness". Depending on the context invoked, the underlying meanings of "connection" and "separation" can bring about a range of perlocutionary effects or specific social meanings. In addition to communicating the "social superiority" noted by Potts (2005) and Sells and Kim (2006), it has been widely acknowledged in the literature that honorifics are involved in the indexing of horizontal relationships. The use of honorific forms to a non-intimate status equal does not, I would argue, communicate "social superiority", but meanings such as non-intimacy, non-familiarity or non-solidarity. Similarly, the use of honorific forms in public speech or when performing sensitive speech acts does not index that the hearer is necessarily of higher rank than the speaker, but demarcates the discourse as formal (in the first case) or signals to the hearer that the speaker is not attempting to coerce him/her in any way (in the latter). These meanings of "power", "distance", "formality" and "softening of assertion" are adopted as parameters for measuring L2 use of honorifics in subsequent chapters.

2.4.2.1 Honorifics usage and power

The primary context-specific meaning associated with the use of Korean honorifics is that the hearer/referent/etc. is either socially superior/inferior to the speaker. Packaging this superiority or inferiority as "power", the vertical relationship whereby one interlocutor is more powerful than another is commonly referred to in the literature either as "status" or "rank". Julie Diamond (1996: 9) divides rank into two components: institutional rank and local rank. The former refers to a relatively fixed social order typically including sex, age, race and position in the family. Local rank includes factors such as occupation, position in an institution, economics, marital status and education. This second set of factors, at least in theory, can be changed through individual efforts, although this will depend on local or cultural variables. In the Korean context, the classification of factors as institutional rank or local rank given above (adapted from Diamond 1996) appears to fit the social reality. All of these factors influence honorifics use, at least to some extent.

In the hierarchical structure of Korean society, age is the most powerful and ideologically-invested factor in determining power differences. Yoon Kyung-joo (2004: 203) posits that speakers differentiate three categories of relative superior age: much older (nai-ka acwu manhta), a little older (nai-ka com manhta) and not much older (nai-ka pyello an manhta). The need to carefully apply honorific language is considered particularly important when interacting with those who are who are "much older", particularly if they are noin (老人; "elders" – generally
over 60). *Noin* are considered to be possessors of wisdom and experience; disagreeing with, contradicting or causing any discomfort to them is highly taboo (Yoon Kyung-joo 2004).

Despite the prevalence of age, there are numerous instances where other factors may override it in the construction of power. Within the family, generational structure takes priority in instances where, for example, a nephew/niece happens to be older than an uncle/aunt. In the workplace, university or military, rank is supposed to supercede age in determining seniority. In reality, this can be a great source of discomfort for both parties, who may even try to avoid speaking to each other altogether in order to avoid problems as to what level of honorifics to use. When forced to converse with each other, speakers in such circumstances may leave sentences incomplete in order to avoid the speech style endings (Lee Jung-bok 1999: 109). In addition, if the speakers interact outside of the family, workplace, university or military, they may revert to age-based norms of honorifics use.¹²

The influence of sex on honorifics use is less predictable than age, position in the family or institutional superiority. Although the status difference between men and women in Korean society is still considerable, this does not always equate with men being able to use lower honorific forms when addressing women. True, between married couples, the practice of the husband using non-honorific language but receiving honorifics from the wife is still considered the social norm. However, in wider social circles, men are often more careful in their language use towards females and may be more reticent to drop into non-honorific language even with those of the same age or younger. Such observations show that sex is often more closely tied up with solidarity (see Section 2.4.2.2 below) than with power. Furthermore, instead of lowering their language to index power differences, on the contrary, men may use higher and more power-laden speech styles to draw out their superior social status.

Talk of men using higher honorifics to emphasize power differences leads nicely onto discussions of power as being dynamic and contestable rather than simply prescribed. This stems from the fact that, as Locher (2004: 31) puts it, status is “not seen as synonymous to power, but as its seat”. Even participants who are ascribed a high relative status will still have to make at least some efforts to claim

---

¹² Interesting, one of the heritage speakers participating in this study experienced this very situation. Her family members residing in Korea included her cousin’s son who happened to be four years older than her. They got on well and sometimes socialized “outside” the family with other friends. After some discomfort regarding language use, they agreed to preserve non-reciprocal use within the family (he used honorifics and she used non-honorific forms) but to reciprocate non-honorific language when meeting outside the family.
this status for their own. In the Korean context, notable superiors will need to live up to and emphasize the high status they are accorded. Those who do not display the maturity, wisdom and morality associated with the respect they are given may find that this respect diminishes. Symptomatic of this point is the fact that speaking about one’s superior committing immoral deeds using honorific forms sounds pragmatically odd; thus, in the following example, it may be more appropriate to omit the honorific -si- (Cho Eui-yon 1988):

(17) Kim sensayng-nim-i na-uy chinkwu In-ho-lul
Kim teacher-HON-NOM I-POS friend In-ho-ACC
[?? cwuki-si-ess-ta / cwuki-ess-ta]
[?? kill-HON-PAST-{T} / kill-PAST-{T}]
‘teacher Kim killed my friend In-ho’

In instances where status differences are less clearly defined, there is more scope to use honorifics to assert one’s claim to power. In sales talk, for example, although clerks in department stores are trained to use high honorific forms to customers, traders in cheaper outlets will sometimes use non-honorific language — especially to younger customers — to assert pressure on them and coerce them into buying. This can be observed both in the ethnographic research of Ahn Jeong-khun (1997) and in my own observed examples that follow:

(18) Observed data: Female clerk uses non-honorific language to female customer at clothes stall
a. po-ko ipe pw-a
   ‘have a look and try it on- {E}’
b. ssakey cwu-lkey
   ‘I’ll give it to you cheap- {E}’
c. kakyek-man hungcengha-ko ka-myen na ppichi-ci
   ‘if you just haggle over the price and then go, I’ll be upset- {E}’

Particularly in (a) and (c), the power-laden language combined with non-honorific forms, combine to coerce the customer into feeling pressure to buy. Such examples show that honorifics do not merely index passive power relations, but can be used to establish the location of power.

2.4.2.2 Honorifics usage and distance
A secondary context-specific meaning of honorifics relates to the symmetrical horizontal relationship between members of a community of practice or participants in a speech event. In this study, I take distance to contain three aspects:
solidarity, familiarity and affect. Although I include "affect" as a constituting factor of distance, it should be noted that this has proven a point of contention amongst scholars (Spencer-Oatey 1996).

"Solidarity" involves perceived commonalities or symmetries shared by two people irrespective of rank (Cho et al. 2006). Commonalities most relevant to Korean society and honorifics include same sex, same family, same hometown, same company, same school, same department (within the company or school) and same club (social, leisure, etc.). Being a member of the same group does not license universal use of non-honorific language. Rather, this sense of belonging allows for power-based roles to be more quickly defined and applied and for patterns of asymmetrical honorifics use (between superiors and inferiors) and symmetrical honorifics use (between those of equal rank) to be established more as a matter of course.

"Familiarity" refers to the sense of closeness that two people may feel purely from the "intensity of interaction" between them. This includes primarily the length of time the people in question have known each other and the hours they have spent in close proximity. However, it is obvious that these two factors alone do not necessarily correlate directly with becoming familiar. The contexts in which the people interact and the kinds of events, etc. they experience together would also be important. Regarding honorifics use, increased familiarity allows some relaxation of honorifics, although this is generally constrained to small power differences, for example, age differences of under five years.

The final piece in the distance "jigsaw" is the influence of "affect", which I take to refer to how much speakers like or are attracted to each other (Baxter 1984; Slugoski and Turnbull 1988). In some cases, speakers may be more careful to apply honorific forms to non-intimates they like and intend to impress, particularly if the interlocutor is a status superior. Alternatively, when minimal power differences allow, speakers may move into non-honorific language quicker with those they want to get close to (and slower with those they don't). Rich examples

---

13. The term "intensity of interaction" is borrowed from interlanguage pragmatics and the work of Klein et al. (1995: 277). Klein uses the term in the dismissal of "length of stay" in the target culture as a variable affecting language acquisition, pointing out that what is important is not how long the learner stays in the target culture per se, but how much they interact with speakers of the language. Similarly, in the current paper I use the term in recognition of the fact that "length of interaction" is not the only decisive factor in the establishment of familiarity and that other factors may be at play.

14. The definition of affect as "liking" represents what Caffi and Janney (1994: 328) refer to as the "cooler" definition of the term. At the "hotter" end of the scale, the term has been used synonymously with "emotion".
of this kind of honorifics use can be found in the work of Lee Jung-bok and Yoo Song-young (see Chapter 3). As well as lowering the honorific level to "get closer", speakers may also switch to higher levels in interactions with intimates to decrease the sense of "solidarity" or "familiarity". A frequently quoted example of this is that of married couples upgrading to honorific forms during arguments (Lee Jung-bok 1999:115).

I conclude this section by commenting on the interplay between power and distance in the application of Korean honorifics. Several authors including Sohn Ho-min (1986), Yun Sung-kyu (1993) and Choo Mi-ho (2006) have commented on the weakening of power differences in Korean society and the move towards more horizontal patterns of usage that this has encouraged. This weakening of power is best evidenced in the growing use of panmal (non-honorific language) by children to parents and by wives to husbands as well as the growing need for status superiors to maintain contaymal (honorific language) when speaking with non-intimate inferiors. However, there is a danger that the growing importance of distance can be overemphasized. Korean society is still far from reaching the point where solidarity can win out over power outside of a few close family relationships. It is still the case that grandparents, teachers and superiors in the workplace are always supposed to be addressed in honorifics, regardless of solidarity, formality or affect. Moreover, the need to apply honorifics according to hierarchical dimensions is still invested with far more social ideology than the need to use honorifics to non-intimates. Despite the fact that it is becoming more unusual for superiors to apply non-honorific panmal forms to non-intimate inferiors and particularly strangers, it was noted in Section 2.3.1 that such usage has not disappeared entirely and does not entail the same social taboo as the use of panmal to status superiors.

2.4.2.3 Honorifics usage and formality
When applied in conference presentations, wedding speeches or TV news, honorific forms do not signal that the hearers are necessarily socially superior or distant to the hearer. Rather, the underlying "separation" of honorific forms works to index the speech event as "formal".

Formality is connected with the level of "structuring" of the "scene" in which an interaction takes place. The "scene" contains two aspects: "purpose" and "setting" (Brown and Fraser 1979:45). "Purpose" includes the activity type and subject matter that participants are engaging in. "Setting" includes both physical and temporal aspects and – most critically – the presence or absence of multiple listeners or third persons. According to Brown and Fraser, all of these aspects may influence language use; however, this does not tell us how speakers go about interpreting which "scenes" are formal and which are informal. For these kinds
of insights, we need to look at the work of Atkinson (1982) and Irvine (2001). According to Irvine, the formal scene can be recognized by (1) increased code structuring, (2) code consistency, (3) invoking positional identities and (4) emergence of a central situational focus. The principal code that identifies a scene as formal is language and the organization of speaking itself. Atkinson shows that the way turns are allocated, the need for speakers to be clearly identified, the clear definition of topic and the use of loud and slow speech are all strongly identified with "formality."

According to Atkinson (1982:92), speakers are sensitive to the degree to which a formal event differs from "normal" conversation and this ongoing process of analysis allows them to judge just how "formal" the frame is in which they are operating. Participants therefore rely on certain signals or "contextualization cues" (Gumperz 1977) to help them establish the level of formality. In Korean interaction, the {P} speech style represents one of the clearest of such cues. The ideological connection between {P} and formality is well established; indeed, despite the fact that this style is also frequently used in informal speech, it is customarily referred to (both in linguistic and layman discourse) as a "formal style" (kyeksikchey). From the opposite angle, the research of Lee Chang-soo (1996: 151) shows that Korean speakers may believe {P} to be the only style that is used in formal scenes (in this case, TV broadcasts), even though the same speakers actually frequently switch between {P} and {Y} when interacting in such contexts.

Other honorifics usages that are closely tied up with formality include the strict application of referent honorifics and the avoidance of intimate terms of address. The use of terms of "separation" towards intimates in formal scenes is motivated by face concerns both for the self and others. By using honorific forms, speakers not only show themselves to be educated or in authority, but also anoint the face of the other party in the eyes of the audience, thus communicating "politeness."

2.4.2.4 Honorifics usage and the softening of assertion
The increased "separation" indexed by honorifics forms can also be used as a means of softening the assertion of an utterance. In such cases, honorifics – primarily a linguistic resource for indexical politeness – display crossover into modulation politeness (see Chapter 3).

Increasing the level of honorification in sensitive speech acts, especially orders, is a widespread and at times highly conventionalized aspect of honorifics use. As noted previously, when speaking contaymal, speakers will tend to add the -si- referent honorific marker to all imperatives, even if they do not use them in corresponding declaratives and interrogatives. Regarding contaymal speech styles, using {P} rather than {Y} is quite highly conventionalized (particularly
for males) in the performative verbs of apology (*coysongha-pnita*) and thanks (*kamsaha-pnita*). Furthermore, speakers appear to show extra care in their use of speech styles in declarative statements, questions and expressions of future volition rather than in sentences that contain modal functions or are modulated in other ways (Lee Chang-soo 1996).

There is also evidence that the subject honorific marker *-si-* is being increasingly used as a marker of modulation politeness. The following combines my own observed examples with those of Lim Dong-hoon (2000):

(19) a. radio presenter to caller (observed example, Lim Dong-hoon 2000: 58)
   pangsong-ey phyenci-ka an nao-**si**-myen ettehkey ha-**si**-lyeko ha-**si**-supnikka?
   ‘what were you going to do if your letter didn’t appear-SHON on the program?’

   b. customer to shop owner (observed example, Lim Dong-hoon 2000: 58)
   kakyek-i elma-i-**si**-eyo?
   ‘how much does it cost-SHON?’

   c. receptionist at language school to customer (observed example)
   70,000-won-i-**si**-pnita.
   ‘it-SHON 70,000 won’

   d. undergraduate student giving class presentation (observed example)
   ilen ttus-i-**si**-ko-yo
   ‘it is-SHON this meaning’

Although *-si-* should as a rule only be applied when the subject (or topic) is human and of superior status to the speaker, these examples show its application where the subject is ‘letter’, ‘price’, ‘70,000 won’ and ‘meaning’. As pointed out by Lim (2000), although these kinds of examples are often treated as “errors”, they can often be heard in natural discourse. It seems to me that such usages are motivated by a situational need to soften the propositional content or illocutionary force of the utterance, particularly keenly felt when dealing with non-intimates in structured or formal settings. In such cases, the added “separation” created by including such honorific markers produces the perlocutionary affect of “politeness”.

2.4.2.5 Other marked honorifics usages
All of the honorifics usages outlined so far in this section have displayed propensity for “marked” or “strategic” applications. By marked upgrading to higher honorific levels, speakers may directly make “relevant” an intention to increase power, distance and formality factors or soften the assertion of an utterance. Marked downgrading, on the other hand, may communicate the intention to
increase intimacy with the hearer or flout power dimensions. In this section, I discuss a few remaining instances of marked honorifics use that do not fit inside this model and, indeed, do not appear to be directly concerned with maintaining face or communicating politeness.

The use of honorific language towards inferiors or status equals is a strong “contextualization cue” (Gumperz 1977) for sarcasm, anger and insult, as well as joke. A particularly potent mixture for this kind of communication is the juxtaposition of honorific and non-honorific elements within the same sentence and, in particular, the inclusion of referent honorifics alongside non-honorific speech styles:

(20) a. teacher to student late for class (Cho Eui-yon 1988: 139)
    haksayng, acwu ilcick o-si-nunkwun
    ‘you have come-SHON very early-{{E}}’

b. husband to wife (observed example)
    maum-taylo ha-si-e
    ‘do-SHON as you please-{{E}}’

c. friend to friend (observed example)
    sinkyeng kku-si-e
    ‘mind-SHON your own business-{{E}}’

In (a), the propositional content (i.e. the teacher’s comment that the late student is “early”) is already ironic; the honorific -si- works as a contextualization cue to make the sarcasm more explicit. In (b) and (c), the use of -si- opens up at least two possible conflicting terms of interpretation: anger/annoyance or joke. As pointed out by Lee Chang-soo (1996: 206), the final interpretation will rely on secondary contextualization cues, particularly prosody. Instances of using honorifics to express anger or sarcasm flout frame-based politeness norms and are intentionally applied to damage the addressee’s face.

One final use of honorifics prevalent in the literature but not covered in the current description is what Lee Ik-hwan and Susumo Kuno (1995) refer to as “empathy” or “hearer-based” honorifics:

(21) Father talking to son about younger maternal aunt (Lee and Kuno 1995: 216)
    yeng-swu-ya, imo-nim ka-si-nta
    yŏng-su-voc, aunt-HON go-HON-{{T}}
    ‘Yŏng-su, aunt-HON is going-HON’

In (21), the father’s use of honorifics towards the referent does not index his own relationship with the aunt, but rather the relationship of his son to the aunt. Lee
and Kuno (1995) attempt to explain this through a rule whereby speakers are obligated to use referent honorifics when talking about a referent that is of higher rank than the hearer. However, positing this kind of use as an obligatory rule appears to be somewhat disingenuous – in natural discourse, these usages appear to be infrequent. Rather, this adoption of the hearer’s position represents a simple case of deictic projection whereby the speaker shifts the deictic center from the default position of himself onto another participant (see Levinson 1983:64) and is therefore able to adopt the participant’s perspective. This use of deictic projection appears to have a pedagogical function whereby adults (or other competent members) socialize children (and other less competent members) into appropriate honorifics use. Such usage becomes more problematic and unusual in instances of marginal power differences or between adult parties.

2.4.3 Contrasts between Korean and Japanese honorifics

As an appendix to the current chapter, I briefly comment on some important differences between Korean honorifics and the corresponding system in Japanese. These notes are designed to clarify points made in the previous discussions for readers more familiar with the Japanese system, which has received more attention in previous literature. For more detailed information regarding contrasts between Japanese and Korean speech styles – including patterns of speech style shifting – readers are referred to Brown (2010c).

Readers more familiar with Japanese honorifics may noticed that the Korean system is more developed in terms of speech styles (hearer honorifics) than Japanese, but not as developed in terms of object honorifics and self-humbling expressions. As well as honorific forms, Japanese is rich with humilific forms that act to humble or “lower” the speaker when talking about his/her own actions. Examples include verbs such as mairu (‘go, ‘come’), zonzu (‘think, ‘know’) and moosu (‘say’). The fact that self-humbling in Korean is limited to a handful of object honorific vocabulary substitutions and expressions for referring to oneself marks an important difference with Japanese in terms of “politeness” theory. Korean honorifics are shown to rely almost entirely on a “positive politeness strategy” (Brown and Levinson 1978) whereby the speaker recognizes the hearer’s “face want” to be afforded an expected degree of deference. Such observations add support to Horie’s (2007) argument that whereas Japanese is a “negative politeness” language, Korean is oriented towards “positive politeness”.

Readers more familiar with Japanese may also have noticed the lack of discussion regarding “ingroupness” as a factor influencing the application of Korean honorifics. When talking about their own parents, grandparents, immediate
superiors, etc. to those outside of the family, company, etc., Japanese speakers will suppress the use of referent honorifics. The opposite is true in Korean, where speakers will use referent honorifics to talk about in-group superiors in front of "out-groupers". Despite the importance of the group in Korean society, the distinction between "in-group" and "out-group" is seemingly not as pervasive as in Japan. Indeed, whereas *uchi* (‘in-group’) and *soto* (‘out-group’) are often quoted as cultural keywords in Japan, the corresponding concepts hardly exist in Korea. Moreover, the need for Japanese speakers to suppress honorification for their own "in-group" seems to be connected to the observations in the previous paragraph that speaking humbly about oneself – as well as one’s own group – is a more important aspect of Japanese honorifics in comparison to Korean.

As a final observation, the role of sex in determining honorifics use is less pronounced in Korean than in Japanese. There is no clear concept (or cultural ideology) in Korean that corresponds to the “women’s language” referred to in the literature on Japanese honorifics (see Siegal 1994: 108 for critical review). In particular, the use of so-called “beautification honorifics” by Japanese women (whereby honorific forms are used even when talking about one’s own possessions, actions, etc. – Ide 1982: 379) has no equivalent in Korean. Whereas the increased use of honorifics in Japanese is linked with femininity and beauty, in Korean the use of high honorific forms – and the {P} speech style in particular – are thought to sound stiff, authoritarian and masculine. As pointed out by Okamoto (2004: 50), this contrast is of significance as it “illustrates the subjective and arbitrary nature of the link between a particular speech style and femininity”
CHAPTER 3

Honorifics and politeness

3.1 Introduction

This book adopts the position that differences between Korean and "Western" "politeness" – and the ideologies surrounding such differences – are key to understanding the way that L2 speakers of Korean perceive, use and learn honorifics. In the chapter that follows this one (Chapter 4), I explain second language speaker progression towards native-like norms in honorifics use as a process of "re-framing" and "re-facing" (Brown 2010b). The former refers to the process of resetting the parameters as to what constitutes polite behavior. The latter depicts the accompanying process whereby L2 speakers engage in the construction of an L2 identity as they participate in the local community of practice. I contend that both these processes are complicated by L2 speakers' native or pre-existing knowledge and ideologies regarding what it means to "be polite" or "show respect".

Before entering into these arguments however, it is first of all necessary to establish the position of honorifics within a theory of politeness and to set down the approach towards politeness adopted in this book. This in itself is no small task, particularly given the current debate in pragmatics regarding how best to define "politeness" and where honorifics may sit vis-à-vis such a concept.

Arguments proceed as follows. In Section 3.2, I review the position of four theoretical camps regarding the location of honorifics within politeness research. The discussions reveal a tendency for honorifics to be separated from theoretical models of "politeness", despite the strong connection at the layman level between these forms and the maintenance of linguistic etiquette. In Section 3.3, I attempt to posit solutions to these problems. The model of politeness I present draws principally on the conceptualization of politeness as being "frame-based" (Terkourafi 2005). I also comment on the importance of recognizing the ideological aspects of politeness and the adoption of a model of face as interactional and relational. Finally, in Section 3.4, I outline "politeness ideologies" specific to the Korean cultural setting that influence the way that honorifics use is perceived. I comment on the contrasts between these Korean ideologies and those prevalent in "Western" cultures. Later in this book, these cultural differences regarding how politeness is perceived are shown to influence the use and development of honorifics in L2.
3.2 Previous approaches to politeness and honorifics

In this study, it is assumed that honorifics are essential to the negotiation for politeness in Korean. However, a review of politeness theory reveals a tendency for honorifics to be separated from "politeness". The reasons for this are generally two-fold. Firstly, honorifics are seen as being "obligatory" markers of fixed social positions incompatible with the notion of politeness as a strategic process (i.e. the Brown and Levinson view). Secondly, the use of honorifics according to social norms has been seen as "unmarked" and thus incompatible with the position that politeness must be "marked" in order for it to be communicated (cf. Watts 1989 and the "polite"/"politic" distinction). In this section, after outlining Brown and Levinson's treatment of honorifics in Section 3.2.1, I explain in 3.3.2 why this treatment has led to the distancing of honorifics from "politeness" in the work of Korean and Japanese scholars (notably Hwang Juck-ryoon and Sachiko Ide). I then consider the place of honorifics in Watts' (1989) widely adopted model of "relational work" and division between "polite" and "politic" behavior (Section 3.3.3). Finally, I provide an overview of work on "strategic" use of honorifics by Korean linguistics Lee Jung-bok (1999, 2001) and Yoo Song-young (1994, 1996) and comment on the implications for politeness research (Section 3.3.4).

3.2.1 Brown and Levinson: Honorifics as FTA mitigators

Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) "universal" theory of politeness is crucial to the discussion of honorifics for two reasons. Firstly, the theory established the vital connection between politeness and "face"; a concept I will claim still remains key to the understanding of honorifics and politeness. Secondly, Brown and Levinson's theory defined a specific (yet ultimately controversial) role for honorifics systems in politeness theory.

Brown and Levinson (1987:61) define "face" as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself". This notion is said to be derived from the theoretical construct of sociologist Erving Goffman (1967) and also from the English folk term, thus tying up face with "notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or "losing face" (Brown and Levinson 1987:61). Face is identified as consisting of two kinds of desires (or "face-wants"); the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (which is labeled "negative face") and the desire to be approved of ("positive face"). These two types of face are inevitably threatened by the performance of sensitive speech acts such as requests, advice, threats, offers, promises and so forth ("face threatening acts" or "FTAs"). Individuals try
to reduce the face threat in such utterances by redress to the hearer’s positive face ("positive politeness") or negative face ("negative politeness"). According to Brown and Levinson, politeness is communicated in the form of an implicature; in other words, as put most clearly by Brown (2001: 11623), by the hearer making an "inference" of the speaker’s "polite intentions".

Brown and Levinson (1987: 178-187) account for honorific phenomena under the negative politeness strategy of "give deference". The theory challenges previous descriptions of honorifics as "automatic reflexes or signals of predetermined social standing". Instead, Brown and Levinson propose that honorifics are "typically strategically used to soften FTAs, by indexing the absence of risk to the addressee." When performing face-threatening speech acts, the speaker can intentionally elevate honorific forms to convey the impression that the hearer is of higher status than the speaker. This acts to minimize any threat of coercion that the hearer may feel and therefore communicates "politeness". Such a description of honorifics is not wholly incompatible with the Korean honorifics system. Indeed, Korean speakers frequently use elevated honorifics to mitigate the force of utterances, as discussed in the previous chapter. However, Brown and Levinson's theory fails to account for honorifics use in utterances that do not constitute FTAs. As pointed out by Matsumoto (1989) speakers of "honorific languages" such as Korean and Japanese are forced into an obligatory choice between different forms in every single sentence, no matter how innocuous the propositional content or illocutionary force may be.

Apart from the treatment of honorifics, Brown and Levinson's model of linguistic politeness was also widely criticized regarding the way that "face" was defined and particularly for the construct of "negative face". Gu (1990) for Chinese, Wierzbicka (1985) for Polish, Sifianou (1992) for Greek, de Kadt (1998) for Zulu, Matsumoto (1988, 1989) for Japanese were amongst those who found that this "want" to be "unimpeded by others" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 62) was incompatible with cultures that valued group membership and involvement over personal distance.

3.2.2 Hwang and Ide: Honorifics as deference or discernment

The failure of Brown and Levinson to account for the majority of honorific usages within a "universal" model of politeness prompted Korean linguists to separate off honorifics from such discussions. Hwang Juck-ryoon (1975, 1990), followed by Dredge (1983) and Sohn Ho-min (1986), proposed that honorifics belonged
to the realm of “deference” rather than “politeness.” Alternatively, Koo Ja-sook (1995) adopted the division of politeness into “discernment” (or “wakimae”) and “volition” proposed by the Japanese linguist Ide (Hill et al. 1986; Ide 1989).

The division between “politeness” and “deference” is based primarily on the distinction between two sets of linguistic forms. “Politeness” represents “an open pattern of language usage” (Sohn 1986:412) including “prosodic means, modal elements, softening adverbials, tag forms, cogitatives, indirect speech or conversational implicature, ellipsis and non-verbal behavior” (Sohn 1986:411). “Deference,” on the other hand, refers to “a closed, language-specific system” of social deictic terms. The cornerstone of the theory is based on examples such as the following, that – according to Hwang (1990:48) – shows that “politeness” and “deference” work as independent systems.

(1) a. apenim, ikes chiwu-si-psio
   father this clear-SHON-IMP:{P}
   ‘father, put this away’

   b. inswu-ya, ikes com chiwe cwul-lay?
   In-soo-voc this please clear give-sua:{E}
   ‘In-soo, will you put this away for me’

Sentence (1a) contains the {P} speech style and referent honorifics, but is a direct imperative. According to Hwang, this sentence is “deferential but impolite”. (1b), on the other hand, contains a hedged request but the non-honorific {E} speech style, rendering it “non-deferential but polite”. A distinction is also made between politeness as “a matter of speaker’s psychology” and deference as “a matter of social code which is imposed upon the participants in communicative interactions” (Hwang 1990:42).

Ide’s distinction between “volition” and “discernment” (or wakimae 弁-) follows the same lines as the politeness/deference dichotomy, “volition” equating roughly with “politeness and “discernment” with “deference”. Ide emphasizes “volition” as representing the speaker’s own active choice of expressions and strategies to achieve politeness. “Discernment”, on the other hand, is described as being “socio-pragmatically and grammatically obligatory” (Ide 1989:227). Ide

1. In this discussion, I treat the development of the theory of “deference” as being in response to Brown and Levinson. However, this is not strictly true, since Hwang’s early writings (Hwang 1975) actually predate Brown and Levinson (1978). Later works such as Hwang (1990) more specifically contrast deference with Brown and Levinson’s politeness. In wider linguistic circles, Ide’s discernment/volition dichotomy has been widely adopted and referenced. One author who does use the terms deference/politeness is Thomas (1995). It is unclear whether Thomas has adopted the terminology from the Korean linguistics.
is less clear than the Korean linguists as to whether "discernment" refers only to social deictic forms such as honorifics (particularly in Japanese) or whether it is a concern that influences other areas of language cross-linguistically. Having said this, Ide is consistent in her statements that "discernment" is more important in Japanese and East Asian societies and language use according to "volition" plays a more central role in the English-speaking world. The other contrast with the Korean linguists is the positioning of "discernment" within rather than outside of politeness. According to Ide, discernment represents politeness in that observance of social norms puts the addressee at ease and creates an atmosphere of "sharedness" (Ide and Yoshida 1999:446).

Although the "deference" and "discernment" models were justified in claiming that Brown and Levinson had underplayed the role of social indexing in linguistic politeness theory, I am critical of the grounds on which Hwang and Ide proposed to separate Korean and Japanese honorifics from a face-based theory of politeness. In particular, I object to the way that social indexing is seen as a "normative" and an "Asian" mode of politeness and other forms of politeness as being "strategic" and "Western". The idea that using politeness forms such as hedges or indirect requests is intrinsically more "strategic" than the use of honorifics is – at best – unscientific and difficult to prove.² At worst, claims that "Western" modes of behavior are more volitional and Korean or Japanese are necessarily more automatic reflects a prejudice rather than a reality.

3.2.3 Watts: Honorifics as ‘politic’ but not ‘polite’

Richard Watts (1989) only briefly deals with (Japanese) honorifics in his theory of "relational work" and, to my knowledge, no linguist has attempted to apply the theory to the Korean honorifics system. Nonetheless, Watts does provide some (rather contradictory) clues as to where honorifics might fit into the model. The "politic"/"polite" division also opens up the important questions of "markedness" and "relevance" in the communication of politeness and in the use of honorific forms.

According to Watts, what had previously been dubbed "politeness" covers a range of social behavior far broader than what is actually commonly evaluated as "polite". Watts adopts the term "relational work" for this broader framework of interpersonal interaction and maintains that all relational work is tied up with the

². Regarding this point, Pizziconi (2003:1489) argues that the use of such so-called politeness "strategies" is constrained by pragmatic, social and linguistic factors in a similar way to the constraints placed upon the use of honorific forms.
negotiation of face. However, within relational work, "polite" is reserved for the
discussion of linguistic behavior that is positively marked, noticed by the hearer
and therefore available for interpretation as such. Linguistic behavior that is ap­
propriate but unmarked and more likely to pass unnoticed is deemed "politic" but
not "polite". In later works, Watts (2003: 204) explicitly grounds this model in re­
levance theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986). According to relevance theory, interloc­
utors can only implicate something above and beyond the underlying message of
an utterance by making such an intention "relevant" and thereby bringing about
a change in the addressee's cognitive environment. For this to happen, the inter­
locutor must employ "ostensive stimuli" – marked linguistic behavior designed to
attract the audience's attention. The use of conventionalized unmarked linguistic
behavior, on the other hand, only reconfirms assumptions that the hearer already
holds "manifest" and therefore cannot be said to "communicate" politeness, as
Brown and Levinson had suggested.

Watts is generally keen to point out that the identification of polite/politic be­
havior is not based on the inclusion or exclusion of any particular linguistic phe­
nomenon – no linguistic item is inherently (im)polite/(non-)politic. In line with
this, in his examples from British English terms of address (Watts 1992: 58–69),
he concludes that address forms may be applied either as "politic" (when their
usage follows the social norm) or as "polite" (when they are used with strategic in­
tention). Such observations suggest similar treatment for honorifics – as "politic"
when they merely reflect power and distance relations, but also with the potential
for marked "polite" usages. However, Watts (1992: 68) confounds this expectation
by commenting that terms of address in "Western European and North Ameri­
can cultures" are "less automatic than the grammaticalized and lexicalized forms
of politic behavior in evidence in the Japanese system of honorifics" [emphasis
added]. The labeling of grammatical and lexical honorifics as inherently "politic"
represents a surprising contradiction in Watt's theory.

Thus, despite making the polite/politic distinction along different lines than
politeness/deference or volition/discernment, Watt's theory ultimately preserves
many of the weaknesses of the former models. Although the theory seems to al­
low room for the treatment of honorifics use that exceeds or manipulates social
norms and therefore for a more interactive approach to honorifics, the statement
analyzed above disappointingly labels honorifics as "automatic". Moreover, Watts
strongly identifies "polite" behavior not just as "marked" and "relevant"; but also
as "egocentric" and "volitional". He also suggests – particularly in earlier work –
that this volitional branch of human interaction is less pervasive in "discernment
cultures" such as Japan (Watts 1989: 132–133). The theory thus seems to perpetu­
ate the same stereotype of Asian modes of politeness as being more "automatic"
and void of individual speaker volition.
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More broadly, although Watts claims that the polite/politic distinction is based on “politeness!” or commonsense, layman notions, there are serious problems with this assertion. As pointed out by Eelen (2001:74), the distinction between “polite” and “politic” is not one that all speakers (or empirical research) would agree with. According to Eelen, previous research shows speakers to strongly associate appropriate T/V pronoun variation and routinized thanking and greeting with politeness, but that both of these would be considered as “politic” according to Watts’ framework.

3.2.4 Lee and Yoo: Honorifics as normative and strategic

The description of honorifics as being socio-pragmatically or grammatically obligatory has constituted the dominating voice within Korean linguistics, particularly regarding the behavior of the subject honorific marker -si-. However, the argument that honorifics do not merely index rigid social norms and that other factors (including speaker “volition”) may come into play has long been a recognized if somewhat weak voice (see for example Lee Maeng-sung 1973; Lee Ik-sop 1974; Kim Sŏk-dŭk 1977; Fred Lukoff 1977; Wang Hahn-sok 1984; Kim Ui-soo 2002). This voice has grown stronger in recent years thanks to the research of Lee Jung-bok (1999, 2001) and Yoo Song-young (1994, 1996).

Lee and Yoo recognize two distinct aspects of honorifics use: “normative usage” (kyupemcek yongpep; 規範的 用法) and “strategic usage” (cenlyakcek yongpep; 戰略的 用法). “Normative usage” is defined as “honorific use that expresses and recognizes personal relationships including hierarchy, intimacy, etc through honorific forms which are thought to be appropriate” (Lee 2001:56 – translation my own). As for “strategic use”, this is defined as “marked and intentionally controlled honorific usage employed by a speaker to pursue specific motives and which is unpredictable and differs from speech community norms” (Lee 2001:76). Lee stresses that strategic use is volitional, intentional, conscious and voluntary and relies on switching – on raising or lowering honorific levels – from the normative to the marked. Yoo (1996) more specifically sees this switching as the intentional manipulation of power and solidarity dimensions. According to Yoo, the switching between two given speech styles expresses a “seesaw” relationship between power and solidarity. Tipping the balance towards the higher speech level acts to draw out power differences and decrease solidarity. Alternatively, tipping the balance towards the lower speech level reduces power differences and promotes intimacy.

Neither Lee nor Yoo propose these modes of language use as being cross-linguistic or connect their research to politeness theory. However, these studies
provide rich evidence that honorifics are not always as "obligatory" as Hwang or Ide (or even Watts) had claimed and that they may indeed be used for the "strategic" functions originally identified by Brown and Levinson. The idea that honorifics may have two distinct usages — one that meets social expectations and one that flaunts them — also provides useful evidence for how honorifics may relate to the "frame-based" view of politeness adopted in the current paper, as will be outlined later in this chapter (Section 3.3.1).

Having said this, the normative/strategic framework is lacking in development and refinement. The main problem, as I see it, is a bias towards considering power and solidarity as the only factors that could possibly influence normative honorifics use. Instead of looking for additional factors or patterns of usage, all switches are too simply labeled as "strategic" and "intentional" attempts to manipulate power and solidarity. As discussed in the previous chapter, in addition to these factors, honorific use may be influenced by other variables such as formality and the softening of assertion. It thus appears questionable whether all of the so-called "strategic" usages analyzed by Lee and Yoo depend on the intentional speaker volition for which these researchers claim. The other part of the model that is underdeveloped is the idea of "markedness". Lee and Yoo establish the salience of honorifics usages purely in comparison to prescriptive L1 norms; there is no discussion as to how "markedness" may be constructed at a pragmatic level.

3.3 Towards a model of politeness

The previous section has revealed an unresolved tension between descriptions of "politeness" as being strategic, egotistic and marked and the portrayal of "honorifics" as being obligatory, imposed and passing unnoticed. In this section, building on the author's previous observations (Brown 2010b), I argue that a "frame-based" view of politeness underpinned by a recognition of the ideological side of the concept and a remodeled version of "face" can provide a framework by which to study the use and acquisition of honorifics from a politeness research perspective.

3.3.1 Politeness as frame-based

The notion of "frame" appears in one guise or another ("frames", "scripts", "schema-ta", "scenarios", etc) across various academic fields including linguistics, artificial intelligence, cognitive psychology, social psychology, sociology and anthropology (Tannen 1993:15). Broadly speaking, "frames" are cognitive representations of
social situations that we have experienced – mappings between contextual factors (setting, identity of the interlocutor, etc) and the kind of (linguistic) behavior that commonly occurs in such contexts. As a simple example, we may have a “frame” for “going to the doctor” which includes not only the linguistic and non-linguistic behavior expected of ourselves (describing symptoms, agreeing to examinations, etc), but also that we expect from the doctor (for example, starting the conversation by asking what is wrong or how they can help).

These frames are primarily constructed through personal experience; in other words, participants in a community of practice organize such knowledge on the basis of their experience in the world and use this knowledge to predict interpretations and relationships regarding new information, events and experiences (Escandell-Vidal 1996:635). “Frames” can thus be viewed as “structures of expectation” (Tannen 1993: 15) – resources that participants can rely on to interpret what form of behavior should occur in a given setting or what mode of action other participants may expect from them.

When applied to politeness research by Victoria Escandell-Vidal (1996) and more explicitly by Marina Terkourafi (2003, 2005), the “frame-based” view represents an alternative methodology for analyzing the way that politeness is established. The notion of “frame” provides a methodology for analyzing how certain linguistic behavior occurring within a certain context is identified as (im)polite and how such norms of politeness are dynamically constructed. Terkourafi (2005) suggests that politeness researchers involve themselves in the process of mappings between contextual factors and linguistic behavior in order to establish empirically what kind of behavior commonly occurs within a given type of context.

The frame-based view judges the politeness of an utterance according to the following criteria: (linguistic) behavior can be judged to be polite to the extent that it regularly occurs within a given context type and goes unchallenged (Terkourafi 2005). To provide some Korean examples, using the referent honorific marker -si- when referring to one's teacher or professor can be considered “polite”, in that this linguistic behavior is the most “regular”, “common” or “normative” in this context type and is unlikely to attract negative interpretations. Similarly, addressing an intimate of marginally older age using a kinship term translating as “older brother/sister” is “polite” in that this is the most conventional way to refer to such a person in the Korean cultural setting.

The frame-based view thus equates politeness with regularity, Terkourafi (2005:248) noting that “politeness resides not in linguistic expressions themselves, but in the regularity of this co-occurrence [between linguistic expressions and a given context]” (2005:248). This view of politeness does not connect the phenomena necessarily with marked or salient behavior (cf. above discussions of
Watts 1989), but expected appropriate behavior that may frequently not even be noticed by the interlocutor.

A distinct advantage of the frame-based view is that it provides a mechanism whereby behavior can be compared to societal norms without relying upon prescriptive descriptions of what constitutes appropriate behavior. Rather than assuming the existence of pre-established prescriptive politeness norms (such as in Brown and Levinson 1978; Hwang Juck-ryoon 1990; Ide 1989 and even Lee Jung-bok 1999 or Yoo Song-young 1996), or denying the existence of such norms altogether (Watts 1989 and other so-called post-modern theories – Terkourafi 2005), the frame-based approach “acknowledges norms to the extent that these can be empirically observed” (Terkourafi 2005: 247).

Terkourafi (2005) claims that her theory of politeness is based on two premises: face-constituting and rationality. Notably, these two notions are treated in a more socially-relevant way than was the case in traditional politeness theory (notably Brown and Levinson 1978). Rather than seeing face as being an individual construct (see Section 3.3.3 below for more specific discussion) and rationality as constituting merely a matter of individual reasoning regarding “cost”, “means” and “end” (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987: 64–65), Terkourafi (2005: 250) sees individual rationality as being pre-conditioned by societal rationality. In other words, speaker choice of a linguistic strategy within a certain context is constrained by what he/she assumes the addressee to be able to recognize, interpret or ratify through the use of such strategies. This knowledge acts to limit the universe of possible utterances into a range of concrete choices (Terkourafi 2005: 249) with expectations regarding the social meanings and consequences of such choices. Within the range of concrete choices, the most rational choice represents that which is most “normal”, “least costly” and least likely to provoke face-threat, hostility or distrust (Terkourafi 2005: 248). This socially-grounded rational preference of speakers to avoid costly modes of interaction explains the motivation for speakers to follow politeness norms. The model furthermore provides a bridge between the consideration of individual speaker intentions and the importance of recognizing social norms within a theory of politeness.

Although the frame-based approach primarily attributes politeness to “regular” behavior, Terkourafi (2005: 250) also considers situations in which there is no pre-established frame-based norm or in which speakers apply marked or novel linguistic behavior outside of typical norms. In instances of lack of norms, interlocutors will make reference to other pre-existing frames, presumably those that are most similar to this new context. However, Terkourafi (2005: 250) points out that, in such situations, “assumptions will be more tentative, and the speaker will need to rely more extensively on trial and error”. Regarding instances where speakers apply salient linguistic choices but still manage to communicate politeness,
Terkourafi (2005:251) recognizes this as an additional mode of politeness. This marked politeness is also dependent on a knowledge of “frames” and expectations regarding appropriate behavior. Instead of meeting such expectations, this kind of politeness flouts them, producing implicatures that are available for evaluation regarding their politeness. We are thus left with two modes of politeness: one primary mode that matches expectations and goes unnoticed (“anticipated politeness” – Haugh 2003) and a secondary mode that manipulates these expectations and gives rise to implicatures (“inferred” politeness – Haugh 2003).

I now turn my attention to addressing problems associated with defining politeness as frame-based “appropriate” behavior and, in doing so, add flesh to the bones of the theory. The two points that need to be addressed are as follows:

1. If politeness constitutes unmarked behavior that passes unnoticed, how can it be “communicated”?
2. If politeness is defined as “appropriate behavior”, is this definition not somewhat broader than common sense notions of politeness?

Let us begin by sketching two possible solutions to point (1). The first is that frame-based politeness is still communicated by implicature, but by a different kind of implicature than that which comes into play with marked politeness. Grice (1989) actually posited three main kinds of implicature: (1) conventional implicatures, (2) generalized conversational implicatures and (3) particularized conversational implicatures. Whereas the third of these involves a full and explicit process of nonce inference whereby the hearer interprets the speaker’s meaning in context, this is not the case for the first or second. Conventional implicatures produce inferences that are “standardized by convention” (Mey 1993:104), which “taken by themselves implicate certain states of the world” (Mey 1993:103). Generalized implicatures are “default inferences” (Levinson 2000:11) or “preferred interpretations” (Levinson 2000:5) which are achieved not through explicit processing but through our heuristic knowledge that, in a context $x, p$ normally implicates $q$. Terkourafi (2003) argues that whereas marked politeness is implicated as a particularized implicature, frame-based politeness is achieved by means of generalized implicature. Politeness is communicated by a perlocutionary effect that comes about by default when the hearer’s expectations regarding appropriate behavior are met (Terkourafi 2003:158).

An additional way to explain how frame-based behavior communicates politeness is to argue that this is achieved at the discourse rather than the utterance level. As pointed out by Arundale (2005), Arundale and Good (2002) and Haugh (2007), post-Gricean pragmatics theory takes a “monologic” view of talk exchanges whereby meaning is constructed by individuals on an utterance-by-utterance
basis. Given the recognized need to research politeness as a "dynamic" and "discursive" phenomenon (see for example Eelen 2001), it appears doubtful that utterance-level interpretation can provide all of the answers as to how politeness is negotiated and established. Evaluations and perceptions of politeness might arise, not so much due to certain utterances (be they marked or unmarked), but over multiple turns within a speech event, or indeed across two or more speech events. In other words, an interlocutor may evaluate a speaker as being "polite" not only due to the use of individual "polite" utterances but rather due to the cumulative effect of repeated appropriate behavior. This idea that politeness is constructed "cumulatively" is consistent with the "frame-based" view of politeness being dynamically constructed through repeated social behavior.

As mentioned above, the second problem that the frame-based view must address is that the definition of politeness as "appropriate behavior" runs the risk of being too broad. At least according to common sense, not all appropriate behavior appears to be connected to politeness. There are some situations in which behavior that is normally considered "rude" may be acceptable or even appropriate, but does this mean it is "polite"? For example, it may be perfectly appropriate for a doctor to order a patient to stick out his/her tongue or for an army general to berate his troops, but it is difficult to evaluate such behaviors for their politeness. In addition, although the appropriate application of certain ideologically-invested linguistic forms (be they expressions of thanks in Anglo-American culture or use of honorific forms in Korean) can be straightforwardly equated with politeness, how about their appropriate omission in situations in which they are simply not needed?

In response to such problems, I posit two solutions. Firstly, I acknowledge that politeness does not necessarily apply to all types of communication. According to Michael Haugh (2003: 398), politeness "involves showing people they think well of others or showing they don't think more highly of themselves than they should." Defining politeness, therefore, as appropriate behavior within this scope allows us to discount behavior that is not involved with such concerns. The examples of the doctor and army general given above may therefore not belong to the realm where politeness is in operation as these types of communication do not necessarily involve concerns as to how the interlocutors perceive each other, or at very least, such concerns appear to be temporarily suspended.

Secondly, I see the lack of association made on a common sense level between, for example, the appropriate use of non-honorific forms and politeness as being largely due to ideological reasons rather than reflecting sociolinguistic reality per se. In other words, the non-use of honorifics towards a subordinate is not commonly associated with politeness due to the fact that it is not imbued with the same powerful social ideology that accompanies the need to use
honorifics towards a social superior. However, both uses are actually two sides of the same coin and play complementary roles in the upkeep of appropriate linguistic behavior and the social system underpinning it. Due to ideological reasons, the use of non-honorific language to a superior is likely to evoke more severe social sanction than the use of honorific language to a subordinate. However, the latter can, I would argue, still result in social discord and in perceptions of impoliteness. This may firstly be the case because such usage is heavily associated with irony and sarcasm and could result in the sincerity or motivations of the speaker being called into question. In addition, repeated inappropriate application of honorific forms is likely to cause discomfort for the group, who may feel that the expected social order and the harmony that goes with it are being disrupted, a point I return to in discussions below.

Finally, I comment upon the position of frame-based politeness within my book and the broader advantages of this viewpoint for interlanguage pragmatics and second language acquisition research. As I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 4, the “frame based” approach to politeness plugs directly into the pragmatic acquisition model that I adopt in this book. According to this view, through exposure to the social world, speakers build up schemas of activities and events, frames that act as a source of reference for future linguistic behavior. For adult L2 learners, the process is more one of “re-framing” rather than constructing such mental representations from scratch; in other words, L2 learners re-analyze and enrich existing frames of knowledge regarding social contexts and the linguistic behavior that commonly occurs within them.

The dynamic way that “norms” are conceptualized within the frame-based view also correlates well with the findings of my research. As shall be discussed in later chapters, what constituted the “norm” in interactions involving L2 speakers of Korean is dynamically constructed in situ through a process of negotiation between the L2 and L1 parties.

Regarding the suitability of the frame-based view for interlanguage pragmatics and second language acquisition research more broadly, the way that this methodology allows for all “appropriate” behavior (including honorifics use) to be dealt with under the umbrella of “politeness” makes good practical sense. For the SLA researcher, I would contend, the object of inquiry should be whether the language usage of a second language speaker is “appropriate” or of how to teach “appropriateness” in the language classroom. As pointed out by Meier (1997), teaching politeness in the language classroom along the lines of Brown and Levinson’s notions of face threat would not represent a realistic approach. The same could be said for teaching the difference between “volition” and “discernment” or between “politic” and “polite”
3.3.2 Politeness as ideology

In the discussions above, it was noted that some linguistic behavior is imbued with more ideology pertaining to politeness than other behavior, but that such ideology does not necessarily equate with the way that appropriateness is actually worked out at the interactional level. In the current section, I expand this observation and offer a definition of "politeness ideology", building on the observations made in Brown (2010b). I then comment briefly on the importance of recognizing the ideological nature of politeness in interlanguage pragmatics studies more specifically.

"Politeness ideology" fits within a larger framework of "language ideology" or "linguistic ideology", which has been defined as "the situated, partial and interested character of conceptions and uses of language" (Errington 2001:110). The existence of such ideologies has been primarily explained as attempts to rationalize or justify perceived language use (Silverstein 1979). In addition, Irvine (1989:255) notes that these conceptions of language use are inherently loaded with moral and political interests. Conceived as such, I define "politeness ideologies" as beliefs pertaining to polite behavior that are shared to some extent within a given group, especially those beliefs which are perpetuated by those in positions of power (cf. Kienpointner 1999).

It should come as no surprise that politeness is an area of language that appears to be particularly rich with ideologies. As pointed out by Held (1999:21) in the issue of Pragmatics specially devoted to "ideologies of politeness", the reason for this appears to lie in the close connections between politeness and the negotiation of power. Discussions of politeness are often inseparable from socially constructed beliefs regarding what constitutes "correct", "proper" and "polite" linguistic behavior. Although those in positions of power (be they politicians, teachers or - all too frequently - linguists) may attempt to convince us that these beliefs are held by all members of the community, the extent to which this is the case is likely to vary.

Researchers who have investigated linguistic ideologies more broadly have been quick to point out that these ideologies do not necessarily correlate directly with linguistic analysis. Silverstein (1979) notes that although ideologies affect the way speakers use language, linguistic ideology should not be taken to equate directly with the distribution of uses perceived in actual linguistic data.

Within politeness research, this need to differentiate between actual linguistic use and linguistic ideology - and also between use/ideology and linguistic theory - has proven problematic. Watts et al. (1992) first brought to our attention that politeness researchers frequently confuse lay interpretations of politeness with
theoretical frameworks about politeness and vice versa. To clear up this issue, he labeled the former politeness1 and the latter politeness2. Eelen (2001: 32) further pointed out that politeness1 (i.e. lay interpretations and ideologies) has rarely been distinguished from “politeness-in-action”, the way that politeness actually works in raw data. Despite making this distinction, Eelen goes onto argue that “spontaneous concepts” of politeness and “politeness in action” feed directly into each other and it may not always be beneficial to separate the two.

However, in failing to attach significance to this distinction, Eelen fails to recognize that lay interpretations of politeness are not always “spontaneous”. In other words, politeness concepts are formed not only in direct relation to “politeness in action” but also against a background of ideological discourse regarding politeness. Thus, although politeness ideologies are certainly connected to the way that politeness is negotiated at the expressive level, they should not be confused as accurate and objective representations of it. Rather, these ideologies are rationalizations that attempt to assign order to language and its relation to politeness and are ideals that are power-laden and tied up with “viewpoints that serve the interests of specific groups and help to implement social value structures” (Held 1999: 21). Ultimately, as noted by Kienpointner (1999: 2), they typically “only partially correspond to the details of authentic communicative interaction” (Kienpointner 1999: 2).

As pointed out by Kienpointner (1999: 2), politeness ideologies do not only color the “stereotypes of lay people about (im)polite behavior”, but also the “assumptions underlying current politeness theories”. Of most importance to the current discussions, claims in previous literature that honorifics (and Asian modes of politeness more generally) are “imposed upon participants” (Hwang 1990: 42), are “obligatory” (Ide 1989: 227) and are “automatic” (Watts 1992: 68) show clear examples of dominant social ideology being mistaken for linguistic reality. As is pointed out at various junctures within the current chapter and the previous one, the application of honorifics may depend on a host of pragmatic factors including speaker intention or strategy and thus can hardly be considered “automatic”. The claims of “obligation” only explain the most ideologically-invested or canonical uses of honorifics and cannot account for a variety of honorifics usages at the politeness-in-action level. In addition, such claims betray underlying social ideologies such as the need to maintain hierarchical social relationships and “conformity”, as I argue in Section 3.4. To be fair to Hwang (1990) and Ide (1989), the problem is hardly one of their own conception. After all, they were writing in reaction to Brown and Levinson, whose original theory (and its concept of “face”) was itself heavily influenced by Western ideologies and a social science tradition with an over emphasis on individual action, image and rationality.
Although I believe it important to differentiate between “politeness ideologies” and “politeness-in-action”, this does not mean that the former are necessarily of no interest to the politeness or interlanguage pragmatics researcher. Indeed, in this book I go on to claim that “politeness ideologies” have an important influence on the way that L2 learners perceive, use and ultimately acquire the target language, as shall be outlined in Chapter 4. In order to more closely consider the “politeness ideologies” tied up with the use of honorifics, I devote a separate section to this topic below (Section 3.4).

### 3.3.3 Face as interactional and relational

In my discussions of a re-modeled version of politeness, I now pause to reconsider the concept that has become widely recognized as the underlying motivation for speakers to apply language politely: “face”. Here, “face” is broadly taken to refer to images or identities (of the individual or group), which are negotiated through interactions in a community of practice. Although “face” was introduced into politeness research by Brown and Levinson, this section shows that the concept offered by them has an individualistic bias that is unfaithful to the origins of the term and unsuitable for the study of politeness in action. I will argue that a more recent model proposed by Arundale (2006) of face as relational and interactional is more appropriate to the cross-cultural study of politeness. I conclude the section by looking at Korean-specific conceptualizations of face and by discussing how the concept relates to the view of politeness acquisition pursued in this book.

Brown and Levinson's (1987:61) claim that their model of face is “derived from Goffman and from the English folk term” has been deconstructed by linguistic politeness scholars. Rather than a purely English folk term, Ho (1975), Mao (1994) and Thomas (1995) point out that the concept is actually Chinese in origin and that Brown and Levinson’s “face” is inconsistent with its Asian origins. In regard to Goffman, Bargiela-Chiappini (2003) shows that the concept is in fact different in vital ways. The notion of “negative face” has no correspondence in Goffman's work and the focus on the individual is inconsistent with Goffman's study of interaction as “the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another” (Goffman 1967:2–3).

For Robert Arundale (2006), the individual bias in the construction of face was already present in the work of Goffman. Brown and Levinson only emphasized this individualist stance. Arundale (2006:195–197) criticizes “the Western preoccupation with the individual as the central factor in explaining human activity” and sees Goffman's model of the interactant as being “obsessively concerned
with his own self image and self preservation”. Arundale points out that such a focus is incompatible with pragmatics and conversational analysis, where communication is viewed as co-constructed between two or more participants. As an alternative approach, Arundale calls on the work of Mead (1934), Buber (1965) and Bakhtin (1981, 1986) and a view of the social self, face and language as being co-constructed as the social self interacts with other social selves. This new model of face as relational and interactional realigns the construct with societies where group interaction is emphasized and the East Asian tradition of seeing human interaction as being group rather than individually constructed.

Arundale’s further proposal that Brown and Levinson’s “positive” and “negative” face be re-conceptualized as “connection face” and “separation face” also corresponds well to the discussion of Korean honorifics and politeness. Drawing on studies into relational dialectics (Baxter and Montgomery 1996), “connectedness” and “separateness” are posited as broad, culture-general frameworks not grounded in any particular emic concept of face. They contain Brown and Levinson’s concepts of “being approved of, liked or admired” (positive face) and “freedom from imposition” (negative face), but encompass a broader range of interpretations to be filled-in by specific cultural scripts. Broadly speaking, connectedness indexes “unity, interdependence, solidarity, association, congruence and more”, while “separation” indicates “differentiation, independence, autonomy, dissociation, divergence and so on.” According to Arundale, communication involves a constant interplay of connection and separation, between expressing closeness to the listener on the one hand and distance from the listener on the other. This dialectic view of “face” corresponds well with the model of Korean honorifics use I presented in the previous chapter and the view of honorifics as indexing degrees of “separation” (and their absence as expressing “connection”).

The concept of face has resonated particularly strongly with scholars looking at politeness in the Korean setting. Although a complete discussion of what may constitute “Korean face” is beyond the remit of the current study, a brief review of previous research may help fill in some of the “emic” aspects of Korean face into Arundale’s “culture general” framework. A number of Korean expressions that correspond to “face” have been identified by Korean scholars, including cheymyen (體面 – lit. ‘body-front’), myenmok (面目 – lit. ‘front-eye’), elkwul, nach, moyangsay (模樣) and cheymo (體貌 – lit. ‘body-form’) (Lim Tae-Seop and Choi Soo-Hyang 1996: 123). Cheymyen in particular has been recognized as a “cultural keyword” in Korea (Oak and Martin 2000; De Mente 1998) and is the term most commonly adopted in Korean sociology to correspond to “face”.

Central to the maintenance of cheymyen are adhering to form and meeting societal expectations, which are identified as being key Confucian values (Lim Tae-Seop 1995). The need to conform to social norms is motivated by a high
concern for how others perceive one's behavior, 'the eyes and ears of others' as Kim Sun-hee (2001:123) describes it (see Section 3.4.3). Expanding on this, Lim Tae-Seop (1995) suggests that five components: cesin 'proper conduct,' inphwum 'ethos,' phwumuy 'refinement,' yengnyang 'ability' and sengswuk 'maturity.' Normative 'Korean' face can thus be said to be established through recognition as a person of ability, refinement, good character and adequate maturity who follows the paths of proper conduct (Brown 2011:111).

Indicative of the importance attached to "face" in the Korean setting is Kim Sun-hee's (2001:122) comment that "to Koreans, face is more important than riches or life itself [translation my own]" The use of "polite" language, particularly respectful language and honorifics has been identified as important to the establishment of face. Cho Eui-yon (1988: 131) notes that inappropriate use of honorifics results in the face of both the addressee and the speaker being threatened; the former feels that his social status is being neglected and the latter runs the risk of being branded rude and ill-bred.

Let me conclude this section by briefly commenting upon the relevance of "face" to the study of interlanguage pragmatics. In Chapter 4, I will argue that the development of competence in pragmatics does not merely involve learning the appropriate use of certain forms in particular contexts or "frames", but ultimately also throws up questions regarding the negotiation of face. L2 speakers first of all run the risk of damaging both their own face and those of their L1 interlocutors through their unwitting misapplication of pragmatic forms. More importantly, even when L2 speakers have sufficient knowledge pertaining to appropriate linguistic performance, they may find that applying such modes of linguistic behavior contradict their own identity or self-presentation. At such times, speakers may find themselves negotiating a face that falls outside the normal guidelines of appropriate behavior in the speech community.

3.4 Korean politeness ideologies and the use of honorifics

In this study, although I am eager to separate layman ideologies regarding politeness from the way that politeness is actually negotiated at the expressive level, I recognize that these ideologies influence the way that politeness is viewed by members of communities of practice. Indeed, the contrasts between the way that different communities "talk about politeness" is expected to complicate the process of learning politeness in L2. These ideologies will color the way that L2 speakers perceive politeness norms in the target culture and may influence the extent to which they are willing or able to appropriate such behavior for themselves.
In the current section, I discuss four key characteristics of the way politeness is constructed at the ideological level in Korean culture and contrast these points with Western culture. These discussions build on and add further detail to the author's previous claims regarding Korean "politeness ideologies" (Brown 2009; Brown 2010b). It should be stressed once more that I am not claiming that these ideological differences necessarily directly reflect linguistic "reality". Rather, they should be understood as ideals or rationalizations that speakers may share to varying degrees and which they may use to make sense of and interpret linguistic behavior.

3.4.1 Indexical politeness

The first and most fundamental way that Korean politeness ideology differs from Western ideology is that it places emphasis on a different mode of linguistic politeness. Whereas "Western" politeness ideologies focus on polite "strategies" for performing requests, advice, threats, offers, promises and so forth, Korean (and Japanese) ideologies focus on the use of honorifics and other forms that index social roles. This ideological difference has been directly and strikingly reflected in "Western" and "Eastern" politeness research tradition and the clash between the Brown and Levinson view of politeness and that of Hwang and Ide (see Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 above).

To capture this ideological difference, I propose the adoption of the terms "indexical politeness" and "modulation politeness" (cf. Brown 2010b). "Indexical politeness" is the term I use to refer to the negotiation of politeness through the application of honorific categories and other areas of social deixis/indexicality. "Modulation politeness" refers broadly to the mode of politeness originally presented in Brown and Levinson's theory. The term "modulation" is adopted from Caffi (2007), who looks principally at "mitigation" (i.e. the weakening of illocutionary force, propositional content or speaker commitment). However, Caffi (2007) also recognizes that modification may alternatively involve "reinforcement" (i.e. strengthening) and suggests "modulation" as a term encompassing both dimensions. The fact that modulation politeness may involve strengthening as well as weakening of interactional parameters represents an important point. Although discussions of politeness in the Anglophone context have tended to focus on the correlation between indirectness, vagueness, etc and politeness, researchers from different linguistic backgrounds (most notably Wierzbicka 1985) have been keen to point out that in some cultures it may actually be politer to make an utterance stronger rather than weaker.
In substance, the division between "modulation politeness" and "indexical politeness" follows the same lines as the "deference/politeness" distinction proposed by Hwang (1990) and the "discernment"/"strategic" division of Ide (1989) (see Section 3.2.2 above). However, the choice of terminology and the grounds upon which the division is made are notably different and contain some important advantages. Firstly, unlike in Hwang's model, the modulation/indexical division places the use of honorifics and other indexicals firmly within the remit of politeness rather than in a parallel category. Secondly and more fundamentally, the modulation/indexical division divides between the two modes of politeness according to purely linguistic grounds. I thus distance myself from any problematic claims that either of these modes relies essentially more on speaker "strategy" or on the need to "discern" one's social position (see Section 3.2.2). Rather, I expect that both modes may feature usage according to social norms and strategic usage that flouts such norms.

My claim is that whereas "indexical politeness" is emphasized in Korean politeness ideologies, "modulation politeness" is emphasized in "Western" cultures. I underline once more that I see this difference between Korean and Western cultures as existing primarily at the ideological level. I thus distance myself from the claims of Ide (1989), for example, and the position that either of these modes is essentially more "important" in Western/Asian cultures or in languages with/without developed honorifics systems. At the politeness in action level, it may well be that both modes are similarly important in the struggle for politeness. However, at the conscious level, Korean and Western speakers appear to have different levels of awareness of these two modes of politeness and, in lay terms, are likely to differ in the one they recognize as being closer to "politeness".

The comparatively low awareness that "Westerners" possess of indexical politeness was underlined in Koo Ja-Sook's (1995) comparative study of linguistic politeness in American English and Korean. Koo made the fascinating discovery that American speakers actually varied their use of language according to the identity of the addressee (in other words, according to indexical politeness dimensions) along similar patterns to the Korean participants. This lead Koo (1995: 143) to conclude that the actual difference was that Koreans are simply "more conscious" of this mode of politeness. Koo (1995: 143) put this difference in awareness down to the hierarchical structure of Korean society and how this contrasts with the "society ideal" of egalitarianism in Western cultures: "Ideally, English speakers are supposed to use the same level of speech to everyone regardless of his/her position of power." According to this view, social structures – and the ideologies surrounding these structures – condition speakers to pay more attention to certain modes of linguistic behavior. I continue my discussion of these ideological difference in Section 3.4.2 below.
In addition to social structure, I would also argue that it is language itself that conditions speakers to have more conscious awareness of certain categories of "politeness". What ultimately sets Korean (or Japanese) apart from English (or other European languages) is not the actual need to vary language according to social relationships, situations, or roles. This requirement exists, it would seem, to some extent in all human languages. Rather, what makes Korean (or Japanese) different is the existence of a highly iconic and pervasive grammaticalized system of forms that are directly correlated with this function. From the "thinking for speaking perspective", the linguistic resources available in different languages are said to "train" each native speakers to "pay different kinds of attention to events and experiences when talking about them" (Slobin 1996:89). The iconic nature of honorific forms thus conditions Korean speakers to pay attention to the hierarch­chal social structure and to attach importance to such modes of politeness.

The difference between the “Western” emphasis on modulation politeness and egalitarianism (on the one hand) and the Korean emphasis on indexical politeness and hierarchicalism (on the other) was found to be key to understanding the L2 usage of honorifics analyzed in Chapters 5–8 of this book. The data and subsequent discussions show that many of the difficulties “Western” L2 speakers encountered in using Korean honorifics stemmed from the fact that they had limited awareness of “indexical politeness”. In the mildest cases, this lack of aware­ness rendered it difficult for L2 speakers to attach significance to the finer points of honorifics use. In more extreme cases, speakers directly “transferred” the ideological belief that they should use language in an egalitarian way onto their use of Korean honorifics. Alternatively, in other cases, speakers attempted to apply honorifics primarily according to situational needs to modulate (i.e. strengthen or weaken) their speech rather than according to the age-rank relationship with the interlocutor.

3.4.2 Marking status differences and respecting the elderly

Dominant Korean politeness ideologies also differ from those in the West in the hierarchical and non-egalitarian patterns by which they operate. As pointed out by Yoon (2004:194), “Koreans believe that people are not equal in status, either in the family or in other large or social groups to which they belong”. This ideology of non-reciprocal and hierarchical social relationships is reified both through the education system and the media, including a wide range of publications and online resources on how to use language “correctly” according to one’s position (Yoon 2004:194–197). This discourse creates an emphasis on how to use language appropriately according to one’s station and places the stress on “polite” language
use towards social superiors, particularly elders (see below). This contrasts with the “Western” ideal of applying “polite” language equally regardless of age, rank, sex, etc. In the Korean context, it is thus of little surprise that speakers have more conscious awareness of “indexical politeness” (i.e. forms required to index social relationships) whereas “Westerns” have more awareness of features that can be applied regardless of the interlocutor’s social identity to express “common courtesy”, as it is sometimes referred to. It is important, however, to stress that the situation noted by Yoon (2004) represents merely the traditional, ideologically invested social norm. As Korean society modernized and Westernizes, concerns such as the need to avoid overtly condescending language when addressing status superiors (see Chapter 2) begin to take on more importance.

Korean politeness ideologies place particular emphasis on the need to exhibit respect when dealing with “elders” or noin (老人 – ‘old-person’) (Yoon 2004: 197). According to Yoon Kyung-joo (2004: 197), the status of noin is usually achieved around hoygap (回甲, 60th birthday), an anniversary that Koreans celebrate with big parties. Respecting noin is tied in with a number of pervasive neo-Confucian social slogans including kyenglosasang (敬老思想, ‘respecting the elderly’) (Yoon 2004: 198) and cangyuyuse (長幼有序, ‘the old and the young know their place’) (Lee and Ramsey 2000: 267), which are “promoted very actively and widely at the national level” (Yoon Kyung-joo 2004: 198). Although Western society may also have a loose ideal of “respecting elders”, previous research shows the socialization into this mode of social behavior to be far more vigorous in the Korean setting (see Sung Kyu-taik 1998). Furthermore, “elder respect” in the Korean context goes beyond the “Western” model as it largely prohibits disagreeing with, contradicting or causing any discomfort to elders. Straying from these norms is considered socially taboo and can result in severe sanction.

Although the most powerful ideologies may involve large age differences, the indexing of much smaller differences (particularly within a specific speech community such as a family, school or workplace) also shows distinct differences from “Western” politeness ideals. In a school setting, it is still the norm for senpay (‘seniors’) to use panmal non-reciprocally to hwupay (‘juniors’), even if the age-rank difference is only one academic year. In family relationships, where egalitarian relationships are all but non-existent, cousins may count months and even days to work out who is the senior party. As for twins, even though the “age difference” may only be a matter of minutes, the “younger” twin will always address the “older” as hyeng (“elder brother”) rather than by name. Recognizing such fine-grained distinctions of age shows distinct contrast to Western politeness ideals. At least in Anglo-American culture, referring to a first-born twin as “older brother” would perhaps only be applied for comic effect.
With their high iconicity, honorifics are easily mobilized as vehicles for justifying and perpetuating the ideologies of hierarchical relationships and elder respect. In other words, the existence of honorifics is at times taken as evidence (not only in lay discussions but at times in academia) of the importance of "respecting elders" and of the ingrained influence of Confucianism on Korean culture. However, as previously noted in Chapter 2, attempts to posit a link between the existence of honorific forms in a particular language and the coexistence of a particular social structure do not stand up to academic scrutiny. As previously quoted, Irvine (1998:52), in her comparison of the honorifics systems of Javanese, Wolof, Zulu and ChiBemba, concluded that these connections only flourish at the ideological level.

However, the way that honorifics become connected with the maintenance of hierarchical social structures is expected to complicate the way that they are acquired in L2. For "Western" learners from societies that hold social ideals of "freedom" and "equality" (Kang 2003), the adoption of a linguistic system taken to reflect, perpetuate and justify a vertically-organized social structure is unlikely to occur without any feeling of resistance. As shall be discussed later in this book, L2 learners of Korean may choose to avoid the application of honorifics when doing so clashes with their pre-existing identities as "Westerners" and their beliefs about politeness and human interaction.

3.4.3 Obligation and conformity

A pervasive underlying ideology regarding politeness in the Korean (and also the Japanese) setting and the use of honorifics in particular is that of "obligation". This ideology is evident in the way that honorifics are portrayed in traditional politeness theory descriptions. As noted previously in this chapter, Hwang (1990:42) described honorifics as an imposed "social code, Ide (1989:227) as "sociopragmatically and grammatically obligatory" and even Watts as "automatic". The ideology of honorifics as being "obligatory" also pervades traditional linguistic theory and the grammatical tradition of analyzing referent honorification as a form of agreement, similar to person agreement in European languages (see Chapter 2 and Brown 2011:116 for further discussion).

My descriptions of honorifics in the current and preceding chapters have revealed that the view that honorifics are "obligatory" represents an ideal rather than a reality. To be sure, in situations where power differences are large (such as when addressing a notable superior such as a teacher, grandparent or other noin), speakers may experience heavy social pressure to follow the norm and use honorifics according to convention. Indeed, the sanctions for not doing so may be severe.
The example given by Koo (1995: 23) that a Korean student may be expelled from school for failing to use honorifics towards the teacher is no exaggeration. However, in situations where power differences are more marginal, frequent opportunities emerge to modulate the use of honorifics for individual strategic motives. Furthermore, even in the cases of teachers, grandparents or other noin, the use of honorifics is not always totally unconditional. As pointed out in the Chapter 2, honorifics may be dropped according to the rules of apconpep ('restriction of respect') or when the superior in question has committed deeds not in fitting with the position of respect. In addition, they may be omitted in casual speech when the superior is out of earshot.

As previously claimed in Brown (2011: 117), the claims of “obligation” can be better understood when the social ideologies that lie behind them are deconstructed. It has been noted in previous research that “learning to conform” takes an important place in childhood socialization both in Korea and other Asian societies. For Japanese, Clancy (1986) notes that children receive lengthy “conformity training” which stresses the importance of behaving in a way that does not attract the negative attention of others. Similarly, Korean children also appear to be socialized into observing a high concern for how others perceive their behavior, or “the eyes and ears of others” (Kim Sun-hee 2001: 123). As noted by Lee Zuk-nae (1999), this concern is motivated by the importance of “shame” in Korean society and avoiding loss of face either for the group or for the individual. Perhaps due to this importance of avoiding being the object of shame, the Korean language features a host of expressions related shame that make reference to “nam” ‘others’ (Kim Sun-hee 2001: 123). These include nampwukulepta (‘be shamed in front of others’), namsasulepta (‘be indecent in front of others’), nam-i po-likka twulyepta (‘be afraid lest others should see’), nam-i tululla (‘others will hear’), nam-tul nwun-i mwusepta (‘the eyes of others are frightening’), nam-tul-i mwe-la ha-lkka (‘what will others say?’) and nam-tul-hantey sonkalakcil tanghata (‘suffer the pointing of others’).

Alongside this, East Asian social ideology puts a positive value on conformity not always shared in the West. As pointed out in Brown (2011: 117), at least according to traditional descriptions, East Asians are said to place value on obeying to elders, observing traditions and following social norms. Indeed, Kim and Markus (1999: 86) claim that East Asians experience satisfaction and actively “like” conforming to societal expectations. In East Asian cultures, conformity is aligned with positive social values and traditions such as balance, harmony, maturity and inner-strength. Independence and individuality, on the other hand, are branded unnatural, immature and disruptive (Kim and Markus 1999:786). As noted by in Kim and Markus (1999), this marks an important distinction with
Western culture, where uniqueness is valued over conformity and is aligned with “positive connotations of freedom and independence”.

I underline that Korean “conformity” represents an ideal rather than an all pervasive truth. Although conforming is important to appropriate social behavior in the Korean setting, speakers ultimately only conform to the extent that they feel obligated to, or to the extent that serves their own individual conversational goals. When away from the “eyes and ears” of others – or when interacting in certain closed social groups – the need to conform to wider social norms may become more negligible. Furthermore, when conforming to the norm contradicts the speaker’s immediate conversational goals, he/she may ultimately choose to flaunt society norms.

However, the perception that Korean politeness – and the application of honorifics in particular – is “obligatory” and dictated by rigid social rules may work to increase the resistance towards the use of these forms by L2 learners. With their pre-existing ideologies of “freedom”, “uniqueness” and “independence”, Western learners may be unwilling to conform to the use of a linguistic system portrayed as absent of individual choice. As shall be seen in the data analysis chapters, Western speakers of Korean are not always prepared to accept that the “norms” of honorifics use necessarily applied to them.

3.4.4 Closeness and intimacy

Although dominant politeness ideologies in the Korean setting place most focus upon the need to use high honorific forms according to social convention for the purpose of expressing “respect” to elders and superiors, it should be recognized that Korean politeness and honorifics have a reverse counterpart. In other words, Korean culture also places importance on the need to use language that is suitably “close” when addressing intimates or the young. As claimed above (Section 3.3.1), this “other side” of the honorific “coin” may ultimately be just as important to the negotiation of politeness at the expressive level in the Korean cultural setting, but is simply not imbued with the same level of ideological force as the expression of “respect”.

In Korean hierarchical relationships, it is not only the role of the younger party that contains expectations regarding appropriate behavior. In return for the respect that they receive, seniors and elders are expected to act in accordance with the reverence attached to their senior years or position. They are also expected to take care of, look after and nurture their juniors. As pointed out by Oak and Martin (2000: 23), “the duty of rulers to be benevolent and just” is one of the two primary philosophical tenets of Confucianism possessing equal weighting to “the
duty of followers to obey and be loyal". In relationships where age/rank differences are more marginal (such as between siblings), the elder party is expected to be responsible for the younger party, show "brotherly/sisterly love" and provide help where needed, including financial help (Oak and Martin 2000: 27).

As well as containing deep-rooted social ideologies tied up with the expression of respect, Korean culture also features mottos and slogans connected with the expression of intimacy and affection. Indeed, perhaps the most oft-quoted Korean cultural keyword is 

Although notoriously difficult to define, this term is perhaps best understood as a feeling of psychological solidarity, sympathetic emotion or affection which grows over time between people who are close (based on observations of Lim Tae-seop 1995). Preserving these feelings of "closeness" is viewed as important for maintaining social relationships and thus Korean speakers may be keen to avoid any conflict that may jeopardize 

This includes using honorific forms where appropriate, but also dropping them when they are not. Applying honorific forms under circumstances where they are not expected according to convention can work to block intimacy and therefore potentially upset 

Applying these observations to the learning of honorifics in L2, although previous research often focuses on the need to acquire "high" honorific forms, there is every reason to think that learning the other "side" of the honorifics coin is just as important for L2 speakers. As pointed out by Choo Mi-ho (1999: 79), learners who are unskilled in the use of non-honorific 

may experience difficulties in developing and maintaining "close" Korean-speaking relationships. In addition, as shall be seen later in this study, it was not only the use of honorific 

that posed ideological problems to L2 speakers but also the use of 

The analysis will show that some learners also experienced ideological opposition to the expectations placed on them by the Korean language regarding how they should behave towards intimates and those of lower rank. More specifically, as we shall see in later discussions, some speakers perceived the use of non-honorific language in such situations to be "disrespectful" and therefore avoided the use of these forms.
4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I examined how Korean honorifics are connected to face concerns, politeness and the constant negotiation of appropriateness that accompanies human interaction. This chapter now presents a framework to analyze how polite linguistic behavior and appropriate honorifics use can be developed or learned.

Learning the use of honorifics involves three distinct processes. Firstly, the speaker will need to develop pragmalinguistic knowledge regarding the use of honorific forms. "Pragmalinguistic knowledge" refers to competence regarding organizational aspects of the pragmatic features under analysis, in this case honorifics. Competence in this area involves knowing "how" to use honorific forms and being able to apply them "correctly" and consistently at the sentence level.

Secondly, and of more import to the current study, the speaker will require sociopragmatic knowledge of honorific forms. "Sociopragmatic knowledge" involves understanding the contexts under which different forms are conventionally used. It also involves understanding the different social meanings that the use or non-use of honorific forms can acquire in different contexts. In simple terms, "sociopragmatic" knowledge refers to knowing "when" to use honorifics.

However, simply knowing "how" to use honorifics and knowing "when" to use them do not necessarily represent sufficient conditions for a second language speaker to use honorifics "just like a Korean". I thus propose a third factor that will influence the development of honorifics: identity. Using honorifics according to native-like patterns will require, at least on some level, that the speaker adopts or negotiates a "Korean" identity and the social positions and roles that this entails. I argue in this chapter that this is particularly the case due to the close ties between honorifics and Korean commonsense notions of politeness.

In this chapter, I describe these three factors in turn. After first briefly considering pragmalinguistic knowledge (Section 4.2), I devote the majority of the chapter to introducing the concepts of sociopragmatic knowledge (Section 4.3) and identity (Section 4.4). I make a connection between these two factors and two key concepts discussed in the previous chapter: "frames" and "face". Following
the author’s previous research (Brown 2010b), the course of acquiring sociopragmatic knowledge in a second language is described as a process of “re-framing”, in other words, of re-negotiating what (linguistic) behavior is typically appropriate in which context type. Expanding this metaphor, I then explain the negotiation of identity in second language by use of a new term: “re-facing”. This process involves re-negotiating self image when exposed to a new language and/or culture. These discussions form the basis for the view towards language acquisition adopted in this book.

4.2 Pragmalinguistic knowledge

The distinction between two modes of pragmatic knowledge – “pragmalinguistic competence” and “sociopragmatic competence” – was first established by Leech (1983) and (Thomas 1983). The former refers to pragmatic phenomena oriented towards the grammatical or organizational end of the scale (Payrato 2003); in other words, knowledge of the actual linguistic resources needed for conveying communicative acts or interpersonal meanings. The latter, referred to by Leech (1983) as “the sociolinguistic interface of pragmatics”, involves knowledge of the social contexts and perceptions underlying interpretation and performance of communication. The current book, with its emphasis on “politeness” and “frames” focuses mainly on sociopragmatic knowledge. However, before discussing such matters, it is first of all important to recognize that, given the complex organizational structure of the Korean honorifics system, pragmalinguistic failures may be detected even in research looking at the competence of quite advanced speakers.

Pragmalinguistic failures can be broken into two categories: (1) failures resulting from a lack of competence and (2) slips or “blurts” resulting from more momentary lack of “control” (Bialystok 1993). Regarding the former, although such failures were less common in the speech of the advanced participants in the current study, the conversational data in Chapters 5 and 6 reveal that some speakers had limited awareness of certain honorific forms. More commonly, however, speakers were aware of which honorific elements they should or should not be using and understood how to form such utterances, but lacked the control needed to apply such features consistently. The subsequent switching between honorific and non-honorific speech that this produced complicated their

1. The “blurt” is the pragmatic equivalent of the grammatical slip of the tongue (Thomas 1983: 95); in other words, when a speaker experiences a temporarily lapse that does not reflect their normal level of competence.
attempts to position themselves appropriately in the interaction, be that in the role of an intimate, status superior, status inferior, etc.

In this way, a lack of proficiency in organizational aspects of pragmatics makes it difficult for learners to present an appropriate and consistent self-image and to maintain politeness. As an example of such issues, I consider one instance of pragmalinguistic failure noted in previous research and speculate as to the complications for self-presentation that such use of honorifics could result in. In the following example taken from Byon (2000: 167), the learner attempts to use honorific language when asking a professor to write him/her a letter of reference. The learner’s inclusion of a honorific form (the auxiliary object honorific verb *tulita*) suggests that he/she is aware of the need to index separation with the notable superior. However, in this case the professor is actually the (implied) subject of the sentence and the (implied) indirect object is the learner him/herself. The result is that the learner ends up elevating him/herself rather than the professor and in doing so violates one of the fundamental principles of honorific language — to abase the self and raise the other:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{write} & \quad \text{give:OHON DN have-DEC:}{\text{Y}} \\
\text{~can you write [a letter of recommendation] for me?} & \quad \text{(intended meaning)}
\end{align*}
\]

Were this learner to utter such a sentence in “real world” interaction, the majority of Korean interlocutors would probably find the utterance odd or amusing rather than offensive. However, although the utterance may not threaten the hearer’s face, the consequences for the speaker’s own face may be more serious. The lack of understanding regarding Korean honorifics that this utterance manifests may be taken to mark a general lack of knowledge regarding Korean culture and society. It would therefore be difficult for a speaker with such an undeveloped command of honorifics to present a consistent face or identity in their interactions with Koreans.

### 4.3 Sociopragmatic knowledge

The current section and the subsequent one look respectively at the development of sociopragmatic knowledge and the construction of identity in a second language. Following Brown (2010b), I model the first of these processes as “re-framing” and, by extension, propose to refer to the second as “re-facing”. These concepts of “frames” and “face” were previously encountered in Chapter 3, where I argued that a frame-based approach to politeness and an interactive and
relational model of face provide for an accurate description of Korean honorifics from a socio-pragmatic perspective. I now look more specifically at how these ideas of “frames” and “face” can be related to a model of honorific and politeness development from an interlanguage pragmatics perspective. In the current section, I begin by defining the concept of “re-framing”, before considering factors influencing this process. Section 4.4 then repeats the same discussions for identity and “re-facing”

4.3.1 Definition of re-framing

Re-framing is the process whereby speakers of second languages construct mental representations pertaining to language use in different contexts. This process may proceed, follow or, more likely, occur hand-in-hand with the learning of the linguistic forms themselves. In this section, I start by introducing the origins of this model of language development, which lie in L1 acquisition research. I will then explain how this approach ties in with L2 development.

As noted in Chapter 3, the notion of “frame” appears in various guises across different academic fields. Although the current author and politeness researchers prefer “frame”, L1 acquisition researchers charting the socio-cognitive development of children tend to talk of “scripts” (Schank and Abelson 1977). The “script” approach to first language development takes child knowledge of familiar events as its focus and attempts to model the process by which children map their experiences of everyday activities, tasks and language use onto mental representations. Katherine Nelson (1986, 1996) more specifically dubs these frames of knowledge “Mental Event Representations” or MERs. Within this, “General Event Representations” (GERs) refer to the broader process of creating representations through a process of abstraction from repeated events, of building up abstract knowledge from specific concrete activities. “Specific Event Representations” (SERs) refer to memories of individual events, usually those that do not fit the GER in some way, perhaps because they include some kind of marked or salient behavior. Thus, children acquire expectations not only of “what is required”, but also “what is preferred, what is possible but unusual, what is awkward, and what is altogether out of bounds of the appropriate” (Ochs 1988: 13). Applying this to an example from Korean honorifics, through exposure to the situated use of speech styles, Korean native-speaker children learn that use of honorific speech styles towards their elders is “required”, that the “deferential” style may be “preferred” (particularly in formal scenes) and that non-honorific styles are “out of bounds” (Brown 2010b: 250).
The modeling of social knowledge as an interlocking sequence of "frames" is supported by evidence that humans conceptualize events in "packets" with "boundaries", "beginnings" and " endings" (Nelson 1996:16). Rather than being external to this process, language is viewed as integral to the mental representation of the external socio-cultural world.

Although this approach to the development of knowledge pertaining to appropriate language use fits in well with an interlanguage pragmatics approach to language learning, as noted in Brown (2010b:250), there is little explicit discussion of "scripts" or "frames" in previous interlanguage pragmatics literature. This is surprising given the fact that this approach provides a workable model for describing how learners map social experiences onto mental representations and, ultimately, of how sociopragmatic knowledge is learned.

However, some research papers do appear to consider a place for discussions of "frames" and cognitive mapping in their approach to pragmatic development, albeit on a more implicit level. In her paper entitled "Learning to Reframe [...]", Pizziconi (2006:149) discusses how learners establish "new labels for events in the world", construct "conceptual frames" and undergo "cognitive restructuring ... driven by a progressively increased familiarity with situated structures". Kasper and Rose (2002) comment that L2 speakers have to "acquire new representations" and "learn sociopragmatic categories". Finally, Bialystok (1993:51) describes acquisition of pragmatics as "mapping ... between form and social context". The adoption of the concept of "frame" allows for these observations to be incorporated into a more a developmental model as to how learners acquire the social meanings connected to pragmatic features.

The key difference between developing frames for a second rather than a first language is that L2 learners do not create such schemata from a void, as is the case with children learning their mother tongue (Brown 2010b:250). Second language learners already possess sophisticated frames of knowledge pertaining to their first language and other languages they have learned, which can only be expected to influence pragmatic development in the L2. For L2 speakers, the process of "re-framing" is thus best seen as one of re-analyzing and enriching existing frames, rather than constructing such frames from the beginning.

This approach to pragmatic learning as a process of re-aligning existing knowledge goes hand-in-hand with interlanguage pragmatics theory more broadly, where the process of developing pragmatic competence has been modeled as a process of achieving "attentional control" (Bialystok 1993) or of re-applying existing conceptual frameworks for polite speech (Koike 1989). The extent to which L2 speakers are able to make use of existing pragmatic knowledge and renegotiate this knowledge where necessary will be crucial to their success in pragmatic development, as I argue in more depth in Section 4.3.2.1.
In the negotiation of existing pragmatic frames, L2 speakers may be influenced by and draw on pragmatic knowledge from a number of sources. As is the case with children learning their native language, L2 speakers learn pragmatics implicitly through participation in and observation of the target culture and also explicitly from written or oral information. Regarding L2 speakers participating in the current study, during the interview sessions I held with each of the 20 participants, various sources of pragmatic knowledge were called upon as the participants attempted to explain their use of honorifics and the "frames" underpinning such usage. As well as calling on knowledge of their native languages and cultures, participants made connections with other languages they had learned/cultures they had lived in, things they had learned in Korean (or other language) classes, things they had been told by native and other non-native speakers of Korean and behaviors they had observed both in real life and in TV dramas, movies, etc. As an example of this, in the following extract from the interview sessions, Mark discusses the difficulties he encounters selecting appropriate honorific forms when teaching Korean students and interacting with Korean friends (line 1). In the negotiation of these difficulties (line 5), he revisits various sources of pragmatic knowledge. These include his own observations of Korean interaction ("I've always noticed that ..."), interactions with "French and Europeans" ("talking with the French and Europeans ...") and things he had learned in German class ("I remember one of my German teachers telling me ...").

(2) Interview data: Mark

1 Mark They are high school students. Do I use panmal? Do I use semi-panmal? How do I address myself to them? How are they supposed to talk to me? That's been for me in that new environment has been really difficult or even just trying to figure out you know I've known him for two years, we're pretty good friends, but he always speaks to me in contaymal, so should I speak to him in panmal?

2 LB Is this a real situation?

3 Mark Yeah. (laughter)

4 LB So is that with one person or is that with a few people?

5 Mark It's with several people. It's just- the idea of- I've always seen panmal as being kind of a closeness factor, not necessarily lording yourself over and saying I am higher than you. But I've always noticed that when Koreans talk to each other in panmal, it's when they are talking with someone they really like being with, sometimes regardless of age. [...] I don't know where that line is. Again, talking with the French and Europeans, people actually tell you "okay let's talk in the less formal language": "Oh, we're close enough let's do it". And they actually have this moment in time-
remember one of my German teachers telling me you know he met up with this family and one moment the lady is like “okay let’s use the less formal one now, I think we are close enough.” So I think part of me is still expecting that.

The extract above acts as an important example of the variety of pragmatic knowledge that is available to L2 speakers and of the ways they attempt to take advantage of it. Crucial to subsequent discussions, the example clearly shows Mark to be involved in a process of renegotiation, of attempting to define the boundaries of his L2 frames and to connect such schemata to previous knowledge regarding language usage. For Mark, establishing the “line” at which it was acceptable to drop honorific language and move into *panmal* (non-honorific language) was a problem that he was still in the process of resolving. The example shows that, in his attempts to establish a clearer “frame” as to when it may be appropriate to do this, he tries to align his own experiences using Korean with information gleaned from what he has observed or been told elsewhere. In making reference to French and German, he attempts to make use of frames of knowledge pertaining to languages with T/V pronoun alternation as a connection between knowledge of his native language and of Korean interaction. In the extract, it is also noticeable that Mark alternates almost freely between talking about specific experiences and general frames. In fact, it is often difficult to tell which he is talking about, hence my questions in lines 2 and 4.

This kind of shifting between the specific and the general closely mirrors Nelson’s (1986, 1996) distinction between GERs (General Event Representations) and SERs (Specific Event Representations). In addition, the way Mark shifts between the two is extremely reminiscent of the evidence presented by Nelson and Gruendel (1986: 21–23) as to the existence of such “scripts” for native speaker children in their analysis of a letter written by an eight-year old. I thus claim this example as preliminary evidence that L2 learners can and do renegotiate pragmatic knowledge, despite the pessimism regarding this problem expressed in some quarters (see Section 4.3.2.1 below).

4.3.2 Factors influencing re-framing

Discussions above have described the process by which L2 speakers learn pragmatic knowledge as one of enriching, re-analyzing or re-negotiating existing frames of knowledge regarding language usage. Yet how easy is it for learners of a second language to re-organize or add to such pre-existing knowledge or to create schemata of L2 usage that approximate native speaker frames? The current
section sets out to explore factors that may complicate (or at times facilitate) this process. These include the influence of the speakers' pre-existing language(s) and culture(s) (Section 4.3.2.1), a tendency for L2 speakers to over- or under-generalize L2 pragmatic knowledge (Section 4.3.2.2) and finally the possibility that difficulties in developing accurate pragmatic representations are training induced (Section 4.3.2.3).

Before looking at these factors, it is important to note a few areas that could influence the process of re-framing but are not discussed in the current section. First of all, discussions of attitudes are delayed to Section 5 (“re-facing”). Furthermore, the current section does not include a number of individual factors that could influence pragmatic development (such as age, aptitude, motivation, personality and cognitive style). Finally and of most significance, although the above discussions have emphasized the importance of participation in the local community to the development of pragmatic frames, I include no separate section arguing this point. In line with sociocultural approaches to language learning and Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of “legitimate peripheral participation”, I view participation (and thus input and interaction) as being largely determined by the social identities of the speakers in the local community. Such discussions are thus subsumed under the larger umbrella of identity and “re-facing” examined in Section 4.4.

4.3.2.1 Pre-existing languages and cultures
Given that the development of L2 pragmatic knowledge is viewed as occurring on the back of existing frames of L1 knowledge, the influence of other languages that the speaker has learned and cultures in which the speaker has lived are crucial to interlanguage pragmatic development. A review of previous research reveals pessimism in some quarters regarding both the possibility of renegotiating existing knowledge to fit a new culture and the ability of L2 speakers to make use of pragmatic knowledge that the L2 and L1 (or other L2s) may actually share.

Some researchers have expressed doubt as to the extent pre-existing pragmatic knowledge, particularly that pertaining to the L1, is available for re-analysis. At the extreme end of the scale, Janney and Arnt (1992: 31) make the strong claim that once frames or “assumptions” pertaining to appropriate (linguistic) behavior are formed, “they remain relatively stable and their influence on social interaction becomes almost automatic”. According to Janney and Arnt (1992: 31), when adults encounter behavior that contradicts established frame-based knowledge, they reject such behavior as “incorrect, ununderstandable or abnormal” rather than re-negotiating the frame itself. Escandell-Vidal (1996: 637) argues though extended metaphor that first language frames represent ROM “read only memory” that can be “retrieved and used but not written over.” The best hope that Escandell-Vidal can offer is that second language learners can “open a new parallel file with
new data from a new culture". Lantolf and Thorne (2006: 29) furthermore ques-
tions whether “acculturation” (i.e. learning to function in another culture without
necessarily compromising one’s own world view) involves any degree of cognitive
shift at all. Superficial knowledge as to why members of another culture act in a
certain way does not necessarily become internalized or cognitively manifest.

As will be clear from previous discussions, the position adopted in this book
is somewhat more optimistic. Examples from the interview data capture clear
evidence of speakers being in the process of renegotiating frames of language
usage and repositioning themselves in relation to the target culture. Moreover,
the literature is rich with evidence – both anecdotal and research-based – that
people exposed to a second language and its culture do experience alterations not
only in their behavior, but in their viewpoint on the world and their ways of per-
ceiving and interpreting events. Perhaps the clearest evidence that L2 pragmatic
knowledge does become cognitively manifest can be seen not in performance of
the L2 itself, but in the way that speakers’ L1 pragmatic knowledge becomes de-
stabilized through lengthy exposure to another language. Speakers transfer L2
pragmatic strategies back into their L1 or perform both L1 and L2 in a pragmatic
style that represents a compromise somewhere in between two sets of cultural
norms (Blum-Kulka 1990; Blum-Kulka and Sheffer 1993) – what Blum-Kulka
(1991) dubs “intercultural style”. The key observation here is that knowledge per-
taining to the L2 is not neatly stored away on a separate “file” as Escandell-Vidal
(see above) would claim but bleeds into knowledge of the L1 (or other languages).
As a final point, there is no reason to believe (as Janney and Arnt 1992: 31 seem
to imply) that pragmatic learning necessarily stops when adulthood is reached.
Adults exposed to new environments – be they in their native culture or in a
second language context – can and do adapt their ways of perceiving the world
and are involved in adopting new modes of behavior, including new registers of
language. Looking at the use of honorifics by Korean native speakers as a case in
point, socialization into appropriate honorifics use does not suddenly stop when
a speaker becomes adult (Park Young-soon 1978a, 1978b, 2004) for the simple
reason that what constitutes appropriate use continues to change as the speaker
advances in age and status and operates in different social environments. If adults
can continue to develop pragmatic frames for their L1, why should this not also
apply to the L2?

As a final point in this subsection, it is worth reemphasizing that the use of
pre-existing pragmatic frames – or the transfer of L1 pragmatic knowledge –
does not necessarily result in pragmatic “failure” The fact is that even unrelated
languages spoken in distant cultures may share pragmatic features, either by
chance or due to the fact that such features are universal. The positive transfer
of native and/or universal pragmatic knowledge thus represents a powerful tool available to L2 speakers. However, the indications are that L2 speakers are not always able to take advantage of shared or universal pragmatic knowledge, even when the L1 and L2 are remarkably similar regarding a given pragmatic feature. L2 speakers have been observed to frequently underuse politeness marking in the L2, even when they frequently apply similar marking in their L1 (Kasper 1981). Regarding universal context variables such as power and distance, Tanaka (1988) and Fukushima (1990) note that language learners frequently underdifferentiate such variables in the L2 despite being highly sensitive to them in the L1. A general tendency here seems to be for speakers to select “non-transfer” (Kellerman 1979) when the L2 is perceived as being distant from the L1 (similar to what Kellerman 1983 dubs “psychotypology”) or when a pragmatic feature is perceived as unique to the L1 (“psycholinguistic markedness” – Kellerman 1983). As a result, L2 speakers may abandon perfectly transferable pragmatic strategies and instead adopt modes of interaction they more stereotypically associate with the L2. For example, Japanese learners of American English have been shown to be more direct than Americans when performing refusals in the L2 (Robinson 1992) perhaps fuelled by the belief that American interaction is more direct than Japanese. Similarly, Raewyn (1998) found that L2 speakers of Japanese had a stronger tendency to reject compliments than native speakers, perceiving this as the blanket appropriate way to behave in a culture that values modesty.

4.3.2.2 Pragmatic overgeneralization and undergeneralization
Pragmatic overgeneralization and undergeneralization are concerned with how L2 speakers apply or fail to apply existing L2 pragmatic knowledge onto new contexts. When the speaker ineffectively or inappropriately applies familiar pragmatic features onto new contexts, this is a case of overgeneralization. In instances where the speaker could appropriately apply familiar pragmatic features onto new contexts but fails to do so, then this is undergeneralization (based on Barron 2003: 40 and Kasper 1981: 378). As such, the idea that L2 speakers are prone to apply language features either beyond or short of their original functions sits within a wider framework of SLA research in which generalization is viewed as a central process.

2. Previous literature tends to make the distinction between “positive pragmatic transfer” (where the learner is aware that the L1 and L2 share a pragmatic feature and successfully transfers such knowledge) and instances in which the learner appears to presume (either correctly or incorrectly) that a pragmatic feature is universal. As pointed out by Barron (2003: 37), differentiating between the two is problematic. As the distinction is not important for the current book, I simply refer to all such cases as “the positive transfer of native and/or universal pragmatic knowledge.”
in language learning (see Selinker 1972). On the one hand, over- or under-generalization may function as an effective strategy enabling those still in the process of learning a language to function in the target language community. However, over-dependence on such strategies – particularly as the learner reaches an advanced level – may act as a stumbling block to approximating local language usage. In this section, I outline two processes of generalization that appear particularly relevant to the development of frames pertaining to the usage of Korean honorifics: (1) strategy of least effort and (2) strategy of “playing-it-safe”.

“Strategy of least effort” describes the tendency for L2 speakers to rely on forms and functions that are highly automated and easily produced and to over-generalize such forms to situations in which a more complex form would be more appropriate (based on Barron 2003:40 and Kasper 1981: 383). On the other side of the coin, it also refers to the undergeneralization and subsequent under-use of more complex or unfamiliar forms. Of particular relevance to the topic in hand, L2 speakers have been shown to undergeneralize, disregard and omit not just features that are complex per se, but also those that lack propositional content and are not essential to conveying referential meaning (Barron 2003:40–41). Although previous research has focused on the tendency to omit modality markers (Kärkkäinen 1992), it appears reasonable to suggest that honorifics may also be affected by this strategy. Put simply, due to the fact that the inclusion or exclusion of referent honorifics does not influence the actual referential meaning of the message, L2 speakers may identify this part of the language as being less important and open to simplification without damaging the underlying content or goals of their speech. In the moment of speech production, L2 speakers of Korean struggling to supply correct grammar, appropriate lexical items and accurate pronunciation may judge referent honorifics as being an added burden that would unnecessarily complicate and slow down their attempts at producing comprehensible speech and realizing their immediate discourse goals.

The strategy of “playing it safe” may result in similar kinds of over- and under-generalization as described above, yet the motivations are quite different: insecurity, lack of confidence and a fear of causing offence. As pointed out by Barron (2003:41), language learners are commonly burdened by a sense of insecurity and this is mirrored in their language performance. In order to overcome this fear of failure, Faerch and Kasper (1989:245) claim that L2 speakers stick to forms that are explicit or clear. To this, I would also add a tendency to over-generalize forms that are perceived either as positive or neutral in terms of politeness. Due to a fear of offending – or at least of having pragmatic performance perceived as inappropriate or incongruous – L2 speakers may be over-conservative in setting the parameters as to when it is appropriate to move from a register or strategy that is perceived as “polite” to one that is seen as less polite or more informal, casual, etc.
4.3.2.3 Training-induced difficulties
The case is strong for providing explicit classroom instruction in pragmatics. Indeed, as argued by Bardovi-Harlig (2001), the empirical evidence suggests that learners who do not receive instruction do not – or perhaps even cannot – converge towards appropriate language usage. However, the caveat here is that inaccurate or misguided instruction may hamper the development of pragmatic frames. In addition, it has been questioned whether the structure of the language classroom itself contributes to inaccurate perceptions of pragmatics by L2 learners. Both of these problems, I shall argue, are particularly keenly felt in the area of Korean honorifics.

Pragmatic information is frequently overgeneralized, simplified or misrepresented both in teacher-fronted metapragmatic instruction and in teaching materials (Barron 2003:42). The reasons for this appear to be two-fold. Firstly, pragmatic information provided by speakers and textbooks is often based on speaker intuitions rather than empirical data (Barron 2003:42). Although native speaker intuitions have been widely relied upon in syntax, they have been proven to be particularly unreliable in the field of pragmatics. Wolfson et al. (1989) found sizeable differences between the way speakers thought they used their native language and the way they actually used it – differences that speakers were largely unaware of. Depending on intuitions for teaching pragmatics could therefore represent a serious oversight.

Secondly, there is a tendency for language educators to present a simplified version of pragmatic information often more akin to an idealized foreigner talk rather than real-world native speaker interaction. Regarding the presentation of Korean honorifics, the need to simplify this particularly troublesome part of the language is keenly felt in Korean language education. Park Young-soon’s (2001:124) pedagogical manual prescribes the teaching of "a very simplified honorifics system" and states that "there is no need to teach all of the honorifics used by native speakers" [translations my own]. Included amongst the things that don’t need to be taught are the non-honorific {E} speech style (the most commonly used non-honorific style) and all referent honorific vocabulary substitutions. Similarly, Han Jae-young et al. (2005:430) claim that the {E} speech style represents a colloquial form of panmal [non-honorific language] that foreign learners do not need and that referent honorifics are not an important part of Korean language education (Han Jae-young et al. 2005:458). In line with this, it is not unusual for Korean language textbooks to deal with non-honorific speech styles and referent honorifics in a perfunctory way and to present the majority of language in the honorific {Y} speech style with referent honorifics dropped. I return to this question in the conclusion chapter.
The structure of the language classroom itself may also contribute towards poor representations of pragmatics in language teaching. Here, the most fundamental problem is that language classrooms traditionally focus on learning _about_ language rather than practicing _to use_ language and such traditions have spread into pragmatic instruction or the _mwunhwa kyoyuk_ ‘culture teaching’ emphasized in Korean language education. The goal of _mwunhwa kyoyuk_, it would seem, is not to foster intercultural competence, but to educate learners _about_ Korean culture with the emphasis on material culture rather than performed culture. In addition to this, the teacher-fronted nature of classroom instruction has been shown to be unfavorable for pragmatic development since it creates a discourse that is typically less pragmatically rich than “real world” conversation. As summarized by Kasper and Rose (1999:96), classroom discourse commonly features a narrower range of speech acts, a lack of politeness markers, shorter and less complex utterances and a limited range of discourse markers. It almost goes without saying that classroom interaction hardly represents a rich environment for exposure to different honorific forms. At least in the Korean context, classroom interaction is a formal mode of discourse. Thus, uniform honorifics are deemed appropriate not only in the speech of students, but also by the teacher, at least when addressing the class as a whole. Although teachers may drop the honorifics when addressing individual students, my own observations coupled with interview data from the current study suggest that this rarely happens in the KSL classroom.

In addition, classroom discourse also limits the chances for speakers to use referent honorifics. Typical I-R-F (Initiate-Response-Feedback) exchanges provide few if any opportunities for students to ask questions back to the teacher and thus use referent honorifics when referring to the teacher as a status superior. Moreover, interview data for the current study suggests that Korean language teachers do not insist on language learners using referent honorifics towards them and rarely provide feedback on the absence of such forms.

4.4 Identity

Discussions up until this point have modeled pragmatic development as a process of developing frames of knowledge regarding the kind of linguistic behavior that is common and acceptable in different contexts. However, this model of interlanguage pragmatics as the development of cognitive representations provides only an incomplete picture. Pragmatic knowledge in itself, it would seem, is not sufficient for speakers of a second language to simply go out and “perform” the language just like a native speaker. To speak Korean “like a Korean” also entails that the L2 speaker – at least to some extent – “becomes Korean” and adopts the
“face”, roles and responsibilities of Korean speakers. Although developing pragmatic competence can be a powerful tool for a speaker in the construction of an L2 identity, it does not necessarily entail it. As will be discussed below, the negotiation of an identity also depends upon the value placed on such a process, both by the L2 speaker him/herself and the local community.

The development of an L2 identity, I would argue, is particularly relevant to discussions of the acquisition of Korean honorifics. As previously discussed in Chapter 3, in Korean cultural thinking, honorifics are closely tied up with commonsense notions regarding politeness, language use and social behavior. In particular, Korean speakers hold close associations between honorifics and important social values regarding the need to respect seniors and elders. Thus, being able to use honorifics “correctly” is an important part of “doing” Korean identity.

In this book, I dub the process whereby an L2 speaker adopts a new identity as “re-facing”, which I define and model in 4.1 below. In 4.2, I discuss potential obstacles to the adoption of an L2 identity.

4.4.1 Definition of re-facing

“Re-facing” refers to the process whereby the L2 speaker is involved in the construction of a new presentation of the self. This typically occurs during what Block (2002, 2007) calls “critical experiences” – “periods of time during which prolonged contact with an L2 and a new and different cultural setting causes irreversible destabilization of the individual’s sense of self” (Block 2007: 21). Negotiating a new identity does not simply involve bolting-on a parallel identity to the existing one or becoming “half-and-half” (i.e. half old identity, half new identity) (Block 2007: 21). Rather, L2 speakers create “hybrid” or “third place” identities (Bhabha 1994), which may share features from both the native and the L2 identity but also elements that “would not have been predictable by simply summing up these contributions” (Block 2007: 21).

In this book, I treat “face” and “identity” as largely analogous concepts that differ less according to referential meaning and more according to the academic persuasion of the researcher involved. Whereas politeness researchers have preferred the former term, socio/anthropological linguists – and more recently interlanguage pragmaticians – have favored the latter. If the way these fields have used the two terms has differed, this has generally been a difference of scope or perspective rather than meaning per se. In politeness research, discussions of face have generally been limited to positive attributes that the “claimant” wants others to acknowledge (Spencer-Oatey 2007:643–644) and the way that this face is threatened, enhanced or maintained through polite linguistic behavior.
Discussions of identity, however, have encompassed a broader range of issues regarding self and self-presentation in communities of practice.

Of particular relevance to the current discussion, identity has been modeled as having two aspects that are directly comparable to the "connection face" and "separation face" (Arundale 2006) outlined in the discussions of politeness in Chapter 3. Just as maintaining "face" from a politeness research perspective involves the negotiation of closeness and distance, establishing an identity within a community involves claiming "sameness" with a certain group or maintaining "difference" from others (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 370). Identities are defined not just by claiming similarities, but also by "their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render 'outside,' abjected" (Hall 1996: 5). Anthropological linguists also follow politeness researchers in seeing identity as being interactional and relational. Bucholtz and Hall (2004: 376) describe identities as being "formed in action rather than fixed categories" and as being situationally constructed rather than irrevocably attached either to groups or individuals.

Included amongst the "tools" by which identity is constructed and negotiated is language itself - what previous researchers have dubbed "ethnolinguistic identity" (Blommaert 2005: 214) or "language identity" (Block 2007: 39). In the current discussions, I adopt the latter term, which is defined by Block (2007: 39) as "the assumed and/or attributed relationship between one's sense of self and a means of communication" which may be a dialect or a sociolect as well as a language. According to Leung, Harris and Rampton (1997), this relationship between self and language has three aspects: language expertise, language affiliation and language inheritance. Language expertise refers to proficiency in the means of communication, which it is assumed must reach a certain level in order for a speaker to be accepted by other users. Affiliation describes the extent to which a person claims attachment to a language and feels part of the community using that language. Finally, inheritance is about being born into a community that is associated with a particular language or being born with other attributes besides language that are associated with that community. These three aspects do not necessarily entail each other. For example, one can inherit a language but have no proficiency in or affiliation to it. Alternatively, one may become proficient in and affiliated to a non-inherited language. However, in combination these three factors work to determine the "face" that L2 speakers negotiate in the target language community, as shall be explored in more detail in Section 4.4.2 below.

Despite the obvious connections between language and self-presentation, in SLA research, identity was traditionally "an issue waiting in the wings, which never came to the fore" (Block 2007: 187). In his comprehensive review of the treatment of the concept in previous research, Block (2007: 187) identifies such concerns as being present but not specifically fore-grounded in Lambert's (1972)
early research on motivation and bilingualism, Guiora et al.'s (1972) conceptualization of "language ego", Schumann's (1974) acculturation model and Schmidt's (1983) work on pidginization. However, the recent trend away from pure cognitivism and towards a social approach to L2 learning has resulted in an increased interest in problems of identity. Strong lines of research emerging in the literature include the identity construction of migrants vis-à-vis social class, economics, etc. (Broeder et al. 1996; Goldstein 1996; Norton 2000), Internet-mediated identity negotiation in the FL context (Thorne 2003), problems of sexual harassment (Polanyi 1995 – Russia; Twombly 1995 – Costa Rica; Talburt and Stewart 1999 – Spain) or gendered subject positions affecting Anglo-American learners (Pellegrino 2005 – Russia; Kinginger and Whitworth 2005) and the adoption of teacher-student positions in L1-L2 talk (Wilkinson 2002).

Previous studies commenting on problems of identity for Western learners of non-European languages include Siegal (1994, 1995, 1996 – Japanese), Iino (1996 – Japanese), Du Fon (1999 – Indonesian) and Higgins (2007 – Swahili). This research has shown that the development of an Asian or African language identity on the part of Western learners can be particularly problematic. In many instances, it may well be that neither the local community nor the language learners themselves particularly value the establishment of a local identity on the part of the latter. Except in the case of heritage learners, speakers may encounter an inability to "pass" as a local being accentuated by folk beliefs that learning the local language is difficult or impossible for "foreigners". In addition, even heritage learners may find that adopting a local identity is at odds with pre-existing images of the self. Such problems are discussed in more detail below.

4.4.2 Factors influencing re-facing

In looking at factors that influence the process of re-facing, the current section builds on Leung, Harris and Rampton's (1997) three-aspect model of language identity outlined above: language expertise, language affiliation and language inheritance. Taking these in reverse order, I re-package language inheritance as a more general notion of "attitudes of the target language community" (Section 4.4.2.1) and language affiliation as "attitudes of the L2 speakers" (Section 4.4.2.2). The former is taken to refer more broadly to the identities that are made available to L2 speakers by the local community and the value that the local community places on L2 speakers adopting local identities. The latter is understood as a matter of the extent to which such speakers aim to become fully competent members of the local community and adopt a local face. Finally, language expertise is covered under "pragmalinguistic competence", already
discussed in Section 3 of the current chapter. More so than at other points in this chapter, discussions throughout this section refer specifically to the linguistic environment in South Korea.

4.4.2.1 Attitudes of target language community
Vital to the construction of a second language “face” – and ultimately to the performance of L2 pragmatics – is the social identity afforded to L2 speakers by the local target language community. In situations in which the local community expects, encourages or allows L2 speakers to adopt a local identity, the process of re-facing should be facilitated. Conversely, when this is not the case, developing an L2 face is expected to be more problematic. Building on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of “legitimate peripheral participation, Norton (2000) points out that L2 speakers not granted “enough legitimacy” (i.e. who are not viewed as “potential members” of the community) may not be deemed “worthy to speak” and thus do not have the opportunities to participate in the community, use the language and build fluency. According to Norton (2000: 3), this may hamper the language development even of the individual traditionally viewed as the “good language learner” who “seeks out opportunities to learn the language, is highly motivated, has good attention to detail, can tolerate ambiguity and has low levels of anxiety”. In the case of the Western learners of Korean participating in the current study, the opportunities for them to negotiate a Korean “face” were found to differ markedly depending on their occupational background (exchange students/professionals) and on their ethnicity (heritage/non-heritage). I now briefly comment on the identities that were available to these different groups of speakers. Such discussions hint not only at the roles that the speakers were expected or allowed to “perform”, but also at the opportunities for interaction with Koreans and for exposure to and use of honorific forms that these roles entailed.

Beginning with the “exchange student” identity, the current book confirms the findings of previous research that such groups occupy positions on the periphery of university life and the L1 community. As noted by Siegal (1994: 19) regarding the Japanese context, foreign students are separated from the mainstream community both physically (thorough being housed in special accommodation, etc.) and through the otherness and temporality that the exchange student identity entails. Crucial to the development of honorifics, exchange students occupy a position outside of the relational and hierarchical structure of the university. In a Korean university, a student’s haknyen (‘university year’, as in first year, second year, etc.) and hakpen (‘university number’, which basically refers to the year they first entered university) are important parts of their identity and strong determiners of rank. In the following extract from the interview
data, as well as bemoaning a lack of interaction with native Koreans, Japanese-born Hiroki discusses how being an exchange student places him outside of this system, making it difficult for him to interact with Korean students and to determine appropriate honorifics use:

(3) Interview data: Hiroki

*I feel like it's very limited in a sense, because people you meet are also foreigners. Very little ... opportunities to meet with the actual- the actual Korean students ... of course, people can say like oh you can take the other you know subjects and do the other subjects- like the other subjects where you know the actual Korean university students also take and actually make friends and do it that way. But still, it's different, you know, as an exchange student [...] Things would be much more clear if I'm il-haknyen [a first year] or i-haknyen [a second year] here, then people would just- because it's- I think it's one of the ways which you can- it's like one measurement- like, "oh, you- which year are you in?", "I'm the second". Okay, I should use containmal [honorific language] to you.*

The “exchange student” identity appears to particularly limit opportunities for interaction with superiors and ultimately restricts the development of fluency in honorific forms. For the majority of exchange students, the only notable superior with whom they interacted with on a regular basis was their Korean language teacher. Crucially, the data analysis (see Chapters 5 and 8) shows that these teachers were lenient in their correction of inappropriate honorifics use and did not demand application of referent honorifics in speech addressed towards them. The data suggests that students who took other classes within the university or joined tongari (university clubs) were exposed to more native-like norms of honorifics use. “Learner stories” in Chapter 8 show that lecturers of other classes were at times stricter in enforcing canonical honorifics use. As for tongari, these provided speakers with ample opportunities to develop more casual relationships and develop fluency in panmal. In sum, the exchange student identity is shown to preclude participation in casual non-honorific interaction, but to limit opportunities for developing hierarchical relationships and exposure to high honorific forms.

For the “professionals”, the current study suggests that the opportunities for this group to negotiate a Korean identity were ultimately even more problematic than was the case of the exchange students. Within the graduate school or work environment, these speakers were generally placed outside of the group hierarchy; thus, although they were exposed to formal Korean, they were not necessarily expected to apply language according to age-rank distinctions. This particularly applied to the workers, who tended to occupy positions that were created specifically for non-Koreans and which did not entail the same rights or obligations of
Korean co-workers. As for the graduate students, some of these had been admitted on programs or scholarships specially reserved for overseas students. Even when this was not the case, participants found that they were not necessarily treated the same as other Korean students. Canadian Matthew, for example, complained that despite his attempts to play the roles of a senpay ('senior' – an older student, commonly in the same department) or hwupay ('junior'), others did not recognize him as such and that this was reflected in the forms of address that he tended to receive (see Chapter 8 for further discussion). Placed outside of the hierarchy and lacking any instantly recognizable peers, many of the professionals complained of a tendency to be perpetually addressed in high honorific forms, and a lack of exposure to panmal. In similar ways to the exchange students, the professionals appeared to be more successful in claiming Korean identities outside of the graduate school or workplace. As well as casual friendships with Korean acquaintances, many of these speakers were actively involved in organized activities that brought them into contact with Korean groups and which offered them Korean identities of sorts. As a case in point, graduate student Holly was a black belt in thaykkyen (a traditional Korean martial art) and taught this in her free time. Being a black belt afforded her an elevated hierarchical position that was rarely compromised by her non-Korean identity.

I now discuss the effects of ethnicity on the identities available to L2 speakers in South Korea. On this point, the importance placed on language inheritance in South Korean society and the subsequent differing attitudes towards heritage and non-heritage speakers participating in the current study was perhaps the most crucial factor in determining the extent to which they were afforded a Korean identity. Korea is often quoted as being “one of the most ethnically and linguistically homogenous countries in the world”: 3 This claim, factual at least to a relative extent, is reinforced by a myth of the Korean people being a single race (tanilmin-cok) descended from one bloodline. In addition, as noted by Coulmas (1999: 408), Korea maintains an even higher congruity between speech community and nation than neighboring Japan or China: “whoever speaks Korean, is a Korean”. The

3. This quotation or similar appears in various books and websites on Korea, including the US Department of State website (www.state.gov/r/pa/et/bgn/2800.htm). Both South and North Korea are well known for having no recognized ethnic minorities or minority languages. However, although Korea may appear racially homogenous in comparison to many countries, claims that Korea is mono-ethnic probably more closely reflect an ideology rather than a reality. Writing in the Joongang Ilbo on August 20th 2007, Lee Hun-beom quotes Japanese research claiming that 60% of the Korean gene pool is not uniquely Korean. Similarly, Park Ki-hyun (2007) found that 46% of Korean clans had overseas origins. In addition, in South Korea, rising numbers of overseas residents and marriages between Koreans and non-Koreans (13.6% according to 2005 government statistics) further threaten the idea of Korea as a mono-ethnic society.
result is that overseas Koreans, or kyopho, are generally expected to speak Korean fluently, almost as if the ability can be genetically inherited. Heritage learners not fluent in the language are therefore seldom spared any compassion for linguistic deficiencies and may even face open criticism for their “poor” Korean skills. For non-heritage learners, the opposite seems to apply, as will be discussed in further detail below.

The majority of heritage learner participants in the current study sensed that learning the language was important for establishing their Korean identity and accepted a “racial obligation” (as James described it) to know Korean. For some of these speakers, such as Daniel, to speak Korean fluently (“like a real Korean”) was the explicit goal:

(4) Interview data: Daniel

That's my aim, you know, to be like a real Korean, so no one is like thinking he's a kyopho ['overseas Korean'] and he doesn’t know about that.

This need for competence in the language as a way of confirming an inherited Korean identity was particularly keenly felt by the two participants who were of mixed Korean ethnicity (Lisa and Chin-u). Although these participants found that some Koreans would quickly “embrace you as one of them” (Lisa), a more common tendency was for them to be “pushed” towards their non-Korean “side” (Chin-u). This seemed to have the effect, at least for these two individuals, of making them “push” back even harder and use the language as a tool to establish themselves as Korean.

However, this strong motivation for heritage speakers – both of pure and mixed ethnicity – to learn Korean and re-connect to their Korean identity was tempered for most by their language expertise falling short of either society’s or their own expectations. During the interview sessions, it was common for these speakers to make self-deprecating comments regarding their own Korean (“I'm not that good in Korean” – Daniel) and to express frustration both at their own language ability and at the lack of understanding shown to them by Korean interlocutors:

(5) Interview data: Jenny

Yesterday when I went to go and mend my watch I was like do you have a DKNY thing and they were like sorry I don't understand your accent. They gave me that kind of look. The way they look at me because I can't speak proper Korean. In those times I get a bit- it gets me upset because I try to do my best to speak good Korean, but on the other side they kind of mock me.
Due to the lack of accommodation shown to them by native Koreans, it is perhaps unsurprising that many of the heritage speakers ultimately preferred to socialize with other kyopho, Westerners or even Japanese friends. Perhaps contrary to expectations, it was not always the case that heritage learners had more Korean friends or interacted within more Korean groups than their non-heritage counterparts. In addition, certain heritage speakers in the current project were shown to emphasize their “foreigner” rather than their Korean identity in order to establish that they were not “completely Korean” and therefore should be “cut some slack” should their linguistic or social skills strayed from local norms. New Zealander Julie attached much importance to the fact that she spoke Korean with a distinct accent. She saw this as being an important weapon in establishing a non-Korean identity and gaining more understanding from the local community:

(6) Interview data: Julie
When I speak Korean, I don’t speak with a Korean accent. It’s with an English accent, well a Kiwi accent. So I think in some ways Korean people are more lenient. I have kind of never been in a situation where the person’s mad because I’ve used the wrong- I addressed the person wrong or I said something wrong. They just smile and say “ok.” And then like afterwards I’m like “did- maybe I should have said that a little more differently”.

Ultimately, although a Korean identity was available to the heritage speaker participants, this was not an identity they always chose to adopt. In addition to the incongruity between accepting such an identity and their own pre-existing “faces” (be it as Westerners, English speakers, feminists, world citizens, etc. – Section 4.4.2.2), the case of Julie above shows that claiming a non-Korean identity at times simply represented a useful strategy, a point I expand upon below.

For non-heritage speakers, the negotiation of identity began from a different starting point. Due to the previously quoted strong links between nationhood, ethnicity and language, non-heritage speakers did not find themselves under direct pressure either to speak Korean or to conform to all social norms, at least not from society as a whole. In line with the findings of Iino (1996) regarding Japan, although Korean society welcomed these “outsiders” interest in the local language and culture, it neither expected nor placed any particular value on the adoption of Korean modes of social behavior or of a Korean identity. Some participants reported that efforts to use Korean were at times frustrated by Korean interlocutors preferring to speak English, using very simplified “foreigner talk” and continually commenting on or praising their Korean rather than listening to what they were trying to get across. Such problems were of course less keenly felt by the two Japanese-born participants. Not only was their “foreigner”
identity less immediately obvious, but Koreans also seemed to perceive less incongruity in other East Asians learning the local language or acculturating to local norms.

One participant who received a wide range of comments on her Korean was Holly. She had initially learned Korean in the provincial city of Daegu and had thus picked up some regional dialect, or *sathwuli*. The continual comments she received on her *sathwuli* (including comparisons with Robert Holley—an American TV personality in Korea who also spoke Korean with a regional accent) were a source of frustration and embarrassment for her:

(7) Interview data: Holly

Even in Daegu, if you start speaking in *sathwuli* people will be like “oh foreigner speaking *sathwuli*, it’s like Robert Holley, it’s so cute.” It’s like, I don’t want you to be telling me about Robert Holley right now, I want you to be answering the question.

Despite the difficulties of negotiating a Korean identity for these non-heritage speakers, the interview data shows that the vast majority of such participants in the current study were ultimately successful in developing deep relationships with Koreans and in being recognized as active members of Korean groups. As such relationships and roles became more established, these speakers often found that they were treated similarly to other Koreans and were increasingly expected to adopt a Korean face and follow the modes of behavior that this entailed. I explore this process of negotiation in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8.

**4.4.2.2 Attitudes of L2 speakers**

Despite the different “faces” afforded to different occupational and ethnic groups participating in the current study, discussions in the previous section hint that speakers did not necessarily automatically adopt the identities that Korean society offered them. Of most significance, heritage speakers and non-heritage speakers were shown at times to distance themselves from the “Korean” and “foreigner” identities that society labeled them with. Some of the reasons as to why certain groups of speakers should align themselves with a Korean or a non-Korean identity have already emerged during discussions above and will be explored in more depth during the data analysis chapters. In the current section, I comment on more general reasons why Western learners of Korean (and more generally of Asian, non-European and other “non-global languages” – Dörnyei et al. 2006) do not always choose to adopt a local identity. I focus on three main points: (1) conflicts with other pre-existing identities, (2) conflicts with ideology pertaining to human interaction and politeness and (3) immediate discourse goals.
The most immediate explanation as to why competent speakers of an L2 may not choose to claim a new identity in the local speech community is that doing so would conflict with their pre-existing face(s). Previous research shows that such pre-existing identities may either be specific to the speaker's native culture or otherwise more general personas of globalized world citizens. Regarding the former, Siegal's (1994, 1995, 1996) ethnographic studies of Western women learning Japanese show that these speakers struggled to reconcile their native female identities with "women's subordinate role in Japanese society" (Siegal 1994: 360). As a result, they declined (to varying extents) the adoption of an identity that was truly Japanese and instead negotiated a face that was actually "outside the guidelines of appropriate behavior in the society" (Siegal 1994: 360). Higgins (2007) also points to feminism as a reason why female learners in Tanzania reject becoming "a complete Swahili". However, Higgins argues that adopting a Swahili identity did not only conflict with culture-specific discourses of femininity, "Westernness" and "Whiteness", but also with the participants perceptions of themselves as "world citizens". According to Higgins, the well-traveled participants in her study had created a "third space" (Bhabha 1994) in which they formed their identities. This space was not connected to any one specific geographical or cultural location, including Tanzania or their home country. Put simply, they did not particularly value connecting themselves strongly with any culture-specific identity.

Such observations, I would argue, reveal a common tension on the part of Western learners of non-global languages. The majority of such learners, it would seem, are cosmopolitans rather than communitarians. Generally speaking, they are knowledgeable of, experienced in and open to overseas culture in general; otherwise, we may ask, why would they be taking the time to learn a non-global language? This cosmopolitan identity, however, clashes with the way that non-global languages tend to be closely tied up to a strong local identity. Languages such as Korean are viewed primarily as "ethnic languages" (mincoke – Ross King 2006) and as such closely entail specific ideas of race and nationhood. It would seem that the very specificity of such identities may be incongruous with the more globalized face of the L2 learner.

A specific claim of the current book is that one area in which the Western or globalized identities of L2 speakers may be particularly incongruous with a Korean identity involves ideology pertaining to politeness. As noted in the previous chapter, cultural thinking regarding politeness has a strong influence on the ways that speakers perceive language use. What we see in the current book is that L2 speakers attach less importance to or even blatantly ignore modes of behavior that do not fit in with their own pre-existing "politeness ideology". In the case of Western learners of languages such as Korean, Japanese and Indonesian, the focus on indexical politeness (i.e. varying language according to the relative identity of
the hearer) in the pragmatics of such languages may be difficult to reconcile with a more egalitarian set of beliefs tied up with being a “Westerner”.

As a final point in this section, it is important to emphasize that a choice not to “be Korean” does not always depend on the kind of global questions regarding identity discussed in the previous two paragraphs. At times, L2 speakers purposefully claim a “foreigner” identity not out of any ideological opposition to “Koreaness”, but as a strategy to pursue specific discourse goals. Heritage speakers, for example, may stake claims to a “foreigner” identity simply so that Korean interlocutors speak to them in simpler and slower Korean. German-born Daniel, despite being one of the most fluent participants in the study and claiming a strong Korean identity, would often preface any interactions with strangers by saying “hankwuk-mal cal mos ha-yse mianha-ciman” (“I'm sorry that I can't speak Korean well, but ...”) and thus establish a non-Korean face. According to this particular heritage speaker, this resulted in Koreans using simplified speech towards him and gave him a sense of security.

Non-heritage speakers would also at times make strategic use of the “foreigner” identity. During the recordings of the role-plays (see Chapter 6), Australian Russell quotes being a foreigner (“oykwukin-i-nikka” “because I’m a foreigner”) as an excuse for his previous drunken behavior, playing on the preconception that non-Koreans cannot hold their drink as well as Koreans! By claiming the “foreigner” identity, this speaker sought the leniency that more competent members of a community may extend to less competent members, including those unfamiliar with local culture. During the interview sessions, Russell confessed to being “quite embarrassed that I used the oykwukin ['foreigner'] cop out” but that this strategy was “the last card in the pack”. Such examples show that speakers may take advantage of a face available to them not because it matches any pre-held identities or ideologies, but as a strategy to manipulate the discourse and pursue their personal agendas.
CHAPTER 5

Data analysis: Discourse Completion Test

5.1 Introduction

This chapter and the three subsequent ones employ mixed methodologies to investigate the honorifics systems of second language speakers. In Chapters 6, 7 and 8, I provide analysis of spoken conversational data as well as "learner stories". In the current chapter, I start by looking at the use of speech styles, referent honorifics and forms of address in DCT (Discourse Completion Test) data. In addition to the L2 participants, the DCT was sat by 40 native speakers. By starting with the quantitative data and using the L1 group as a baseline, I am able to identify broad trends and characteristics of the honorifics usage of L2 speakers. I am then in a position to further examine these trends in relation to questions of identity and ideology through the analysis of quantitative data in Chapters 6, 7 and 8.

The specific goal of the current chapter is to establish the underlying "frame-based" knowledge that L2 speakers possess regarding the contexts in which different honorific forms can be applied. The DCT assesses honorific usage in relation to a range of power relationships, degrees of distance and the formality of the scene. In addition, by analyzing results according to occupation and ethnicity, I am able to make some initial observations as to how the different identities of these groups entail different uses of honorifics. Use of DCT data alone, however, comes with certain restrictions. Firstly, the contextual factors presented in the DCT are necessarily simplified. Power, distance and formality are presented as more or less static variables rather than the dynamic models presented in Chapter 3. In addition, the format assumes that the settings in which L2 speakers use Korean and the relationships they establish with Korean speakers approximate L1-L1 interaction. Contrary to this, data in subsequent chapters shows that L2 speakers at times negotiate social relationships that fall outside native speaker "norms". For the time being, considerations of such factors are put aside to later chapters.

It was hypothesized that significant differences would exist between the honorific competence of the L1 and L2 speakers and that occupation and ethnicity would also influence the results. More specifically, I expected L2 speakers to be less sensitive to the influences of all three contextual factors and therefore frequently over- or under-generalize their use of honorifics. Within this general
pattern, I hypothesized that the largest differences between the L1 and L2 speakers would exist regarding the “power” dimension, with L2 speakers being less inclined to indexing hierarchical relationships. Due to the importance put on egalitarian language use in Western politeness, I expected these speakers to avoid language that they saw as either overtly subservient on the one hand or condescending on the other. I also expected potential differences between the ways that exchange students and professionals as well as heritage and non-heritage speakers use honorifics. As pointed out in the previous chapter, the identities available to these different occupational and ethnic backgrounds entailed different opportunities for using the language and applying honorifics. Being an exchange student and/or heritage learner increased the opportunities to use informal language within the family unit or the university setting. On the other hand, being a professional – and to some extent being of non-Korean heritage – entailed increased use of formal language. I thus expected that exchange students and heritage speakers would overgeneralize the application of non-honorific language, while the professionals and non-heritage speakers would “overuse” honorific language and exhibit more caution downgrading to non-honorific forms.

5.2 Methodology

This section briefly introduces the rationale for using DCT (Discourse Completion Test) methodology. I explain the design of the DCT and discuss technical issues that arose during the design process.

As noted by Kasper and Rose (2002: 96), well-designed DCTs (or “questionnaires”) represent a valuable tool for probing speaker metapragmatic knowledge as to the contextual factors under which certain linguistic choices are appropriate. “Questionnaire responses”, argue Kasper and Rose (2002: 96), “indicate what strategic and linguistic options are consonant with respondents’ understandings of L2 pragmatic norms and what context factors influence their choices”. Thus, it appears reasonable to assume that the DCT represents a suitable methodology for exploring the frame-based knowledge speakers possess regarding honorifics use. However, although the DCT used for this particular project was designed to illicit data that was as faithful to real-world interactions as possible, this does not presuppose any claim that the way participants used honorifics on the test necessarily replicates “real world” usage. As noted by Rose and Kasper (2002: 96), DCTs monitor competence or knowledge rather than performance. The kind of data collected by DCTs represents a static and idealized version of the speaker’s knowledge of language rather than the dynamics of natural interaction. The current study, however, treats this kind of data as a baseline for analyzing the honorifics
usage of non-native speakers, rather than an end-point in itself. When looked at in combination with recorded interactions and introspection data, the DCT data makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of L2 honorifics.

In addition to the 20 L2 speakers, the DCT was sat by a group of 40 native speakers. The test sat by the native speakers differed only in that it contained instructions in Korean rather than English. All of the native speakers were in at least their third year of study at a well-known university in Seoul. The group included 17 male and 23 female participants and the average age was 24.3 years. Two pre-test versions of the DCT were also piloted by 18 L2 and 47 L1 speakers. The feedback of these speakers regarding how they perceived the contexts presented on the DCT proved invaluable in redesigning the final version of the test. I stressed to both the L1 and L2 groups that they were required to fill in the survey to reflect how they would use language in their own natural interactions, rather than according to prescribed rules of language use. Discussion of the DCT was included in the introspection sessions held with each L2 participant.

The DCT, reproduced in Appendix 1, was composed of 24 separate items in which the participant had to complete an utterance by adding a bound form of address and a verb with appropriate endings, including referent honorifics and speech styles. The sentence that had to be completed had basically the same propositional content for each item; it was only the context in which the sentence was being uttered that differed. The only small alteration in the content of the sentence was that in items 1–12 the object noun of the sentence was yenghwa ('movie'), while in 13–24 it was nyusu ('news'), reflecting a slight change in context, as shown in Figures 2 and 3.

The 24 different contexts were generated through four levels of power, three of distance and two of formality. All of the questions took a university setting as their background; in other words, the contextual factors provided were all based around interactions with professors and fellow students. This setting appeared to be the most relevant not only to the native speakers who were all university students but also to the non-native speakers who were studying in a university setting.

You are having lunch with some students and professors (all native Korean speaker) from the Korean university at which you are studying. You are having a one-on-one chat with the person next to you, who is male. You are talking about a movie you have seen. You want to ask the person you are talking to if they have also seen this movie:

너는 그 영화를 봤어?

How would you say this sentence if you were talking to the different people listed in the tables below?

Figure 2. Instructions from the DCT (items 1–12)
You are a student representative attending a departmental meeting with 10 other students and 5 professors (all native speakers of Korean) from the Korean university at which you are studying.

The aim of the meeting is to choose some new computer software for the department. One of the other participants in the meeting talks about one particular piece of software. By chance, you saw a report about this same piece of software on the news last night. You mention this to the room and then ask the original speaker, who is male, (across the room with everyone listening) if he also saw the news report:

너는 그 뉴스를 봤어?

How would you say this sentence if you were talking to the different people listed in the tables below?

Figure 3. Instructions from the DCT (items 13–24)

students, but also to the L2 speakers. Although five of these participants were not currently students, all had experience of being socialized into appropriate use of Korean towards teachers and classmates during their experiences learning the language. Within this university setting, the survey was then composed of two parts reflecting two levels of “formality”. For the first twelve items (situation 1), the scene was informal: a one-on-one chat about movies with the person sitting next to you at lunch (see Figure 2). This contrasted with the formal scene of the following twelve (situation 2): contributing to a discussion regarding the choice of a computer program at a departmental meeting (Figure 3). Items for each situation were then sub-divided into three degrees of “distance”: interactions with new acquaintances or strangers (first set of four items), interactions with previous acquaintances who are not yet close (second set of four items) and interactions with intimates (third set of four items). Within each set of four questions, four degrees of “power” were then distinguished: professor (age = 50), senpay (‘senior student’) two years older than you, classmate the same age as you and hwupay (‘junior student’) two years younger than you, as shown in Figure 4.

In the final version of the DCT, the gender of all of the interlocutors was set as “male”. Versions of the DCT used on the pilot study had repeated each item for both genders. However, analysis of the results showed that the effects of gender on honorifics use were far from statistically relevant. The decision was thus made to randomly remove the “female” items from the final version of the DCT.

The reliability and authenticity of the contexts on the DCT were established both in relation to previous literature and through feedback from the pilot study. The levels of power were defined primarily by age and based on the observations of Yoon Kyung-joo (2004: 203) that speakers differentiate three broad categories
Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 _______?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Se11pay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 _______?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 _______?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 _______?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** Sample items from the DCT

of relative age: much older, a little older and not much older at all (see Chapter 3). To this, I added an extra level by differentiating between an interlocutor who was the same age and one who was younger, a distinction that Yoon (2004: 204) acknowledges her framework to lack. Regarding distance, although as noted in Chapter 3, this factor may include solidarity, familiarity and affect, for reasons of simplicity, I limited the definition to degrees of familiarity. Within this, the three-way distinction between new acquaintances (or strangers), non-intimates and intimates is well attested in the interlanguage pragmatics literature (see for example Olshtain 1989). Unfortunately, there are no previous distinctions of “formality” available in the research. For the current study, I merely divided between formal and informal scenes. The former included the following characteristics: structured and focused activity type, clear speaker roles and presence of bystanders (including status superiors). In the pilot studies, the majority of L1 informants agreed that this context represented a formal scene in their culture.

I now comment on two problems I encountered during the design process. Firstly, attempting to elicit bound forms of address proved more problematic than envisaged. In natural spoken Korean, such forms can often be dropped if the identity of the referent can be inferred from context. During trials of the survey, a natural resistance to adding a form of address was detected amongst the L1 speakers, who often left the space untouched, despite specific instructions to complete all blanks. Although re-designing of the DCT minimized such problems, some native speakers still failed to fill in all of the slots on the final version. Interestingly, this tended to occur in contexts where “low” power factors clashed with “high” distance or formality.¹

¹. One possible solution to this problem of eliciting forms of address would have been to elicit a vocative free form instead of a bound form. Although I considered this possibility, I was keen to stick to eliciting the bound form in order to allow for analysis of L2 speaker knowledge of second person pronouns. Given the particular restrictions on pronoun usage in Korean (and
A second problem in design that proved more difficult to overcome was the danger of participants being too aware of the focus of the study. As pointed out by Brown (1988: 33), subjects in any study have a tendency to try and second guess the goals of the research and "help" the researcher achieve the apparent aims. To reduce the dangers of this "subject expectancy", Brown (1988: 37) advocates the inclusion of "elements that have no actual purpose other than to distract the subjects from the real aims of the study." However, given the fact that honorifics are an aspect of the Korean language that pervades every single utterance unit, the inclusion of such "distractors" was not straightforward. In the first pre-test version of the DCT, I experimented using different and more complex contexts on each item as well as utterances of different propositional content in order to distract participants. However, this created imbalances as to how power, distance and formality were perceived. In the end, I abandoned such attempts and left the focus of the study more obvious. Having said this, although it may have been clear that the research involved honorifics, the expected results would not, I believe, have been so easily identified. The variations detected in the L1 answers attest to the fact that there was no "correct" answer as to how the test should be completed.

When analyzing the DCT data, as well as simply calculating the relative frequencies of different honorific forms, usage was assessed according to the three contextual factors of power, distance and formality. The statistical relevance of differences between overall frequencies of honorific forms in the L1/L2 speaker data was calculated using t tests. When factoring in the influence of the three contextual factors, ANOVA was applied. To ascertain the extent to which the different occupational and ethnic groups deviated from the L1 baseline, I carried out post-hoc t tests. Rather than attempting to establish a "correct" answer and compare L2 use against this, I simply compared the relative frequencies by which the L1 speakers and two groups of L2 speakers used different forms.

5.3 Results and analysis

I present the results in three sections according to the area of the Korean honorifics system under analysis: hearer honorifics (Section 5.3.1), referent honorifics (5.3.2) and forms of address (5.3.3). In each section, I begin by comparing the overall frequency of different honorific elements. In the hearer and referent honorific sections, I then systematically analyze the results according to power, distance and

the obvious differences on this point with English and other European languages), I saw the possibilities for such analysis as important to the research project.
formality. Throughout the discussions, results are analyzed according to the occupation and ethnicity of participants. Raw L2 data can be found in Appendix 2.

5.3.1 Use of hearer honorifics (speech styles)

The data for the current study features four of the six speech styles: the non-honorific {T} and {E} and the honorific {Y} and {P}. Neither of the two "authoritative styles" {N} nor {S} featured in the data, providing further evidence that these two speech styles are falling into disuse. I shall begin by examining the frequency of honorific versus non-honorific styles (5.3.1.1) before moving on to patterns of honorific styles (5.3.1.2) and non-honorific styles (5.3.1.3).

5.3.1.1 Variation between honorific and non-honorific styles

Differences were detected between the L1 and L2 speakers both regarding the frequency of honorific styles ({Y} and {P}) versus non-honorific styles ({T} and {E}) and the distribution of these styles according to power, distance and formality. Overall results displayed in Table 15 suggest that L2 speakers use more honorific and less non-honorific styles than L1 speakers; however, such differences in total usage were just outside the normal measurements of statistical significance (p = .12).

More meaningful results are obtained when these overall figures are broken down according to occupation and ethnicity, as displayed in Figure 5. Although both occupation and ethnic groups used honorific styles at a rate that was higher than the L1 speakers, the professionals (t = 2.3410, p = .02) and non-heritage speakers (t = 1.9192, p = .06) differed to extents that were significant and marginally significant respectively.

Before commenting on the wider pattern of L2 speakers being cautious users of non-honorific speech styles, I acknowledge that the opposite pattern applied for two of the exchange students – heritage speaker (Jenny) and non-heritage (Andriy). These two speakers did not just use honorific styles below the L1 mean.

Table 15. Non-honorific/honorific speech styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Non-honorific styles</th>
<th>Honorific styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>M = 6.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>M = 4.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.5822, \ p = .12 \]

* M = mean number of items on which form is used. Total number of items = 24.
(17.4), but were extremely low users with scores of 8 and 10 respectively. The score of 8 for Jenny was actually lower than the minimum score of 10 recorded for the L1 group. Of particular note, Jenny’s use of the non-honorific {E} style in four of the six items involving senpay (‘senior student’) acquaintances represented a usage not found in the L1 data. On this point, Jenny reported that she tended to use panmal (‘non-honorific language’) even to those older than her because “this way we both feel comfortable and become close friends”. Data in Chapters 7 and 8 confirm that some exchange students contradict the pattern for L2 speakers to be cautious users of panmal and actually use non-honorific in a more liberal way to native speakers.

Of the remaining 18 L2 speakers, all but one (Christine – 14 tokens) applied honorific speech styles above the L1 mean of 17.4. Indeed, two of the professionals – Holly and Alice – used honorific styles on every item and another ten speakers applied them 20 or more times.

Let us now identify the contexts in which the majority of L2 speakers – and in particular the professionals and non-heritage speakers – used honorific speech
styles at a higher frequency than their L1 counterparts by examining the results according to power, distance and formality. Looking at the influence of power first of all, the Figure 6 displays the frequency of honorific speech styles depending on whether the interlocutor was the professor, the senpay, the classmate or the hwupay. Results for the L1 and L2 speakers are shown in bold; scores for the different occupation/ethnic groups are displayed by dotted lines. The frequency is displayed as a percentage calculated from the combined scores of each group.

Two-way ANOVA results show that scores according to the four power factors and the L1/L2 groups were significantly different. Post hoc t tests – not to mention the curves on the graph – provide a clear picture of where these differences existed. Both L1 and L2 speakers used honorific speech styles in 100% of items involving the professor, avoiding the social taboo of using non-honorific styles to notable superiors. Both groups then made small reductions in their use of honorific language towards the senpay; the slightly lower score of the L2 speakers being not statistically significant. However, from this point honorific speech

---

**Figure 6. Honorific speech style use in relation to power**
Table 16. Honorific speech style use in relations to power and according to occupation/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Senpay</th>
<th>Classmate</th>
<th>Hwupay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange students (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-heritage (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 100%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

style use takes on different patterns for the L1 and L2 speakers. Whereas the use of honorific styles towards the classmate falls to a frequency of 48.7% for the L1 speakers, the descent is significantly flatter for the L2 speakers (65.8%; t = 2.23, p = .03). For the hwupay items, neither of the two groups made large downgrades, but the L2 frequency continued to be statistically higher than the L1 speakers (t = 2.0514, p = .04).

Analysis of the results in Table 16 according to occupation and ethnicity revealed that the former had a larger influence on the use of speech styles in relation to power. Although the exchange students did not match the L1 group when it came to downgrading to non-honorific speech styles on the classmate and hwupay items, the deviation from the L1 baseline was not statistically significant in either case whereas it was for the professionals (t = 2.6734, p = .01 and t = 2.6025, p = .01 respectively). It was thus the professionals who applied honorific speech styles not only at the highest frequency but also in the most egalitarian manner. Regarding ethnicity, the scores of both the heritage and non-heritage speakers largely followed the overall L2 pattern, but with one notable exception. This involved the low use of honorific styles by the heritage speakers on the senpay items (83.3%), making this group the only one to statistically differ from the L1 speakers in this particular power environment (t = 1.9706, p = .05). Such usage hints at a particular reticence for certain speakers to index "separation" towards marginal superiors, which forthcoming discussions show was more commonly reflected by an omission of referent honorifics.

The second contextual factor to be considered in the analysis of honorific/non-honorific speech styles is the influence of distance, as displayed in Figure 7 and Table 17. ANOVA results show that distance had significant effects on the use of honorific styles and that there were meaningful differences between the usage of L1 and L2 speakers. Although L2 speakers used honorific speech styles at a higher rate across all distance environments, post-hoc t tests comparing scores
on individual items pinpoint the largest differences to exist on the intimate factor ($t = 1.9127, p = .06$, marginally significant). Comparison of scores according to occupation and ethnicity reveal an interesting additional pattern. Although the frequency of honorific styles used towards the most distant interlocutor (i.e. the stranger) and the least distant interlocutor (i.e. the intimate) were roughly
the same for each group, the graph suggests that the point at which participants downgraded from the honorific to the non-honorific styles came later for the non-heritage speakers and the professionals in particular. Whereas the overall tendency for both L1 and L2 speakers was to downgrade at a similar rate from the stranger to the acquaintance and then from the acquaintance to the intimate, the professionals used similar frequencies between the first two items and only downgraded when it came to the intimate. The professionals used honorific speech styles statistically more on acquaintance items than both the L1 speakers (t = 2.4077, p = .02) and the exchange students (t = 2.1626, p = .04). Such results suggest that the professionals are more cautious to use panma.l, tending to wait for intimacy to be clearly established before using non-honorific language.

In relation to the formality variable as well, the professionals were shown to be the most reticent in downgrading to non-honorific speech styles, as shown in Figure 8 and Table 18. ANOVA revealed significant differences both regarding the importance of formality as a variable affecting the use of honorific speech styles and also between the L1 and L2 groups. Factoring in the influence of occupation and ethnicity, the most significant statistical difference from the L1 baseline occurred for the professional group on the lunch item (t = 2.4519, p = .02). These results are in line with observations made previously regarding power and distance to the effect that speakers with a professional identity are the most reticent when it comes to downgrading to non-honorific styles. Although non-heritage speakers were also more cautious than their Korean heritage counterparts, this was not to an extent that was of statistical significance.

The overall tendency has been for L2 speakers – and the professionals in particular – to be more cautious in downgrading to non-honorific styles in situations where power, distance and formality are low. An analysis of performance on individual questions shows that the specific items on which the most marked difference existed between the professionals and the L1 baseline were interactions with the classmate and hwupay (‘junior student’), acquaintances and intimates in the informal lunch setting. On question 8 (hwupay, acquaintance, lunch), for example, whereas only 32.5% of the L1 speakers and 20% of the exchange students used honorific speech styles, 70% of the professionals applied them. This difference reveals reluctance on the part of the professionals to use non-honorific styles.

---

2. Comparison of the frequency of honorific styles used on the stranger/acquaintance and acquaintance/intimate items showed that both these contrasts were statistically significant for the L1 speakers (t = 2.1868, p = .03 and t = 5.6524, p = >.0001). Although the exchange students seemed to follow the same pattern of usage, the statistical scores for both comparisons fell just outside of being relevant. Finally, the scores for the professionals showed the first comparison to be not relevant and the second to be relevant (t = 2.9865, p = .008).
in situations where their power advantage or the informal setting would appear to license it, but they are not yet totally intimate. Perhaps due to limited opportunities to interact in casual peer-group settings, the professionals struggled to
establish the point at which it was acceptable to initiate non-honorific panmal. “I don’t know where that line is,” commented Mark, “I don’t know how Koreans determine when – I guess that’s a mystery to me”. Consequently, speakers such as Mark would “play it safe” and wait until they were totally intimate before using non-honorific styles or, more often than not, until the other party suggested that they use the non-honorific styles. In line with this, Russell reported that he liked “to be safe” and “wait for someone to tell me to use panmal [non-honorific speech styles] and err on the side of -yo [the {Y} speech style].”

In addition to representing a strategy of “playing it safe”, this reluctance to downgrade to panmal also appeared to result from a resistance to apply language according to hierarchical patterns. Participants cited a reluctance to switch down to non-honorific styles when doing so would index their position as being older or superior rather than simply closer to the other party, as it may in this instance of question 8. “I find it hard to put myself above other people”, commented Russell, “it just doesn’t seem natural” Similarly, Alice commented that it was “very baffling” and “just very confusing” that “a year or two difference makes it possible for me to use panmal and for them to have to use contaymal”. The influences of questions of politeness and identity on the unwillingness of speakers such as Russell and Alice to initiate hierarchical relationships through their use of honorifics shall be explored in depth in forthcoming chapters.

5.3.1.2 Use of honorific styles
I now briefly consider the frequencies of the two different honorific styles {P} and {Y} (this section) and the two non-honorific speech styles {E} and {T} (following section). Table 19 displays the overall frequencies at which the so-called “deferential” {P} style and “polite” {Y} style occurred in the data.

The results show that the increased frequency at which L2 speakers apply honorific speech styles is largely accounted for by a higher rate of {P} usage, with {Y} usage being remarkably similar between the L1 and L2 groups. However, analysis according to occupation and ethnicity show that this general pattern did not tell the whole story. Of particular significance, as displayed in Figure 9, it was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>{P}</th>
<th>{Y}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>M 4.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 16.6%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>M 5.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 22.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.2881, p = .20 \quad t = 0.1516, p = .88 \quad t = 1.588, p = .12 \]
Figure 9. \{P\} and \{Y\} speech styles according to occupation/ethnicity

shown that this high rate of \{P\} was chiefly limited either to exchange students or non-heritage speakers. In addition, despite the general trend of similar rates of \{Y\} usage, the professionals were shown to use this speech style at a much greater frequency than the L1 group.

The high use of \{Y\} by the professionals can be accounted for by the general tendency of this occupation-based group to apply honorific speech styles in a broader and more egalitarian pattern. The remarkably high use of \{P\} (particularly by the exchange students), however, is more difficult to explain. Indeed, this finding appears to go against the expectation that exchange students would be comfortable with more casual and less honorific language, but not as familiar with high honorific forms.

There were two contextual environments in which some L2 speakers, and particularly exchange students, displayed a tendency to use \{P\} at a higher rate than L1 speakers. Firstly, L2 speakers were shown to be more sensitive to the influence of formality on their application of \{P\} than was the case for L1 speakers. Indeed, on the formal meeting items, overall L2 usage was statistically higher, albeit to a degree that was only of marginal significance (t = 1.7972, p = .08). As noted in Chapter 2, the \{P\} speech style is highly associated with formality in
Korean common sense politeness discourse. Indeed, as was mentioned at that juncture, native speakers may (mistakenly) believe that this style is used uniformly in formal scenes. This ideological correlation between {P} and formality has influenced the way that it is presented in Korean language teaching, where {P} is frequently described in teaching materials as being a "formal style". The frequent use of {P} by the L2 speakers on the DCT may thus represent the influence of transfer of training.

The second difference between {P} usage in the L1 and L2 results was the fact that L2 speakers at times applied {P} to those of the same or younger age on the classmate (12.5%) and hwupay (12.5%) items. For the L1 speakers, use of {P} in these environments was highly infrequent (0.1% on both items), confirming observations made in Chapter 2 that this speech style is not generally considered appropriate when addressing status inferiors, even when distance and formality factors are "high". The L2 speakers, and the exchange students in particular, appeared less aware of this restriction and thus over-generalized the use of {P}.

5.3.1.3 Use of non-honorific styles
I now briefly consider the breakdown of the {E} and {T} non-honorific styles. The initial results displayed in Table 20 suggest that the overall tendency for L2 speakers to apply non-honorific speech styles at a lower rate was split between {E} and {T}, with differences in application of {T} being more profound. Factoring in occupational background and ethnicity (Figure 10), it was actually found that use of {T} was restricted to exchange students and almost entirely to heritage speakers, with Ukrainian Andriy being the one exception.

No particular reason for this avoidance of {T} by the professionals or non-heritage speakers emerged during the interviews. It may be that this avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>{E}</th>
<th>{T}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>M 4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 17.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>M 3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 15.4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | t = .6042, p = .55 | t = 1.5927, p = .12 | t = 1.5822, p = .12 |

3. Korean language textbooks including those published by Sogang University and Ewha Womans University and King and Yeol's Elementary Korean label the {P} speech style as the "formal style".
was simply connected to the emerging tendency for these groups to be more “cautious” users of honorifics. Since the use of interrogatives in the {T} speech style can have more condescending connotations than the {E} style, some speakers may have perceived {T} as being more tied up with hierarchical relationships and thus were even more likely to avoid {T} than {E}.

5.3.2 Use of referent honorifics (-si-)

Given the fact that second language speakers err on the side of caution and “over-use” honorific speech styles, one might expect them to employ referent honorifics at a higher rate than their L1 counterparts. However, the results of the DCT displayed in Table 21 suggest that the opposite is the case: L2 speakers use referent honorifics at a lower frequency than L1 speakers. Analysis shows that all but five of the L2 participants used -si- at a frequency lower than the L1 speaker mean of 12.15 and that the usage of the L2 group as a whole was significantly lower than the L1 speakers.
Table 21. Frequency of -si-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>-si-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n=40)</td>
<td>M 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n=10)</td>
<td>M 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \text{ test} \quad t = 2.4582, \quad p = 0.02 \]

![Bar chart showing usage of -si-](chart.png)

Figure 11. Use of -si- according to occupation/ethnicity

Analysis of frequencies of -si- according to occupation and ethnicity in Figure 11 revealed that this tendency to omit referent honorifics was strongest for the exchange students and non-heritage speakers (\( t = 2.8425, \quad p = .01 \) and \( t = 2.2705, \quad p = .03 \) respectively). Although the statistically lower use of the exchange students is in line with the suggestion that these speakers lacked exposure to the contexts where formal language is used, the low use of the non-heritage participants represents a less expected result.

It should be noted at this stage that these results were influenced by the fact that three of the exchange students (heritage speaker Eun-Chae and non-heritage Andriy, Julio) and one of the professionals (heritage speaker Christine) did not
use -si- at all. Given the advanced proficiency of these speakers, this total avoidance of referent honorifics marked a noteworthy finding. On questioning these speakers regarding their non-use of -si-, it soon became apparent that these four speakers had a conscious awareness of referent honorifics that lagged far behind their general fluency in Korean. In fact, when asked about this point of the language, the two heritage learners Eun-Chae and Lisa became confused as to what I was questioning them about and seemed to think I was referring to the contrast between the {Y} and {P} speech styles. Having said this, both of these speakers did show some sporadic use of -si- in the recorded discourse data (see Chapter 6). A similar kind of confusion between speech styles and referent honorifics also contributed to Andriy's avoidance of -si-. This speaker explained that he did not use -si- because he was already using the {P} speech style and felt that using {P} and -si- together would be "too formal". Contrary to this misguided metapragmatic knowledge, in cases in which the hearer and referent are identical, an utterance cannot usually be considered properly deferential without the addition of appropriate referent honorifics, no matter how high the speech style employed. This case shows that the tendency for learners to misunderstand the relationship between speech styles and honorifics reported in Yeon Jae-hoon (1996) may extend to advanced level speakers.

As stated above, it was the exchange students and non-heritage speakers who used -si- at the lowest frequency. However, analysis according to "power" in Figure 12 and Table 22 suggests that all the L2 speakers, including the professionals and heritage speakers, also used -si- at a lower frequency than native speakers when it came to situations in which the use of honorifics becomes most sensitive in the Korean cultural sphere: encounters with superiors. As seen below, the professionals and heritage speakers only approximated the L1 frequency in encounters with the hwupay and classmate, where the mandate to apply referent honorifics is more negotiable. However, when addressing the senpay and the professor, where the use of referent honorifics becomes invested with cultural ideologies of respecting seniors and maintaining hierarchical relationships, the L2 frequency of -si- usage departed more visibly from the L1 baseline.

4. Despite this, I chose not to eliminate the results of these four speakers from the analysis in this section. This decision in part stems from the fact that although the non-use of these speakers may exaggerate the overall findings, they are not out of line with the general pattern of L2 speakers - and particularly exchange students - being low users of referent honorifics. In addition, given that this book opens out in future chapters into a more qualitative study, the decision to eliminate extreme cases would go against my overall methodology of embracing differences and discussing the extraordinary cases as well as the more typical.
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**Figure 12. Usage of -si- in relation to power**

**Table 22. Usage of -si- in relation to power and according to occupation/ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Senpay</th>
<th>Classmate</th>
<th>Hwupay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange students (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 4.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 5.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 85%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 4.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 78.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-heritage (n = 10)</td>
<td>M 4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical analysis of the data confirms that both the L2 speakers as a whole and each of the different occupation/ethnic groups used -si- at a lower frequency than the L1 group on the professor and senpay items. This difference was statistically significant on both items for L2 speakers as a whole (t = 3.4575, p = .001 and t = 2.5126, p = .02 respectively) and statistically significant or at least marginally
significant for each of the occupation/ethnic groups. In contrast, on the classmate and hwupay items, the only instance of statistical significance was the marginal extent to which exchange students differed from the L1 baseline on the latter ($t = 1.8211, p = .07$). In summary, although the professionals and heritage speakers used -si- at a frequency more similar to the L1 speakers, their distribution of -si- does not follow the L1 pattern. Similar to the results presented in the speech style section, the professionals in particular are shown to vary their language less according to power and to prefer more egalitarian use of honorifics.

The remaining factors - distance and formality - also reveal some noteworthy comparisons between the different groups of speakers. Beginning with distance, Figure 13 and Table 23 suggest that L2 speakers, and the professionals in particular, were not as sensitive as L1 speakers to the influence of distance when deciding to include -si-. Of most significance, the graph shows a steep decrease in the frequency of -si- from the acquaintance to the intimate items for L1 speakers, which is not mirrored in the L2 results. For L2 speakers, the decrease in use of -si- with intimacy is more gradual, with similar curves from the stranger to the acquaintance and then the acquaintance to the intimate. Indeed, whereas the drop in the rate of -si- used by L1 speakers from the acquaintance to the intimate items is highly statistically significant ($t = 5.0299, p = .0001$), no such meaningful results can be found for the L2 speakers as a whole or any of the occupation/ethnic groupings. The L2 usage of -si- was statistically lower than the L1 baseline on the stranger ($t = 1.8970, p = .06$ - marginally significant) and acquaintance ($t = 2.6782, p = .01$) items. For exchange students, the rate was lower for all three items (stranger: $t = 2.3417, p = .02$; acquaintance $t = 3.0363, p = .004$; intimate $t = 2.1201, p = .04$). It was also notable that the more egalitarian application of -si- by the professionals resulted in them using a fractionally higher rate than the L1 speakers on the intimate items.

The comparatively low sensitivity to distance in the use of referent honorifics on the part of L2 speakers may, I believe, show influence of training-induced difficulties. In KSL teaching materials, -si- is frequently explained along the lines of an agreement process with subject referents such as halmeni (‘grandmother’) and sensayngnim (‘teacher’), with little consideration paid to the importance of using this marker when addressing strangers and non-intimates. I shall return to this

---

Figure 13. Usage of -si- in relation to distance

Table 23. Usage of -si- in relation to distance and according to occupation/ethnicity

point in the concluding chapter when I discuss the implications of the study for classroom teaching.

Variation for the formality factor displays the opposite pattern than for distance, as evinced in Figure 14 and Table 24. Here, it was the L2 speakers who varied their usage more, despite their overall scores being lower than the L1 baseline. The sharper rate at which the L2 speakers dropped -si- for the informal
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Figure 14. Usage of -si- in relation to formality

Table 24. Usage of -si- in relation to formality and according to occupation/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>ANOVA (formality factor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>M 6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>F = 15.94, p = .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 57.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>M 5.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 44.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA (groups)</td>
<td>F = 11.13, p = .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only group applying -si- below the L1 frequency on the meeting items as well was the exchange students, although only to a marginal extent (t = 1.8439, p = .07). These results underline that the higher sensitivity of L2 speakers towards

lunch setting resulted in significantly lower usage on this item for all L2 groups. The statistical analyses for the different L2 groups were as follows. L2 speakers overall: t = 3.4649, p = .001. Exchange students: t = 3.3523, p = .002. Professionals: t = 2.1513, p = .04. Heritage speakers: t = 2.9469, p = .005. Non-heritage speakers: t = 2.5218, p = .02.
formality regarding the application of referent honorifics did not result in a particularly high use of -si- in the formal setting, but rather an apparent belief that -si- could be more readily omitted in informal environments.

Considering the three contextual factors together, there were two specific items in which the usage of L2 speakers differed most markedly from L1. The first was question 9 - intimate professor at the informal lunch. In addition to the four L2 speakers who did not use -si- at all, a further four speakers dropped -si- for this item, displaying a preference for marking intimacy rather than perpetuating power differences. In contrast to this pattern, it was noted in Chapter 3 that in Korean native speaker talk, increased intimacy generally only leads to decreased honorifics use when age/rank differences are small, perhaps under five years. Addressing a professor without appropriate referent honorifics is in most contexts considered highly taboo, no matter how close the relationship may be.

The second item on which the L2 groups used -si- at a significantly lower rate than the L1 speakers was question 2: addressing a senpay who was a stranger at the informal lunch. Whereas 29 out of the 40 L1 speakers (72.5%) used -si- on this item, only 9 of the 20 L2 speakers (45%) followed this pattern. Given that 11 of the L1 speakers also omitted -si- in this context, such non-use can hardly be deemed to be outside the boundaries of appropriateness. However, it reveals a reticence amongst L2 speakers to index "separation" when the age or status difference is more marginal. During the introspection sessions, Russell was amongst the participants who commented upon a reluctance to use honorifics non-reciprocally with those either marginally older or younger. He quoted "seven years" as a reasonable age difference to engender such usage and commented that he saw those of similar age/rank at his university as his "colleagues" rather than as senpay or hwupay ('seniors' and 'juniors'). Similarly; Alice stated that she could understand the indexing of age-based relationships when it was "a ten year difference", but otherwise found that the "emphasis on age is bizarre to me". As noted in earlier chapters, for Korean speakers, an age difference of only one year may be enough to affect the use of honorifics. The clash noted here between a more egalitarian ideology of language use on the part of the participants and the hierarchical usage of honorifics in Korean society is discussed in greater depth over the subsequent chapters.

The analysis both in this section and the previous one have shown that second language speakers have a tendency to "overuse" honorific speech styles on the one hand, but avoid referent honorifics on the other. The upshot is that speakers tend to use the {Y} and {P} honorific speech styles on their own, without -si-. As noted in Chapter 2, such combinations of honorific and non-honorific language exist in native speaker discourse, but have limited applications. The hearer should generally be of similar or subordinate rank with distance or formality preventing
Table 25. Use of honorific speech styles without -si-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Honorific styles without -si-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n=40)</td>
<td>M 5.2 % 21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n=20)</td>
<td>M 10.4 % 43.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t$ test $t = 4.3045, p = .0001$

Figure 15. Use of honorific speech styles without -si- according to occupation/ethnicity
downgrading to full non-honorific language. As shown in Table 25, L2 speakers used this combination of honorific and non-honorific language at a frequency double to the L1 speakers. The deviation from the L1 baseline was found to be significant for all of the occupation/ethnic groups, with non-heritage speakers being particularly high users (Figure 15).

The reasons behind this preference for a mixed honorific/non-honorific “code” will be explored in depth in forthcoming chapters. For the moment, I posit that this vital difference between the way that L1 and L2 learners use honorifics is influenced both by L2 learner knowledge of honorific forms as well as questions of identity and politeness.

Considering knowledge first of all, the over-dependence of L2 learners on this mixed code appears to be perpetuated, at least in part, by the way that honorifics are presented in KSL teaching. As pointed out by Choo Mi-ho (1999: 86), Korean textbooks tend to place more emphasis on teaching hearer rather than referent honorifics, which leads learners to “overuse addressee-related honorifics, but to underuse or misuse referent-related honorifics”. To compound matters, interview data for the current study suggests that KSL teachers are unlikely to provide learners with feedback when learners omit referent honorifics. According to some participants, KSL teachers did not correct omissions even when the addressee is the teacher him/herself. In the following interview extract, Richard discusses his experiences with the Korean language teachers at his host university:

(1) Interview data: Richard
1 Richard They don’t tend to notice, at least not now, they don’t tend to notice or they don’t care whether you say like ha-yyo [verb ‘to do’ + {Y} speech style, but without -si-] or ha-si-eyo [verb ‘to do’ + -si- {Y} speech style]
2 LB So can you get away with asking your teacher questions just like ha­yyo [verb ‘to do’ + {Y} speech style, but without -si-], like sensayngnim, cwual-ey mwe ha-ess-eyo ['teacher, what did you do on the weekend?', without -si-]?
3 Richard Yeah
4 LB Yeah? And they never correct you on that?
5 Richard Yeah.

As outlined in Chapter 4, the exchange student identity limited opportunities to interact with status superiors. The fact that Richard’s Korean teacher – the only age/rank superior with whom he interacted on a daily basis – did not provide him with feedback on his use of referent honorifics thus significantly reduced his opportunities for developing frame-based knowledge regarding the application of these forms.

Both previous research and the interview data for the current project suggest that L2 speakers experience more difficulty in comprehending the function or establishing significance of referent honorifics. Learners at lower levels of competence struggle at times to understand the logic behind referent honorific use. In the case of Japanese, Cohen’s (1997: 151) autobiographic account of his
experience learning the language includes the observation that using referent honorifics "seemed illogical to me", particularly when talking about an absent third party. Cohen notes that although he "learned" referent honorifics, he did not go on to use them regularly (Cohen 1997: 150) and found it "burdensome to have to learn two forms of the same word" (Cohen 1997).

In addition to encountering problems understanding the usage of referent honorifics, L2 speakers also display a tendency to underestimate their importance. As learners struggle to develop competence and control over grammar, pragmatics, pronunciation and so forth, forms of the language that appear of least importance may be the first to be generalized or omitted according to the "strategy of least effort" (see Chapter 4). Since referent honorifics do not have referential meaning, they occupy a low position on speaker priorities and may be dismissed as something "extra" and "superfluous" that can be learned at a later date. In the interview transcripts, this is reflected in the comments of Alice, who reported that she was "thinking about too many other things that I don't place enough importance on getting the right nophimpep [honorifics]". Although she "cared some" about using the correct honorifics, she did not "care enough" to "have it come into my sentence".

In addition to being of lower priority compared to other areas of language, L2 speakers may more specifically view referent honorifics as being of less priority than hearer honorifics. For some L2 speakers, the belief seemed to be that as long as they attached the {Y} or {P} ending, referent honorifics could be omitted without risk of serious offence. Typical of this trend is Alice's comment below to the affect that the divide between non-honorific/honorific speech styles ("panmal-contaymal") is "much more important" than the divide between using and omitting referent honorifics ("contaymal-higher contaymal"). As previously mentioned and contrary to this statement, in Korean native speaker interaction, omission of referent honorifics can be highly face threatening in certain contexts and these forms are not, it would seem, judged "less important".

(2) Interview data: Alice

I get the sense that the panmal-contaymal divide is much more important than the contaymal-contaymal like certainly higher contaymal. And I think as a Korean language learner, they give you a little more leeway in like appropriate usage within contaymal.

This sense that referent honorifics were not important and could be easily omitted was also found to correlate with the politeness ideologies of Western learners. The fact was that using honorific speech styles but omitting referent honorifics allowed
speakers to strike a balance between using Korean to some degree of appropriateness, but not sacrificing their own native-language ideals regarding politeness. On the one hand, using the honorific speech styles gave them a feeling that they were being “polite” and not condescending or disrespectful towards any of their Korean acquaintances. Then, on the other hand, by omitting referent honorifics, their speech did not sound too subservient or too involved in the perpetuation of a social system they did not necessarily aspire to become a part of. In the words of Alice, this kind of usage represented a “level of formality that I am comfortable with”. Previous studies into the development of politeness in Japanese and Indonesian by Siegal (1994) and Du Fon (1999) respectively, show this same choice of “comfortable” speech over “appropriate speech” by some L2 learners. I expand discussions as to the correlation between the more egalitarian use of honorifics by L2 speakers and politeness ideology over the next three chapters.

5.3.3 Use of forms of address

As explained in the methodology section, as well as featuring a slot for the verb to be completed with correct honorific forms, the DCT also contained a blank for a bound form of address. This could in theory be filled by one of Korean’s five second person pronouns. However, as mentioned in Chapter 2, the use of all of these pronouns is highly restricted. In many environments, a title, fictive kinship term or personal name should be retained and this was reflected in the survey data. Significant differences were detected as to the frequencies of these different forms of address in the L1 and L2 data, as can be seen in Figures 16 and 17.

The t test scores in Figure 16 show that the frequencies of titles and personal names differed significantly between the L1 and L2 groups, with kinship terms being marginally significant. Furthermore, Figure 17 hints at large differences between the occupation and ethnic groups, with the high use of personal names by the professionals representing one of the most salient patterns. In the following subsections, I examine usage of each of the four categories of address forms in turn. It should be noted, however, that, unlike in the previous two sections, I do not look at the use of terms of address in relation to power, distance and formality, at least not in a systematic way. The reason for this is that many address terms are related to specific power relationships and do not show regular patterns of variation across the different contexts. The application of titles, for example, was largely restricted to use of kyoswunim (‘professor’) and sensayngnim (‘teacher’). These only appear on the professor items and are rarely if ever dropped due to decreased distance or formality. An analysis of such address terms according to
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Kinship terms</th>
<th>Personal names</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Omission</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>M 10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>M 7.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t) test</td>
<td>(t = 4.0761, p = .0001)</td>
<td>(t = 1.7737, p = .08)</td>
<td>(t = 5.1574, p = .0001)</td>
<td>(t = 1.3778, p = .2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Frequency of forms of address

power, distance and formality would not therefore shed much light on the use of this part of the honorifics system.

5.3.3.1 Use of titles

L2 use of titles was shown to be significantly lower than the L1 baseline \(t = 4.0761, p = .0001\). Figure 18 and post-hoc \(t\) tests reveal that this tendency extended to all occupation and ethnic groups, with no particular group coming closer to approximating the L1 frequency.

Closer analysis of the data shows that the L2 speakers did not only use titles at a lower frequency, but also used a smaller range of titles and in a narrower range of contexts. In fact, 118 of the total 139 tokens for L2 speakers constituted use of the honorific titles *kyoswunim* ('professor'-HON) and *sensayngnim* ('teacher'-HON) towards the professor. When addressing the *senpay* ('senior student'),

---

8. The statistical analyses for the occupation/ethnic groups were as follows. Exchange students: \(t = 2.8244, p = .07\). Professionals: \(t = 3.1322, p = .003\). Heritage speakers: \(t = 2.8244, p = .007\). Non-heritage speakers: \(t = 3.1322, p = .003\).
whereas in the L1 data the titles *senpay* (‘senior’) and *senpaynim* (‘senior-HON’) appeared 63 times (26.3%), in the L2 data these only appeared on 19 occasions (15.8%). L1 speakers also used titles such as *hakwu/hakhyeng* (‘classmate’) towards the *classmate* as well as *hwupay* (‘junior’) and *hwupaynim* (‘junior-HON’) towards the *hwupay* (‘junior student’). None of these forms of address appeared in the L2 data.

The L2 speakers' avoidance of *senpay(nim)* and other terms of address based on university hierarchy can be explained through their identities as “exchange students” and “professionals” as well as their attitudes towards politeness as “Westerners”. The fact was that, apart from the five graduate students, few of these speakers would ever have experienced contexts in which these forms are used. As discussed in Chapter 4, the exchange students occupied positions on the fringes of university life. They did not belong to any department or have a properly defined

### Table: Frequency of forms of address according to occupation/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Kinship terms</th>
<th>Personal names</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Omission</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 speakers</td>
<td>M 10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td>% 41.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange students</td>
<td>M 7.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>% 29.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>M 6.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>% 28.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>M 7.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>% 29.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-heritage</td>
<td>M 6.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>% 28.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17.** Frequency of forms of address according to occupation/ethnicity
Figure 18. Frequency of titles

|haknyen ('university year') or hakpen ('university number'). Therefore, as Patrick explained it, "as an exchange student, the concept of senpay/hwupay doesn't quite apply". As for the workers, although they had been taught to address teachers with honorific forms, they had never been socialized into the use of other terms of address related to school hierarchy. Thus, it was perhaps only the graduate students who may have needed to use terms such as senpay(nim). However, even amongst these speakers, resistance was detected towards such titles due to the power differences that they indexed and the incompatibility between this mode of interaction and "Westerner" identity:

(3) Interview data: Alice
I think maybe something in me like culturally just like shuts down. I'm like "you're one semester ahead of me, I don't care".
Not only does the Alice's comment reveal a basic clash between her own egalitarian politeness ideology and the hierarchical structure of Korean universities, but a more specific reversion to indexing marginal power differences. Although the vast majority of second language learners felt that it was reasonable to use respectful terms towards notable superiors, many complained that marking differences of just one or two years in language appeared “illogical”, as Alice described it.

5.3.3.2 Use of kinship terms
The appearance of kinship terms in the DCT data was limited to the fictive usage of forms translating as “older brother” towards the senpay. Although, as can be seen in Figure 19, the overall L2 speaker usage was lower than the L1 baseline to an extent that was marginally significant ($t = 1.7737, p = .08$), analysis according to occupation and ethnicity revealed that this tendency to avoid kinship terms was generally limited to professionals ($t = 2.3973, p = .02$) and/or non-heritage
speakers \((t = 1.6849, p = .10\) – marginally significant). The exchange student group actually used these forms at a higher frequency than the L1 group. Non-heritage speaker use was below the L1 baseline, but not to an extent that was statistically significant.

The interviews revealed that these distinct differences between the occupation and ethnic groups reflected two conflicting attitudes towards kinship terms. For some speakers – including the majority of exchange students – using kinship terms in a fictive way was a part of the language that was novel and fun. “I kind of like that”, commented Patrick, “that wasn’t too hard to get used to”. However, other speakers – and especially the professionals group – expressed more cautious or even negative attitudes towards the use of kinship terms. Several speakers reported receiving negative reactions towards their use of kinship terms, a point I shall return to in the analysis of learner stories in Chapter 8. Such experiences had dissuaded them from using such forms, unless perhaps they were asked to do so by L1 interlocutors.

Some of the older female participants expressed particular resistance to the use of oppa (‘older brother’). This particular kinship term can take on some specific cultural meanings that may be particularly difficult for Western women to align with their pre-existing identities. Not only does this term connote a difference in age/rank, it can become associated with a “cute” and submissive feminine role. With these connotations of “cuteness” and “submission”, Korean females often apply this term strategically when performing face threatening speech acts towards males of marginally older age rank, particularly their boyfriends. Such usage is typically accompanied by a certain “whiney” prosody and increased length (“oppa::”). In the following extracts, Holly and heritage learner Alice explain how these connotations led them to avoid oppa. Interestingly, during the interview, both of them attempted to imitate the “whiney” prosody that they associated with this term:

(4) Interview data: Holly
I will use it sometimes, but I am kind of prejudiced against it. It’s because of the Korean girls who whine and say “oppa::: [in whiney drawn out intonation]”. I don’t want to sound like that. Like, when I hear that word, that’s what I hear. I think the connotation that I have is- is these girls who are just trying to trick these men into getting married to them without showing anything about their real personality.

(5) Interview data: Alice
The connotations to oppa, because it's used within a dating context and a family context and then a school context, I just find it very like unclear and yeah again, like, I don't like the emphasis on “I'm younger than you.” So, I'll just- I'd much
rather just use *nwukwu nwukwu ssi* [the name+ssi form of address]. Like I'm perfectly happy to be polite, but the emphasis on that, you know, that one year difference ((laughter)) in their ages [...] It's associated in my mind with something that's like- like *aykyo* ['cuteness']. Right, like trying to seem cuter than you are and like sort of emphasizing that by using *oppa*. And, yeah, like makes- like, whether its there or not, like that's the connotation it has in my head. It's like, you know "*oppa::: [in whiney drawn out intonation]".

This avoidance of *oppa* and the negative view of how some Korean women talk is reminiscent of the experiences of Western women learning Japanese reported in Siegal (1994, 1995). Although Korean has no direct equivalent of the "women's language" that female learners of Japanese appear to be particularly resistant to, the more submissive gender role of women in the Korean context is nonetheless reflected in language, albeit with certain intonations or discourse styles. The clash between the Korean female "face" and that of the Western participants represented one more barrier in the negotiation of identity for the female participants in the study.

As exemplified by the comments of Alice above, it was not always the case that heritage speakers were willing users of kinship terms, despite their exposure to Korean in the family environment. Although the heritage speaker application of kinship terms did not differ significantly from the L1 baseline, negative attitudes regarding the use of these forms emerged during the interviews. New Zealander Christine, for example, reported that although she used these forms out of convenience, she did not enjoy being addressed as *enni* or *nwuna* in the family setting. Her younger sister had begun to call her *enni* five years ago due to "pressure from the older generation in the Korean community in New Zealand" to adopt the use of kinship terms within the family. However, Christine explained that "I do not answer to *enni* ... when she says *enni*, I am like 'I can't hear you'". In a similar vein, James reported that he did not like younger females addressing him as *oppa* due to the emphasis that it placed on age. Such examples show that heritage speakers may explicitly disagree with Korean norms of social behavior, irrespective of whether they are willing to follow such norms or not. As observed by Kang's (2003:311) study into the use of kinship terms in Korean-English code switching, such forms "embody Korean social ideologies of relative status" that some overseas Koreans do "not agree with".

### 5.3.3 Use of personal names

As noted in Chapter 2, the use of personal names in Korean is highly restricted. Due to the obvious differences with European languages on this point, it was little surprise that this factor witnessed some of the largest differences between the L1
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Figure 20. Frequency of personal names

and L2 data (t = 5.1574, p = .0001). Although the high use of personal names was significant for all occupation and ethnic groups, the statistical deviation was larger for professionals and non-heritage speakers, as shown in Figure 20. Overuse of personal names suffixed by -ssi was found to be a particular feature of L2 address terms. The frequency of this -ssi suffix, which can attach both to given names and full names, is displayed in Table 26.

This overuse of name+ssi corresponds well with previous observations regarding the influence of politeness ideology on the kind of honorific forms preferred by L2 speakers. Similar to the mixture of honorific speech styles but omission of referent honorifics commented upon in previous sections, name+ssi seems to occupy a similar balance of polite egalitarianism – or at least the perception of it. It

Table 26. Use of the -ssi suffix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>-ssi-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n=40)</td>
<td>M 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n=20)</td>
<td>M 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t \) test \( t = 3.9406, p = .0002 \)

was noted in Chapter 2 that although -ssi indexes a certain degree of separation, it can hardly be thought of as honorific or deferential. With an air of politeness, but an absence of subservience, -ssi provides L2 speakers with the impression that they are being polite Korean-style but are still using language in a non-discriminatory way. As Alice noted in her discussions of oppa in (5), she was much more comfortable using the name+ssi formula, which had none of the subservient connotations of titles or kinship terms.

The overuse of name+ssi also seems to reflect the fact that this is one address formula that the “foreigner” identity entails exposure to. Due to their own unstable position in the status hierarchy, L2 speakers may find that they receive this form of address frequently from L1 interlocutors. In addition, the name+ssi format is the most frequently occurring address form in Korean language textbooks (Lee On-kyeong 2005) and is the form of address that Korean teachers use (quite appropriately) to address their students.

5.3.3.4 Use of pronouns

The overall rate at which L2 speakers apply pronouns was lower than the L1 baseline, but not to an extent that was statistically significant (see Figure 21). However, analysis according to occupation and ethnicity found that the professional group were particularly low users of pronouns, and here the difference with the L1 group was significant \( (t = 3.0224, p = .004) \). As mentioned in Chapter 2, the use of all five Korean second person pronouns is highly restricted. The low use of pronouns by the professionals can therefore be taken as further evidence that this group of speakers tended to opt for caution in their use of honorifics use and avoided forms associated with potential politeness.

Almost all pronouns in the data consisted of the use of ne towards the classmate and hwupay. However, one of the exchange student non-heritage speakers (Hiroki) and one of the professional heritage speakers (Chin-u) also used tangsin on one and three instances respectively. As mentioned in Chapter 2, in contemporary Korean, the usage of tangsin is almost entirely restricted to reciprocal application between middle-aged couples. However, it was noted that tangsin can
sometimes appear as a feature of “foreigner talk” and becomes associated as the closest equivalent to the English “you”. Interestingly enough, the introspection sessions showed that Japanese-born Hiroki was fully aware of the limited usage of tangsin; despite this, he continued to use it towards non-intimates in a way that could be highly face-threatening:

(6) Interview data: Hiroki

I use it to a person who I’m not too close with and a person I don’t know his or her name. At that point I use tangsin. But I was kind of very- I don’t know. When I was back in OOO [name of home university], my Korean teacher said that tangsin is kind of- you only use it between husband and wife.

The use of tangsin by some participants in the current study is reminiscent of the application of the pronoun anata by L2 speakers of Japanese reported in Siegal
(1994) and of anda by speakers of Indonesian in Du Fon (1999). The tendency appears to be for learners to over-generalize the pronoun that most closely resembles the English "you". The use of tangsin by Hiroki shows that this usage is extremely resilient to metapragmatic instruction; learners may continue to apply such pronouns despite knowing that this usage is inappropriate.

5.4 Conclusion

The current chapter has identified a number of crucial trends regarding the honorifics competence of L2 speakers. In this concluding section, I shall summarize these differences by making reference to the three hypotheses made at the start of the chapter:

1. The honorifics use of L2 speakers will show less variation than that of L1 speakers
2. L2 speakers will vary their usage less according to "power" and avoid overtly subservient or condescending language
3. Exchange students and heritage speakers will overgeneralize non-honorific language, while the professionals and non-heritage speakers will overuse honorific language

The first of these hypotheses has been confirmed through various observations made throughout this chapter. The trend for L2 speakers to apply honorifics in a more egalitarian way can be further clarified through a comparison of the affects of power, distance and formality on the honorifics use of the three groups. In order to summarize the influence of these factors concisely, Tables 27 and 28 display post hoc t-test results comparing the "highest" and "lowest" power factors (professor vs. hwupay), the "highest" and "lowest" distance factors (stranger vs. intimate) and the two formality factors (lunch vs. meeting) for honorific speech styles (Table 27) and referent honorifics (Table 28). These show that all three factors had significant effects on the use of honorific speech styles and referent honorifics for both the L1 and the L2 speakers. However, the extent to which the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 (n = 40)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>12.8943</td>
<td>8.1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n = 20)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>5.8742</td>
<td>4.83333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Affects of contextual factors on honorific speech styles (\{P\} and \{Y\})
factors are relevant is noticeably less for the L2 speakers on all three factors. These results re-confirm that L2 speakers varied their honorifics use less on the DCT in comparison with the L1 speakers.

Results also suggest that it was the “power” factor on which the performance of L2 speakers differed the most from their L1 counterparts. This can first of all be seen in the more sizeable differences in Tables 27 and 28 between the $t$ factors for power and those of the other two factors. More tellingly, the data analysis throughout this chapter has highlighted a variety of different instances in which speakers avoid using language that would work to place them either “above” or “below” others in the age-rank hierarchy. Instead, L2 speakers were shown to over-generalize the use of a “code” that combined honorific speech styles (with referent honorifics dropped) and personal names suffixed by -ssi. This combination of honorific and non-honorific elements represented a simplified honorifics code that had the appearance of “politeness”, but that avoided overtly hierarchical language. However, in contrast to the claims of Park Kyung-ja (1996), the fact that L2 speakers were not as sensitive to power as L1 speakers did not generally mean that this factor became less important than distance or formality. Age-rank was still the factor that L2 speakers most closely associated with variation of honorific forms.

Regarding the final hypothesis, although all L2 groups followed the basic pattern of usage described in the above paragraph, notable differences were detected between the different occupational/ethnic groups. The non-heritage speakers and particularly the “professionals” were shown to be more cautious in their use of honorifics. When it came to the application of speech styles, this was reflected in a reluctance to downgrade to non-honorific styles. As for forms of address, these speakers avoided intimate patterns such as the pronoun ne and fictive kinship terms. The exchange students, on the other hand, were shown to have more problems applying higher forms of honorifics towards status superiors. These speakers omitted the -si- subject honorific marker at a frequency that was significantly higher than the L1 group. This tendency, however, did not extend to the heritage speaker identity. Contrary to expectations, heritage speakers were more accurate users of -si- than their non-heritage counterparts. However, a key finding of the
DCT was that all occupation/ethnic groups omitted -si- when it came to the cases where it took on the most significance: items featuring the status superior professor. Although professionals and/or heritage speakers may have used referent honorifics more, the usage was more egalitarian and did not follow the hierarchical application of L1 speakers.
Data analysis: Role-plays

6.1 Introduction

This chapter is the first of two utilizing recorded conversational interactions to analyze the honorifics use of L2 speakers. Whereas the following chapter employs naturally occurring conversational data, the current chapter makes use of recordings of staged role-plays. I begin in this introduction by sketching the twin goals of analyzing role-play data.

Firstly, role-plays allow for controlled research into ways that the main trends of L2 honorifics use (see previous chapter) are manifested and maintained across spoken interaction. The role-plays look at honorifics use in two broad frames: (1) interactions with status superiors and (2) interactions with intimates of similar age-rank. In the first of these situations, contextual factors favored the use of honorific *contaymal*, whereas in the second situation non-honorific *panmal* would be expected, at least according to native speaker “norms”. In addition to looking at whether speakers adopted the native “norm” across these two broad frames, I am able to assess the pragmalinguistic control that these speakers exercised over both *panmal* and *contaymal*.

The second and more specific goal of this chapter is to look at how speakers’ ideologies regarding politeness influence the way they use honorifics in spoken interaction. In Chapter 3, I claimed that honorifics are primarily applied as markers of “indexical politeness” (the signaling of appropriate relationships to addressees, referents and bystanders), which is the mode of politeness most emphasized in Korean cultural ideologies. In contrast to this, it was suggested that Western cultures place more importance on “modulation politeness” (the modifying of the propositional content or the force of an utterance) and emphasize egalitarian interaction over the overt signaling of social relationships. I posited that these contrasting “politeness ideologies” influence the way that honorifics are acquired and used by L2 speakers. With this in mind, the role-play scenarios were purposefully designed to feature the need for speakers to vary their speech according to both modes of politeness. On the “indexical” side, speakers were required to modify their speech according to whether they were addressing the status superior or the intimate. On the “modulation” side, the role-plays contained highly
face-threatening situations in which the participant had to adjust their speech as they performed the speech act of “apology”. I hypothesized that this need to express modulation as well as indexical politeness would affect the participants’ use of honorifics and allow for insights into the way that L1 politeness ideology may influence the L2. Indeed, the role-play transcripts show that this need to pay attention to modulation as well as indexical politeness at times resulted in patterns of honorifics use that fell outside anything reported in the literature on L1 Korean.

The chapter is organized as follows. After a review of methodology in Section 6.2, Sections 6.3 and 6.4 present the data analysis. The first of these data analysis sections looks at the use of speech styles, referent honorifics and forms of address in the role-play involving the status superior. The second repeats the analysis for the intimate role-play. I conclude in Section 6.5 by summarizing the findings in regard to the goals outlined in this introduction.

6.2 Methodology

Data for the current chapter was collected through the recording of two role-plays between the 20 L2 participants and Korean native speaker partners. After explaining the rationale behind using role-play data, I describe the procedure and related design issues.

The role-play is recognized as an effective data elicitation tool for researchers collecting data pertaining to specific target structures. Large quantities of high-quality and relevant data can be gathered quickly in mechanical fashion (Chaudron 2003: 772–773). Furthermore, as noted by Kasper and Rose (2002: 87), the clear specifications of relationships in role-plays enable researchers to observe how factors such as power, distance and degree of imposition influence communicative acts and how these values are negotiated through conversation. Kasper and Rose (2002: 87) provide an extensive list of pragmatic development studies successfully employing role-plays. In the areas of Korean pragmatics and honorifics, Han Sang-mee (2005) uses a series of role-plays in her study of communication breakdowns in L1-L2 discourse. Ryu Jay-hyang (1998) uses role-plays as an elicitation tool in a study of the development of strategic honorifics by Korean high school students.

The effectiveness and validity of using role-plays as a means of data elicitation has, however, been questioned in some quarters. According to Chaudron (2003: 772–773), despite the best efforts of the researcher to design role-play tasks to elicit targeted structures, subjects may still avoid the production of such forms. Furthermore, Chaudron (2003: 772–773) points out that clashes between the
social and psychological demands of the task and the speaker's own cultural norms or personal anxieties may lead to non-compliance. Of most significance, there is a dearth of research looking at the extent to which pragmatic performance in role-plays actually mirrors performance in real life interactions or compares to data collected through other methodologies. The indications are that role-play interactions are more authentic and pragmatically complex than DCT data (Kasper and Rose 2002: 88–89). However, Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) and Margalef-Boada (1993) show that the pragmatic strategies used by participants in role-plays may not be as complex – and also not as polite – as those in authentic interaction. The latter study suggests that the absence of social consequences in the role-play environment may relax the extent to which participants adhere to politeness norms (as noted by Kasper and Rose 2002: 88).

My rationale for using role-plays in the current study was twofold. Firstly, the role-plays allowed for the collection of data that would have been near impossible to access through naturalistic techniques. Although I also collected recordings of naturally occurring interactions (Chapter 7), participants were either reluctant or found it difficult to record interactions which involved disagreement or dispute and which therefore provided evidence of honorifics use when under duress or under circumstantial pressure to modify speech according to “modulation politeness”. Secondly, the use of the role-plays allowed me to analyze honorifics use in two contrasting power-distance relationships and make direct comparisons between the different occupation/ethnic groups. These kinds of direct comparisons would not have been possible through naturalistic techniques alone.

Furthermore, in the design of the role-plays, measures were taken to maximize the production of near-natural discourse and to increase validity. As much as possible, the role-plays were designed to be spontaneous\(^1\) scenarios in which subjects could act out roles similar to those they encountered during their natural interactions. Furthermore, the role-plays were constructed to be as “open”\(^2\) as possible. Although the participants were provided with general goals, the course and outcome of the interaction were not pre-determined. Validity was further increased by the use of introspection sessions during which I questioned participants regarding their reasons and motivations for use of honorific forms and

---

1. Kipper (1988) differentiates between spontaneous role-plays (in which participants retain their own identity) and mimetic-pretending role plays (in which participants assume a different identity).

2. Kasper and Dahl (1991) differentiate between open and closed role-plays. In the former, although the roles and goals are set, the course and outcomes are not predetermined. In the latter, the course of the interaction is pre-set.
other discourse strategies. Where necessary, I played back the digital recording or allowed participants’ to read through the typed transcript.

I now comment on the specific design of the two role-plays. As previously stated, the role-plays assessed honorifics use in interactions with a status superior and an intimate status equal. These two power-distance relationships reflect the two broad distinctions that speakers of Korean recognize when determining honorifics use: (1) people who are “above” the speaker and should be addressed in/spoken about in honorifics and (2) people who are “equal” or “below” the speaker and do not need to be addressed/spoken about in honorifics (Yoon Kyung-joo 2004). In the first role-play, the participant took the role of an overseas student studying at a Korean university and the Korean interlocutor played the role of a professor (the “professor role-play”). In the second interaction, both parties played the roles of friends of equal age (the “friend role-play”). Despite these two contrasting power-distance relationships, the actual role-play situations and the potential face threat associated with them were near identical. In both situations, the participant had something he/she had to explain and/or apologize for. In the professor role-play, he/she had lost a book belonging to the professor. In the friend role-play, he/she had broken the friend’s digital camera. Furthermore, in both situations the participant was arriving 20 minutes late to meet the professor/friend. The role-plays were developed through trials involving five learners and three research assistants.

The provision of appropriate instructions was crucial to the design of the role-plays. Participants were provided with an instruction sheet written in English (Appendix 3). The use of English not only facilitated comprehension, but also prevented participants from copying the use of phrases directly from the text where such phrases may not be appropriate in the role-play scenario itself (a potential danger pointed out by Cohen and Olshtain 1994). It was explained to the participants that the broad goals of the role-plays were to placate the upset professor/friend and to agree on a course of action. Although participants were provided with the reasons as to why they had lost the book / broken the camera / turned up late, it was emphasized that they should decide for themselves whether to tell the truth, fabricate other explanations or extricate themselves from the situation in other ways. The participants were given no specific directions as to what honorific forms they should use. However, they were instructed to behave naturally and to “use language that would be appropriate when addressing a professor / a close friend”.

The Korean role-play partners were also provided with instructions, as well as a training/practice session. Regarding honorifics use, the Korean interlocutors were instructed to use panmal in the friend role-play, regardless of whether the second language participant reciprocated it or not. However, there was some
debate and disagreement amongst the assistants as to whether panmal or contaymal would be more appropriate in the professor role-play. Traditionally, the power difference between the professor and student would license the use of panmal. However, as previously noted, the use of panmal to adult non-intimates is becoming increasingly unusual in Korean society. Indeed, these days an increasing number of university professors use contaymal – or at least the honorific {Y} speech style. In the end, the assistants agreed that following more recent trends and primarily using contaymal would be more appropriate. In addition to training sessions, I held discussions with the role-play partners after each session and asked them for their impressions of the participant’s performance.

During the introspection sessions, the majority of participants reported that their general behavior in the role-play reflected the way they interacted in the “real world”. Indeed, only one of the participants felt that their performance was “unnatural”. The participant in question – Julio – complained that the fact that the conversation was being recorded coupled with the fact that he was meeting the interlocutor for the first time rendered him “too nervous” to behave naturally. Several other participants reported that their behavior was largely natural, but contained slight differences. Amongst these participants, Hiroki noted that he “was exaggerating a bit because it was a role play.” Hyŏng-chŏl commented that he would have thought about the “solutions” more carefully in the real world. Mark claimed that he would normally have been more “apologetic”. One participant – Holly – said that her behavior itself was natural, but was adamant that she would never put herself in such a situation in the first place. Such comments, however, proved the exception rather than the rule. Other participants followed Richard’s comment that the scenarios were “fairly similar situations to some of the things I have come across in real life” or at least situations they could potentially find themselves in. Andriy reported that he had actually recently found himself in the exact situation of losing a professor’s book – to be precise, a rare book of which only 400 copies existed! Of most importance to the current study, all participants believed that their use of honorifics in the role-plays largely reflected their real-world usage.

6.3 Honorifics use in “professor” role-play

As previously outlined, the scenario in the “professor” role-play was that the participant had lost the professor’s book and was also late. I begin the analysis by looking at speech style use, before moving on to referent honorifics and forms of address.
6.3.1 Use of hearer honorifics (speech styles)

The use of appropriate honorific language when addressing a notable superior represents the most pervasive norm regarding the Korean honorifics system. Considering speech styles, at least in native speaker talk, the use of anything but {P} or {Y} could be highly offensive and incur severe social sanction. A first glance at Table 29 and Figure 22 confirms that L2 speakers of all occupation/ethnic groups are conscious of this strong social norm. In only 1.3% of predicate final endings in the entire database did participants depart from this and use the non-honorific {E} and {T} styles. However, closer analysis of the spoken data will shows that — in addition to these occasional (inappropriate) uses of {E} and {T} — overuse of the "polite" {Y} rather than the "deferential" {P} speech style at times entailed a casual mode of language that could be judged unsuitable for use towards a notable superior. A contradictory pattern was for L2 speakers to upgrade to the {P} speech style as a mode of modulation politeness.

I begin the analysis of this data by looking at the isolated occurrences of the non-honorific {T} and {E} styles. Although more traditional studies may treat all uses of non-honorific speech style towards status superiors as "pragmatic failure" or even as "errors", closer analysis of the data underlines that this is not always the case. Indeed, four of the six appearances of non-honorific styles were in fact totally free of face threat towards the professor. The reason for this was that they represented soliloquy. In such cases, panmal does not express disrespect but signals to the status superior that the utterance is not aimed at him/her and that he/she is not expected to respond. In order to confirm that these utterances were soliloquy, participants made use of prosodic clues such as speaking at a low amplitude. In the following example, Julie uses {E} in this way when ruminating to herself as to whether a friend will be able to lend her a book to replace the one lost:

(1) Role-play: Julie
1  Julie kulssey cey-ka han salam-iss-nun ke kath-untey- ku pilley- um pillye cwul swu iss-ulkka?
   ‘well, I have one person, will they be able to lend it to me-{E}?’

However, the two further instances of the non-honorific {E} style occurring in the data were addressed directly to the professor and thus had the potential to threaten face. One of these instances is presented in line 5 of the following example; the other instance appears in an example discussed slightly later in this section (example (4), line 11).
Table 29. Speech style tokens in professor role-play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Non-honorific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{P}</td>
<td>{Y}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22. Speech styles in professor role-play according to occupation/ethnicity
(2) Role-play: Hyŏn-chŏl

1 Professor ettehkey- ettehkey- chayk ce pen-ey ku- ku ceki cal po-ass-eyo?

‘how- how- that book- the last time- that- that- well have you read it?- {Y}

2

ku ke-to pillye tallan . ku haksayng-tul toykey manh-ase . cwul se-se kitali-ko iss-nuntey

‘there are so many students asking to borrow it that they are waiting in line’

3 Hyŏn-chŏl a: yey: ku chayk i- yo

‘ah yes that book- {Y}’

4 Professor yey

‘yes’

5 Hyŏn-chŏl → ce: um: . ku chayk ilhepely-ess-e

‘I um I lost that book- {E}’

6 ku cenchel-ey . ku hakkyo o-nun kil-ey . ku . kkampakha-yss- ney-yo cey-ka

‘on the train- on the way to college- um I forgot it- {Y}’

7 Professor . ani- mwe- ilh- ilhepely-ess-tako- yo?

‘no- uh- you mean you lost it- {Y}? ’

On playing back the tape, this heritage learner was surprised to hear his own use of {E}. He reported that it represented a momentary pragmatic “blurt” and was influenced both by the artificial nature of the situation and by being put “under pressure”. On this latter point, it can be seen that the slip occurs at the most delicate point of the discourse, at the very moment when Hyŏn-chŏl is admitting that he had lost the book. Although the professor reacts angrily in line 7, it is problematic – given that this was a role-play – to say that any actual face threat took place. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that this slip was a contributing factor to Hyŏn-chŏl being perceived by the role-play partner as “not formal enough” and “not respectful”. If we take this to be the case, we see that a lack of pragmalinguistic “control” may complicate the negotiation of “face” and, more specifically, Hyŏn-chŏl’s attempts to present himself as an apologetic student. Discussions in Section 6.4 below will show that these momentary problems of control when under duress more commonly occurred in the opposite direction – in other words from non-honorific to honorific styles.

Despite the fact that slips into non-honorific styles were few, this did not always guarantee that the use of speech styles was otherwise necessarily deferential enough. Looking at utterance units that featured honorific styles, Figure 1 (above) shows that the “polite” {Y} style accounted for approximately two thirds (65.9%) of speech style usage and the “deferential” {P} for one third (32.8%). Although
both \{Y\} and \{P\} are “honorific styles” and may be used towards status superiors, \{P\} indexes an extra layer of separation perhaps required from time-to-time in interactions with notable superiors, especially in sensitive situations. Indeed, discussions with the role-play partners revealed a strong preference for participants who used a higher percentage of \{P\}. Such participants were perceived as sounding more “polite”, dignified and apologetic (rather than just trying to escape from the situation with lame excuses).

Breakdown of the results according to occupation and ethnicity (Figure 2) showed that it was the exchange students and the non-heritage speakers who maintained a higher percentage of \{P\} usage. This discovery, consistent with the DCT results, confirms the surprising finding that exchange students rather than professionals use \{P\} at a higher rate. Closer analysis of the individual speakers who struggled to use \{P\} reveals that it was not only the “heritage speaker” and “professional” identities that seemed to influence this, but also being “female”. Indeed, three heritage speaker female professionals (Alice, Christine, Julie) only used \{P\} on one occasion each. As noted in Chapter 2, the \{P\} speech style is at times perceived as “authoritative” and “masculine”. It is possible that these ideologies, which are sometimes perpetuated through Korean language teaching materials,\(^3\) influenced the low \{P\} usage of these female participants.

For speakers who used \{Y\} in the majority of utterances, overuse of this style at times engendered a discourse style that may be judged in the Korean context as being too causal for use towards a notable superior. As mentioned in Chapter 2, unlike \{P\}, \{Y\} can occur with a wider range of pre-final endings, including connectives and epistemic modals. The repeated use of \{Y\} in conjunction with such endings could be judged as inappropriate at times for the role-play scenario. Mieko was one participant in the study who habitually used connective endings, including the use of -(nu)ntey in line 3 of the following:

(3) Role-play: Mieko

1 Mieko yey- yey kuntey. ku .. chac-kak ey ka-se ku . chac-ko iss-ess-nuntey eps-ess-nuntey . kulayse ku i ke cen- [colphan-i-lako-\(\cdot\)]
   ‘yes yes but . um .. I went to the book shop um . and was looking for it,
   but they didn’t have it . so it is out of print-\{Y\}\(\)’

\(^3\) Several Korean language textbooks make reference to the added “masculinity” of the \{P\} style. For example, King and Yeon’s Elementary Korean (2009:186) states that “male speakers are advised to use formal forms [i.e. the \{P\} style] occasionally, even when speaking to people with whom one need not be formal: overuse of the polite forms in -yo strikes some Koreans as ‘talking like a woman’".
Mieko was one of two Japanese-born UK-educated participants. During the introspection sessions, she reported that her repeated use of -(nu)ntey was influenced by Japanese, in which this feeling of unfinished-ness was connected with “polite speech”. However, in the Korean context, overuse of such endings can make speech sound too casual or simply unclear. In the above example, -(nu)ntey makes Mieko’s statement that she does not know what to do about the lost book sound vague and irresponsible rather than a strong statement that she has tried everything but still cannot find a solution. This leads the professor to ask her in line 8 if she has thought for herself about how she is going to resolve the problem.

Another potentially inappropriate expression with {Y} that appeared in the data was the epistemic modal -canha (known information), used by Julie in lines 5 and 10 in (4). The uses of -canha would appear too informal in the Korean context and furthermore presuppose that the status superior professor should remember that Julie was busy (line 5) and was doing a part-time job (line 10). In addition to this, her use of the expression -tan mal-i-eyyo ‘I’m telling you that’ in line 6 is rather assertive in a situation in which Julie is supposed to be placating the professor for her misdemeanors rather than pleading her innocence. The

---

4. Although I do not systematically analyze the use of honorifics by the role-play partners themselves, this particular utterance is noteworthy for its inclusion of referent honorifics. It was unusual for the “professor” to use referent honorifics towards the younger exchange students and this use of -si- occurs at the point in the discourse where the “professor” is becoming exasperated with Mieko’s irresponsible attitude and vagueness. It could therefore be interpreted as a sarcastic usage, or as a signal to Mieko that she should be displaying a higher level of deference. Unfortunately, I have no data from the discussion with this particular assistant to confirm whether this was the intention.
expression also contains the plain *mal* ('words, speech, language'), which is normally replaced with the honorific noun *malssum* when addressing status superiors. Struggling with her attempts at playing the role of the apologetic student, Julie slips into the non-honorific {E} speech-style in the final line.

(4) Role-play: Julie

1 Professor  way kul-*ay*: haksayng-un?
   'why are you carrying on like this-{E}?'

2 Julie  ani-*eyyo*
   'it's not that-{Y}'

3 cincca-*yo*
   'really-{Y}'

4 ettehkey cengsin-i eps-ess-na pwa-*yo*
   'somehow I must have been out of my mind-{Y}'

5 → ku ttay papp-ass-tako kula-yss-*canh-ayo*
   'I told you I was busy at that time, you know-{Y}'

6 → ku onul-un ku kkuth- sikan-un machi-ese o-lyeko ha-yss-nuntey:
   kuntey totwuk-i cey kapang kaciko ka-ss-*tan mal-i-ey-yo*
   'and as for today, I'm telling you that I was trying to come on time but then a thief took my bag-{Y}'

7 ku ke-lul-
   'that-

8 Professor  onul-un: ku haksayng-un onul-un kuleh-ta chi-ko liphothu nay-ci mos ha-yss-ul ppwun-tele haksayng-un mannal nuc-ci-*yo*?
   'even if we accept that was the case today, it's not just that you didn't submit the report, but you are always late, aren't you-{Y}?'

9 ce pen hakki tongan-ey achim swuep-un mannal nuc-ess-ci-*yo*
   'last semester, you were always late for morning classes, weren't you-{Y}?'

10 Julie  → ney- ku- ce alupaithu-to ha-yss-*canh-ayo*
    'yes, I was doing a part-time job, you know-{Y}'

11 ku ke ttaymwuney cincca himtul-*e*
    'things are really difficult because of that-{E}'

In the hierarchical structure of Korean society, subordinates typically take a passive role in interactions with superiors, submitting to any questions, requests etc. and being careful not to push their own opinions or agendas. In contrast to this, instead of accepting responsibility for her misdemeanors, Julie uses the casual and assertive language discussed above as she leads the dialogue away from her own wrongdoings and into discussions of her innocence and personal difficulties. This behavior was in fact symptomatic of deeper problems that Julie encountered
in adopting the identity of "subordinate". During the introspection sessions, she admitted that "I really don't know how to approach someone older and more higher status". In addition, she drew attention to the fact that the instructions for the role-play stated she had been taking the professor's class for a year. Having known the professor for a period of time, she presumed she could "get away with anything". This idea that power differences can be superceded by familiarity represents a frame of contextual knowledge better suited to Julie's native Australia rather than Korean interactional norms. As previously discussed, in the Korean context, notable superiors are typically always shown the same degree of respect regardless of how "intimate" the relationship becomes.

The interview sessions revealed that the inability of some participants to control the {P} speech style and the more formal mode of linguistic behavior that it entailed resulted in discomfort in their wider interactions. Heritage speaker Alice reported that her inability to use {P} was a hindrance when she had to give classroom presentations on her graduate course:

(5) Interview data: Alice
I think I have a very hard time with the -pnita form [{P}]. I think it's a combination of not having learned it so much in class and then not having so much exposure to it, like outside of class either. And when I've had to do palphyo [presentations], I've noticed everyone else uses the -pnita form and I'll like do two or three sentences of -pnita and I can't sustain it, I'll switch back to -yo.

Alice is aware that situations such as classroom presentations represent a distinct contextual frame that engenders a more formal use of language. However, her "control" over these structures lagged behind her frame-based knowledge, perhaps due to a lack of opportunities to use this speech style. She thus struggled to present the self-image that she knew was more appropriate and to which she aspired.

For speakers who had better control of {P}, however, this speech style represented an important politeness "strategy". Analysis of patterns of switching between {P} and {Y} revealed that the majority L2 speakers strongly associated upgrading to {P} with "modulation politeness" and attempts to mitigate the propositional content or illocutionary force of their utterances. The most sensitive and potentially face-threatening part of the role-play was when the participant had to apologize to the angry professor. Analysis of the data shows that it was while performing the speech act of "apology" that the vast majority (118; 75.6%) of {P} usages occurred, both in the apology IFID itself ("Illocutionary Force Indicating
Device” – performative verbs of apology) and in supporting moves (taking on responsibility, explanation, offer of repair, promise of forbearance).5

Looking first at speech style use in apology IFIDs, it should be made clear that use of the \{P\} speech style here is conventionalized to a large extent. As noted in Chapter 2, when conversing with status superiors, use of the performative verb coysonghata is preferred to mianhata. Then, with coysonghata, the \{P\} speech style is favored – coysongha-pnita is the most conventional way to apologize to a superior. The data shows that, out of a total of exactly 100 apology IFIDs, 76 were rendered in the preferred coysongha-pnita. coysongha-yyo also occurred on 20 occasions and mianha-pnita appeared four times.

Although \{P\} use in apology IFIDs thus more often represented a conventionalized pattern, there were examples where such usage was in fact motivated by more strategic attempts at modulation politeness. Indeed, for heritage speaker exchange student Jenny, alternation between coysonghay-yo and coysongha-pnita displayed two different patterns of modulation. Jenny applied apology IFIDs a total of 22 times in the role-play (far higher than any other participant), 20 times with \{P\} and twice with \{Y\}. The two uses of \{Y\} occurred at the outset of the role-play (lines 1 and 4 below) as part of an apparent discourse strategy to make light of her misdemeanors, emphasize solidarity with the professor and to sound girly or childish. By adopting the role of a child begging for forgiveness, Jenny sought the leniency that adults may extend to children under such circumstances. However, the Korean interlocutor reacts negatively to her attempts to adopt this role, and counters by questioning her directly and angrily about her lateness (lines 6, 7, 9). Realizing that her strategy is backfiring, Jenny alters her behavior and adopts a more subservient and deferential role. This change in her self-presentation is reflected by her jump to coysongha-pnita in line 10 and the subsequent repeated use of this apology IFID.

(6) Role-play: Jenny
1 Jenny → ney coysongha-yyo- nuc-esu ‘yes, sorry- for being late-\{Y\}’
2 Professor haksayng ... ecey na-hantey i meyil pona-yss-nuntey ... cikum-pota i-sip-pwun cen-ey o-ntako ha-yss-ess-nuntey i-sip-pwun-ina nuc-ess-e ‘student ... yesterday you sent me an e-mail ... you said you were going to come 20 minutes earlier than this, so you’re twenty minutes late-\{E\}’

5. This description of the speech act of apology is based on Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984).
I now present examples of upgrading to the {P} speech style when performing the supporting moves to the apology:

(7) a. James: taking on responsibility
   nemwu cal mos ha-yss-supnita
   ‘I have done so wrong-{P}’

b. Mark: explanation
   cihachel-ey twu-ko nayly-ess-supnita
   ‘I left it on the underground and got off-{P}’

Matthew: offer of repair
   cey-ka mwe yusil- yusilmwul ku seynthe tasi hwakinha-l kes-iko tto ku
   cey-ka cinca ku cil-i kwaynchanh-un henchayk-ul yelsimhi chac-tolok ha-
   keyss-supnita
   ‘I will check at the lost- lost-and-found center one more time and I will search
   hard for a secondhand book of okay quality-{P}’

d. Holly: promise of forbearance
   swuep nuckey an o-tolok nolyek ha-l ke-pnita
   ‘I will try not to be late for class-{P}’
In (7a), James is in the process of accepting responsibility for losing the professor's book. His use of {P} in the expression cal mos ha-yss-supnita 'I have done wrong' emphasizes the seriousness of his concern and lends gravity to his utterance. Regarding the next strategy, explanation, Mark's use of {P} in (7b) as he openly states that he left the book on the underground provides a similar impression that he is taking the situation seriously and is willing to accept blame. In the final two strategies, offer of repair and promise of forbearance, {P} occurred at a particularly high rate. This was in part due to the fact that these two moves were most frequently performed using the pre-final volitional ending -keyss- which tends to occur most frequently with {P}. We see an example of -keyss-supnita in example (7c) and then a different expression of volition -l kes-i-pnita in (7d). The use of {P} in these utterances makes the promise to compensate for any wrongdoings sound stronger and more binding.

Transcripts from the introspection sessions revealed that L2 speakers perceived {P} as an important tool for mitigating the force of their utterances. Participants perceived the {P} speech style as being more "polite" than {Y} and more suitable for use when the speech event was particularly delicate. Consider the following extract from the interview with graduate student Mark:

(8)

Interview data: Mark
To me -supnita [the {P} speech style] feels very cold and it feels very standoffish. So if I'm in a - if I were in a position where I suddenly felt insecure about where I was and I felt someone might be upset at me I would use lots of polite language to maybe make them not so upset [...] If I were in a situation where I was having to say I'm sorry and to me it feels- I don't know. I don't think it's so much that I'm trying to get on the person's good side, but ... yeah. So, in the case of apologizing, it felt very natural.

Mark's perception that increased use of the {P} style represented "polite language" that could be used to smooth over the situation was mirrored in the comments of other speakers. Hiroki commented that continuous use of {Y} would not have been polite enough for the situation and that he consequently used as much {P} as possible. Russell described {P} as being "even more polite" and Holly reported that in using {P} she was "trying to be more polite". Such comments suggest that speakers at times consciously exploited {P} for "modulation politeness" and attempts to reduce face-threat.

It should be underlined that these attempts by L2 speakers to use {P} to soften the assertion of utterances were not wholly out of tune with findings in the L1 literature. In discussions of "strategic politeness", Yoo Song-young (1997) and Lee Jung-bok (2001) report similar usage of {P} to reduce illocutionary force or
mitigate face threat. Thus, on one level, the current research shows that advanced L2 speakers may manipulate speech styles according to localized discourse goals in similar ways to native speakers. The difference may lie in the perception of {P} use more than the usage itself. Whereas L1 speakers strongly connect {P} with more static values such as “deference” and “formality”, these words never occurred in the introspection sessions with the L2 speakers. The L2 comments focused on discussions of using {P} to be more polite according to situational factors or personal goals and the kind of communication emphasized by “Western” politeness ideologies.

6.3.2 Use of referent honorifics

I now discuss the use of referent honorifics on the “professor” role-play. The discussion is limited to the use of such constructions when the referent in question was the professor him/herself rather than an absent third party.

6.3.2.1 Use of subject honorifics

Since the “professor” is a notable status superior, the L2 speakers would be expected according to normative usage to use the referent honorific pre-final ending -si- in instances where the professor appeared as subject referent. In addition, for certain verbs such as mekta ‘to eat’ which has the separate honorific form capswusita, the stem itself would need to be substituted (see Chapter 2). As shown in Table 30, the L2 speakers largely followed this norm, including -si- in 83.0% of predicates where the professor appeared as a subject referent.

Analysis according to occupation and ethnicity confirmed the findings presented in Chapter 5 that exchange students and non-heritage speakers have a higher tendency to omit -si-. Out of the twenty speakers, eleven used -si- on every utterance in which the professor was the subject referent. Seven of these consistent users were professionals; seven of them were heritage learners. Four speakers (two exchange students versus two professionals; one heritage versus three non-heritage) used -si- on some but not all utterances and one speaker (professional; heritage) omitted -si- entirely. As for the remaining three speakers (all exchange students; one heritage versus two non-heritage), it was not possible to assess their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 30. Use of -si- in professor role-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use of -si- as they did not produce any utterances in which the professor appeared as the subject referent.

Interestingly, the identities of the speakers who included/omitted -si- differed in some ways between the written DCT data and the spoken role-play. The one speaker (Julie) who omitted -si- on all utterances on the role-play actually used this particle at a native-like rate on the DCT. Similarly, although Chin-u often omitted -si- on the role-plays, he was a comparatively high user on the written DCT. From the opposite angle, out of the four speakers who totally omitted -si- on the DCT, three of these were shown to use -si- on the role-play (Eun-chae and Andriy on some utterances; Christine on all utterances). For the fourth speaker (Julio), there was no evidence either way as he was one of the speakers who never applied utterances in which the professor appeared as subject referent.

These mixed results suggest that most or all participants in the study would use -si- at least some of the time, but that they either had a low conscious awareness of this honorific form (in the case of speakers who used it on the role-plays but not on the DCT) or struggled to control its usage (for speakers who used it on the DCT, but did not always use it on the role-play). Interestingly, two out of the three speakers to whom the former applies were heritage speakers. This suggests that such speakers may have some knowledge of -si- (perhaps developed during childhood) that they apply subconsciously during spoken interaction, but have limited conscious awareness that they could draw on for the written DCT. For such speakers, it may be that -si- functions more on the level of an interactional marker rather than a fully-fledged referent honorific. They are able to apply this form in routinized contaymal speech but have little conscious knowledge of the wider function of the marker or of the pragmatic factors that may influence its application.

The role-play data allows for examination of the contexts in which participants struggled to control -si-. The eight instances in which -si- was omitted are listed below:

(9) a. Hiroki
   kyswunim-i ku ihay an ka-nun hay-to [...] ‘professor even if you don't understand [...]’

   b. Eun-chae
   kulemyen-un cemswu kkakka: cwnun ke-yo?
   ‘in that case are you going to take points off me?’

   c. Andriy
   a: .. cal cinay-ss-supnikka?
   ‘ah .. how have you been?’
d. Mark
    cinan cwu-ey ku kyoswunim-i ce-hantey mwusun chayk-ul pill-yess-canha-yo
    ’last week there was that book that you borrowed [intended meaning: lent] me, professor’
e. Chin-u
    ku chayk-i ke yocwum philyohay-yo?
    ’this book- do you need it these days?’
f. Chin-u
    nayil tasi philyohay-yo?
    ’do you need it again tomorrow?’
g. Julie
    cinan cwu-ey pillye cwun ke iss-canh-ayo
    ’there was that one you lent me last week’
h. Julie
    onul philyohay-yo?
    ’do you need it today?’

The examples reveal a tendency for speakers to omit -si- in relative clauses (b, g) and in instances where the subjecthood of the sentences is questionable (a, e, f, h). Regarding the latter, three of the sentences (e, f, h) feature the verb philyohata (‘need’), in which kyoswunim (‘professor’) appears as the (implied) dative nominal and the actual (implied) nominative is the inanimate chayk (‘book’). In such sentences, inclusion of -si- is the norm in face-to-face interaction, which is taken by Yeon Jae-hoon (2003: 55) as evidence that the dative nominal is the true subject. The omissions of subject honorifics by L2 speakers in such contexts suggests a tendency for speakers to undergeneralize the application of -si- to instances in which the “honored being” is strictly in nominative position. Although it could be argued that the more complex relationship between the “honored being” and -si- in such constructions contributes to this under-generalization, it is also possible that the way that -si- is taught in KSL classes (i.e. as a “subject” honorific) is also a contributing factor.

As well as adding -si-, participants could opt to substitute the honorific nominative case marker -kkeyse for the plain -i/-ka. As noted in Chapter 2, this substitution adds an extra layer of deference, but is not obligatory and can sound too formal. Only one occurrence of this form appeared in the dataset, suggesting that L2 learners tend to avoid the extra formality that this particle entails. Due to the

---

6. Due to the fact that L1 speakers apply -kkeyse inconsistently, it is difficult to judge omission of this particle as pragmatic failure. However, previous studies that apply more prescriptive
content matter of the role-play, there were no opportunities to evaluate second language learners' use of subject honorific noun forms.

6.3.2.2 Use of object honorifics
Due to the context of the role-play, situations in which the professor appeared as an object referent were limited. All instances of inclusion/omission of object honorifics involved the verb *tulita* 'to give', either in cases in which participants were talking about giving the book (or a financial replacement) to the professor, the phrase *maissum tulita* (speech:HON give:OHON – ‘to speak to:OHON’) or in benefactive constructions.

Table 31 shows that L2 speakers only applied *tulita* in 58.8% of predicates where the professor appeared as an object referent. In fact, only six speakers (two exchange students versus four professionals; four heritage versus two non-heritage) used *tulita* at every opportunity and one (exchange student; heritage speaker) sometimes used it. Seven speakers (four exchange students versus three professionals; four heritage versus three non-heritage) did not use it at all and for six speakers (three exchange students versus three professionals; one heritage versus five non-heritage) there was no evidence as to whether they used it or not since they never talked about giving anything to or doing anything for the professor.

The frequency of *tulita* (58.8%) was significantly lower than the use of the subject honorific *-si*- (83.0%) reported in the previous section. The lower usage rate of *tulita* appears to be connected to the fact that Korean object honorification is more difficult to acquire than subject honorification. Firstly, as pointed out by Kim Young-joo (1997: 368) in her observations on honorifics acquisition by native speaker children, the process of object honorification is cognitively more complex, as it involves “elevating” a non-subject in order to “downgrade” the subject NP. Secondly, object honorification is more difficult to acquire as its appearance is much restricted and its input frequency is thus less than subject honorification (Kim Young-joo 1997:368). In native speaker acquisition, whereas subject honorification appears between the ages of two and three, object
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norms have treated use of *-i/-ka* attached to honorific titles as errors or failures, including Han Sang-mee (2005:106).
honorification occurs much later. Indeed Kim Young joo (1997: 368) claims that “elementary school students, if they use non-subject [i.e. object] honorifics at all, often make errors, wrongly providing the subject honorific marker when the non-subject honorific form is required”

Perhaps due to the low frequency of object honorifics in the input, some participants displayed an awareness of these forms that lagged far behind their overall proficiency in Korean and, indeed, their competency in using other areas of the honorifics system. During the interview sessions, heritage learner Julie, for example, became confused when I brought up her omission of *tulita*. When I quoted the utterance in question, which involved her saying that she would make a *copy* of the lost book for the professor, she mistakenly jumped to the conclusion that I was correcting her use of the English word “copy” in place of the Korean *poksa*. The use of “copy” is actually perfectly acceptable as a recognized loan word.

(10) Interview data: Julie
1 LB You said about copying the book. You said “copy mantule cwu-lkey-yo [I’ll make you a copy]” while it should have been=
2 Julie =poksa [copy]
3 LB Well, poksa- poksa hay tuli-lkey-yo [I’ll make:OHON you a copy]
4 Julie Yeah

Even in cases where participants had a more developed awareness of object honorific forms, they reported that the application of these forms represented a lower priority than other areas of speech. Hiroki, for instance, reported that he omitted more “complicated” honorific forms such as *tulita* in order to “speed up” his speech. In line with the “strategy of least effort” (Chapter 4), language learners are prone to undergeneralize the application of more complex forms and also those that lack propositional content and are not essential to conveying information – both points generally apply to *tulita*.

However, it should be pointed out that L2 speakers’ failure to apply *tulita* at times did actually contribute to misunderstandings in the discourse. As mentioned in Chapter 2, one contributing factor as to why pro-drop language such as Korean may have developed verbal honorifics is the need to disambiguate deleted NPs. Without the use of *tulita*, the professor was at times unclear as to whether the deleted object NP was indeed him/herself and not some other person of lower status who would not need to be referred to using honorifics. In line 3 of the following, Richard is attempting to say that he would give money to the professor to pay for the lost book. However, without *tulita*, the professor is unclear as to whom Richard is planning to give money to (line 4):
(11) Role-play: Richard

1 Professor i ke ettehkey ha-l ke-ya haksayng?
   ‘what are you going to do about this, student?-{EI}’

2 Richard kulemen ku .. ku chayk-ul . ku cey-ka ku cacwu- ku yusilmwul
   seynthe ka- ka-l ke-nte-yo
   ‘well that book- I’m going to go to the lost-and-found section-{-Y}’

3 kyeysok kulentey ku cwungan-ey .. ku chayk-i ku . ton- . ton-ul
   cwe-se- . ku kyoswunim-uy . ku kyoswunim-i chayk-i- -i-nikka- . ku
   ton cwe-se ku=
   ‘I’ll continue to do that and that book- money- I’ll give money- because
   it is your book, professor- I’ll give money so-’

4 Professor →=nwukwu-hanthey ton-ul cwe-yo
   ‘who are you going to give money to-{-Y}?’

5 Richard yey kyoswunim-hanthey cwul ke-yo
   ‘I’m going to give it to you-{-Y}’

Apart from occurrences of the honorific noun malssum (‘words:HON’) in the ex-
expression malssum tulita, there were no other instances of object honorifics.

6.3.3 Use of forms of address

Observations now turn briefly to the use of forms of address. After discussing
the terms participants used towards the professor, I then analyze the first person
pronouns by which speakers referred to themselves.

All participants exclusively and appropriately addressed the professor using
the title+nim construction. Out of a total of 70 such usages, 50 featured kyoswu-
nim ‘professor:HON’ and 20 featured sensayng-nim ‘teacher-HON’. Interest­
ly, out of these 70 usages, 43 were free forms of address, whereas only 27 were
bound forms.

We may wonder why participants used such a large number of free forms,
given that the role-play was a one-on-one conversation and there was thus no
need to use terms of address to identify any particular addressee. Analysis of
the data suggests that this repeated usage represented a mode of modulation
politeness applied to mitigate potentially face-threatening utterances. By prefix-
ing expressions of apology etc with kyoswunim/sensayngnim, the participants
may have been strategically reminding the professor of his superior status and
emphasizing that they were not in a position to coerce him. Such an interpreta-
tion is consistent with the politeness strategy of “give deference”, recognized by
Brown and Levinson (1987:182). The following extracts show instances of this
usage both with *kyoswunim* and *sensayngnim* in expressions of promise (12) and thanks (13).

(12) Role-play: Patrick
1 Patrick ney *kyoswunim* cikak an ha-keyss-*supnita* 
‘yes, professor, I won’t be late-{P}’

(13) Role-play: Patrick
1 Patrick ney kamsaha-*pnita sensayngnim* 
‘yes, thank you teacher-{P}’

Although this modulation politeness pattern has not been reported in studies into L1 Korean, my own observations suggest that native speakers also apply *kyoswunim* and *sensayngnim* in this way. Moreover, as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), it would appear that such a “strategy” is universal to some extent. These examples can thus be taken as evidence of learners successfully making use of the transfer of native or universal pragmatic knowledge when speaking their second language.

Analysis of first person pronouns appearing in the data showed evidence of one further means of mitigation available to L2 speakers. The transcripts contained a total of 159 first person pronouns. All but nine of these featured the self-humbling *ce*; the remainder consisted of the plain (and less appropriate) *na*. Considering the fact that Korean is a pro-drop language, the rate of first person pronouns was remarkably high. Five speakers used *ce* more than ten times; one speaker used it on more than 20 occasions (Jenny). Interestingly enough, all of these speakers were ethnic Koreans, revealing this repeated use of *ce* to be a salient feature of heritage speaker honorifics usage.

Previous studies (Jung Eun-hyuk 2006) have noted that lower-level learners of Korean may resist deletion of pronouns in their pro-drop second language. However, given the advanced proficiency of the participants in the current study – coupled with the fact that this pronoun retention did not feature on the “friend” role-play or in the naturally occurring data (Chapter 7) – problems in adjusting to speaking a pro-drop language do not suffice as an explanation here. Instead, it would appear that this usage represented another mode of modulation politeness on the part of the speakers to emphasize their humble position in relation to the professor and thus reinforce the impression that they are not in a position to impinge on the professor in any way. In the following extract, Jenny’s constant repetition of *ce* (lines 1, 4) coupled with use of *kyoswunim* (“professor”) work to reaffirm the student-professor relationship and the hierarchical roles that come with it as the student explains how he lost the book.
(14) Role-play: Jenny

1 Jenny kyo-swunim- ke-lul cihachel an-eyta nayly-e kaci-ko-
   'professor I left it on the underground-

2 Professor cihachel an-eyta noh-ko nayly-ess eyo?
   'you left it on the underground-?

3 kulem il-hepely ess-ta-n mal-i eyyo cikum?
   'so now you mean that you lost it?

4 Jenny ye yey ka . yusilnwul seynthe-to ka po-ass-nunt ey eps-te-la-ko-yo
   'yes I went to the lost-and-found center but it wasn't there-

6.4 Honorifics use in "friend" role-play

In this role-play, the participant and the partner adopted the roles of intimates
of identical age. The participant was responsible for breaking the friend’s camera
and was also arriving late. I shall begin the analysis by looking at speech styles,
before moving onto terms of address. I do not set aside a separate section for ref-
erent honorifics due to their low frequency in the data.

6.4.1 Use of hearer honorifics (speech styles)

In interactions with intimate status equals, the use of the non-honorific {E} and
{T} styles represents the "norm" in Korean society. In such situations, use of hon-
orific speech styles can sound too formal, and therefore uncomfortable, cold, in-
sincere or sarcastic. Consistent with the DCT data, the majority of L2 speakers
followed this norm on the "friend" role-play. As shown in Table 32, non-honorific
styles appeared in 76.9% of the total number of utterance units.

However, in line with the findings of Kim Jung-hee (1998), the data revealed
a tendency for some L2 speakers to avoid non-honorific panmal even when inter-
acting with a someone who was supposed to be an intimate. Consistent with the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 32. Speech style tokens in friend role-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorific styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{P}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DCT analysis, it was the professionals and non-heritage speakers who displayed a higher tendency to use honorific styles to the “friend”, as shown in Figure 23.

Closer analysis of individual performance on the role-play reveals that this use of honorific styles was largely confined to five speakers. Two of the exchange student non-heritage speakers (Mieko, Julio) mixed honorific and non-honorific styles in fairly equal quantities and three of the professionals (non-heritage Holly and Russell as well as heritage speaker Chin-u) used honorific styles in all or the majority of utterances.

The patterns regarding which participants used honorific styles towards intimate status equals (and which ones did not) largely correlated with the DCT data
The one notable exception was that of heritage learner Alice. This speaker totally avoided non-honorific styles on the DCT, but used them fluently on the role-play. As an explanation, she reported that, in "real world" interactions, she used non-honorific styles with some close friends and relatives, but rarely used them with fellow graduate students at the university, even intimates. Although she applied the latter "frame" as a guide for the DCT, on the role-play she admitted to making a strategic choice to use *panmal*. This decision represented a deliberate attempt to make the imagined relationship more intimate and thus facilitate the act of “apologizing” to the friend. This strategic choice of Alice to use *panmal* to emphasize solidarity and thus mitigate face threat contrasts with the more common pattern of L2 speakers applying honorific styles to strategically emphasize respect, as shall be analyzed in discussions below.

(15) Interview data: Alice

I wasn’t sure- would I speak -yo [{Y}] to a friend? Because that was what I wanted to do. But then I was like that’s just going to be weirder. And then I was like and if I have to apologize, I feel better if I’m using *panmal* [...] It’s like- it’s like oh we’re that close and that comfortable that like- coz I’ve done the terrible thing that like our relationship is such that it can sustain that sort of like situation, as opposed to like someone who I’m friends with but I’m still using -yo [the {Y} speech style], I think. Somehow that went through my head, but then I could say like *mian* ['sorry', with verb stem and speech level ending omitted] and I think that’s easier to say than *mian-hay-yo* ['sorry' in the {Y} speech style]. Coz it’s awkward enough as it is, but *contaymal* [honorific language] will make it less comfortable. I had that- I definitely had that split second internal dialogue.

In the following discussions, I look first at speakers who used non-honorific styles in the majority of utterances, before turning to those who used honorific styles in some of their speech. Due to the fact that the two non-honorific styles {E} and {T} do not generally differ in the degree of “connection” that they index, I do not explore patterns of switching between these two particular styles.

The 15 speakers who predominantly used non-honorific speech styles on the friend role-play included all but one of the heritage speakers and all but two of the exchange students. Although eight of these fifteen experienced momentary lapses into the honorific styles, such pragmalinguistic slips (or “strategic uses” – see below) only occurred in the speech of two of the heritage speakers (Jenny and Julie). The fact that the remaining seven heritage speakers fluently applied *panmal* shows that this group has a pragmalinguistic advantage over non-heritage speakers in their ability to control non-honorific speech. As noted by Sohn Sung-ock (1995)
and Byon (2003), heritage learners typically learn these styles through casual interactions in the home environment and commonly struggle with contaymal when they learn Korean in the KSL classroom (Byon 2003: 280).

Isolated slips into honorific language by eight of these consistent users of panmal speech styles primarily resulted from the staged situation itself. The friend role-play was more “artificial” than the professor role-play in that it demanded the use of intimate language between two people who were, in reality, meeting for the first time. As Matthew put it, “I found it a bit difficult especially at the beginning to put into panmal, because he wasn’t someone I knew very well.” However, this was not to say that these slips did not mirror problems that these speakers occasionally experienced in real-world interactions. Patrick, for example, reported that although he generally experienced good control over his speech styles, “rarely but it does happen that during like I’m talking panmal and then suddenly it [the {Y} style] slips out”.

Closer analysis of where these slips took place revealed an interesting pattern: these momentary lapses tended to occur at points where speakers were performing potentially face threatening speech acts in the course of placating the “friend”. In the following extract, for example, note how Eun-chae switches to {Y} in lines 3 and 5 when performing the apology supporting strategy of “offer of repair”:

(16) Role-play: Eun-chae

1  Eun-chae  sukhlun-i kocang na-nun kes kath-a
               ‘the screen appears to be broken-{E}’

2  Friend  cinca i ke il-nyen-i-sang nem-e kaci-ko i ke mulyo sepisu an toy-l
            they-ntey
            ‘really it’s been over a year [since I bought it] so I doubt the guarantee
            is going to cover it’

3  Eun-chae  → ku ke- ku ke-nun nay-ka ta nay-lkey-yo
               ‘that- I’ll pay for that-{Y}’

4  Friend  cinca- ettehkey ne poko ta nay-lako hay- tto
            ‘really- how can I ask you to pay everything- again’

Eun-chae  → kulayse nay-ka nemwu mianha-nikka-n . ku AS pi-nun nay-ka ta
            nay-lkey-yo
            ‘so because I’m so sorry I’ll pay for all the repairs-{Y}’

6  Friend  a cengmal kochi-l swu iss-ulkkka i ke?
            ‘will they really be able to repair this-{E}?’

7  nemwu simhakey mangkacy-ese
    ‘it’s so seriously damaged’

8  Eun-chae  cikum ka- ka po-ca
           ‘let’s go- let’s go and see-{T}’
In instances such as the above, the extent to which these upgrades from the non-honorific {E} to the more honorific {Y} can be deemed modulation politeness “strategies” is debatable. Rather, such examples suggest that L2 speakers slip into language they view as “safe” when under situational pressure. However, in the data from these fifteen speakers, there were instances in which speakers used shifts to {Y} with more deliberate and meaningful intentions. In the following, Julie upgrades in line 4 when performing the “offer of repair” strategy:

(17) Role-play: Julie
1 Friend cincca mianhay- mianha-ta-n mal pakk-ey ha-l mal-i eps-ci?
   ‘really except for sorry- sorry you have nothing else to say, do you-{E}?’
2 Julie ung ... ku ke-pakk-ey eps-e
   ‘yes, I have nothing else to say except for that-{E}’
3 miahha-y
   ‘sorry-{E}’
4 → nay-ka cenyek sa cwu-lkey-yo::
   ‘I’ll buy you dinner-{Y}’
5 Friend a kulem
   ‘well of course’

In this instance, Julie’s usage of {Y} appears to be a deliberate attempt to be humorous and playful, a feeling generated by the elongation of the -yo ending and the rising-falling intonation accompanying it. As such, it seemed to me initially that Julie’s “strategy” here was to promote solidarity with the “friend” and make light of her misdemeanors with a playful use of honorifics. Upgrading in this way when joking would not be out of line with L1 speech style usage (Lee Chang-soo 1996: 206). During the interview sessions, Julie confirmed that this use of {Y} was deliberate. However, as well as accepting that is represented “teasing” and “joking”, she curiously also maintained that it was an attempt at sincerity or to show that she really was “sorry”:

(18) Interview data: Julie
1 LB You said it in a singsong voice like you were messing around.
2 Julie Messing around, yeah, joking. Just being a tease. Trying to be really sincere. Like I’m really sorry hay cwu-lkey-yo [‘I’ll do it for you’ – in elongated rising-falling intonation]. Yeah, like you know.
3 LB So was it- you said there two things. You said one was kind of teasing and then being sincere?
Julie's claim that this marked use of the {Y} speech style was “joking” but at the same time “sincere” represents a rather curious explanation. She had evidently picked up this playful use of {Y} from her interactions with Korean intimates, yet her explanation leaves the questions as to whether she was fully aware of the contextual meanings that this lightheartedly ironic use of {Y} indexed. Although L1 speakers would go along with her explanation of this use of {Y} as far as the comments regarding joking and teasing are concerned, it appears unlikely that they would also associate it with an honest attempt to make an apology more sincere. The literature on honorific shifting is not devoid of discussions of {E}/ {Y} alternation, but use of {Y} between friends of equal age does not appear to go beyond joke or sarcasm. The bottom line is that jocularity and sincerity are incompatible meanings and that {Y} is not conventionally used to express the latter in interactions with intimates. This example shows that L2 speakers may pick up the outlines of native-like language usage, without necessarily fully developing the frame-based knowledge on which such usages depend. In other words, even though Julie's use of {Y} sounded like a native-like attempt at irony and solidarity, this actually differed from the specifics of her discourse strategy.

I now consider the two participants (Mieko and Julio) – both non-heritage exchange students – who mixed the non-honorific and honorific styles in fairly equal quantities. Two basic patterns of {E}/ {Y} switching appeared in these participants' transcripts. Firstly, both speakers used more {Y} at the start of the role-play, but applied {E} at a higher rate as they became more accustomed to the “friend” role. Secondly, both speakers displayed the previously identified tendency of upgrading to {Y} when under pressure or performing face-threatening speech acts. However, as well as being more frequent, these upgrades were also more marked and deliberate:

7. However, switching to {Y} in order to reduce illocutionary force in sensitive speech acts may be an available strategy in other contexts. For example, a marginal status superior may address a marginal inferior with {E} as a normative level but then upgrade to {Y} when performing sensitive speech acts. Although the higher status of the superior may license use of {E} in most utterances, the power difference may not be enough for him to coerce the non-intimate hearer and order him/her around in non-honorific speech styles.
(19) Role-play: Julio

1 Julio  emma-hako ta ku cip-eytaka ku .. chengso ha-lako kula-yss-ess-ko
 'mum-at home-was telling me to clean the house'

2 na-n kunyang emma ku na-n cikum yaksok iss-nuntey na-nun nuc-ul
 ke-lako
 'I just said to mum that I had an appointment and I was going to be
 late'

3  → ai cinccca a mianha-yyo
 'oh I'm so sorry-{Y}'

4 Friend  ne-n mamapo-iya
 'are you a mama's boy-{E}?’

5  emma-ka ha-la-nun taylo ta ha-y?
 'do you do everything your mum tells you to-{E}?’

Julio's upgrade to the {Y} speech style in the apology IFID mianhay-yo ('sorry)
marks a distinct break from native speaker norms; in L1 speech, friends would
only use {Y} in apologies to signal joke or sarcasm. The introspection sessions
revealed that, for Julio, the use of honorific speech in such instances represented
a sincere strategy to mitigate the face-threatening situation. "You want to make
the other person feel better", explained Julio, "you want to use a higher language
so they 'oh he messed up so he's respecting me now, even though we are the
same age". This idea of using higher language to an intimate status equal in order
to show them “respect” and thus make them feel better represents a frame of
pragmatic knowledge not matched with the norms of Korean culture. In the Ko-
rean cultural sphere, “respect” tends to be limited to something that a subordinate
shows to a superior - the idea of showing respect to someone of the same age and
expressing this through the use of honorifics does not really apply, a point I return
to in Chapter 7.

Finally, I examine the transcripts of the three speakers who predominantly
used honorific speech styles. Not only did these three speakers all use the honor-
ific {Y} as their main speech style, but they were also responsible for all but
one of the 14 instances of {P} and all but two of the eight instances of the subject
honorific -si-. Out of these three speakers, Russell and Chin-u applied some occa-
sional uses of panmal, while Holly maintained contaymal throughout. The speech
of Holly was remarkable for the lack of variation between the “professor” and the
“friend” role-plays. In the first four lines of the “friend” role-play reproduced be-
low, the use of {Y} in line 1, the {P} style in the apology IFID in line 2 and subject
honorifics in the plea for forgiveness in line 4 mark a discourse style that would
normally be considered incompatible for addressing a “friend".
(20) Role-play: Holly

1 Holly a cengmal nuc-eyo
   'oh I'm really late-{Y}'
2 coysongha-pnita
   'I'm sorry-{P}.'
3 Friend ani
   'no'
4 Holly yongsehay cu-si-eyo
   'please forgive me-shon-{Y}.'

As shall be seen in resultant chapters, Holly’s blanket use of contaymal extended to the vast majority of her real-world interactions. During the introspection sessions, her perception of panmal as being universally disrespectful and rude was found to be a major reason for avoiding it. I shall discuss this speaker’s intriguing use of honorifics in more detail in Chapter 7.

Turning our attention to the final two participants, the use of predominantly honorific styles by Russell and Chin-u seemed to stem from two sources. Firstly, both had been exposed to Korean predominantly in “professional” environments, with Chin-u being one heritage speaker who did not benefit from fluent control of panmal. They were thus more accustomed to both giving and receiving contaymal and experienced difficulty achieving control over panmal. Russell in particular struggled to drop the -yo ending of the {Y} style after certain pre-final endings, notably -ney (modal ending signaling newly perceived information – (21a)), -lkey (volitional ending – (21b)) and -ketun (cause or explanation – (21c)) and thus habitually slipped into honorific language:

(21) Role-play: Russell
a. i-sip-pwun nuc-ess-ney-yo
   'I see that I'm 20 minutes late'
b. com ttelecy-ess-ketun-yo
   'because it fell'
c. saylo nao-nun moteyl-ul sa-lyeko ha-lkey-yo
   'I'm going to buy you a model that has just come out'

Secondly, both participants reported that the sensitive nature of the situation and the need to modify their speech in line with modulation politeness contributed to a preference for honorific speech styles. In the following extract from the introspection sessions, I was questioning Chin-u to see whether his use of honorific styles merely represented a lack of pragmatic competence or something on a deeper level. Chin-u reported that, even if he had had better control of panmal, he...
would still have used *contaymal* in order to be “polite” and “sincere”. Furthermore, Chin-u’s discussion of the way he would emphasize the honorific verb endings when apologizing or thanking reveals a strong belief that these forms can be used as markers of modulation politeness, even in interactions with intimates.

(22) Interview data: Chin-u
1. **LB** How about if you had been in control of the *panmal* a bit more? Would you have used *panmal* the whole way through?
2. **Chin-u** I don’t think so. No, I don’t think so. I think I would have =mixed=
3. **LB** =mixed it. But I think I would have still stayed using more of the *contaymal*, just because when I think *contaymal*, I think being polite and being sincere. So I think I would have kept with that because that’s what I think when I think *contaymal* [...] It’s just kind of my way of- in my thinking, it is just being more polite. So if I do make a mistake or mess up, I really want to be more polite. And I even know that when I’m apologizing, I make sure I emphasize the -yo at the end. So, if I’m saying you know “coysonghapnida [sorry-{P}]” or “komaweyo” [thank you-{Y}], I make sure I really emphasize the ending. If I’m being apologetic or if I’m showing gratitude or something, I know I do that.

The interview transcripts of Russell reveal similar connections between using *contaymal* to intimates and the circumstantial need for linguistic mitigation. In the following extract, Russell connects his use of the {Y} speech style on the friend role-play to his wider usage in the “real world”. His comments on using {Y} to show “respect” are reminiscent not only of Chin-u’s comments above, but the previously cited case of Julio and a more “Western” ideology regarding what respect is and who you need to show it to:

(23) Interview data: Russell
1. **Russell** Generally I do- I would say it’s fair to say I use -yo [the {Y} speech style] perhaps inappropriately because I could use *panmal*. Especially if I’m late, I think I would tend to use more -yo because I’d probably want to try and smooth things over, show respect or something.
2. **LB** Do you think in your real interactions with Korean people, if there is someone who you often use *panmal* with, would you sometimes use -yo in a situation where you were apologizing?
3. **Russell** Yeah. Yeah, I think I would do that.
Russell describes his motivations for using {Y} as being to “smooth things over” or “show respect,” but admits that this is “perhaps inappropriate”. This paradox of trying to express politeness while at the same time being aware that the method of expression is may be inappropriate according to L1 norms encapsulates the complexity of pragmatic development in a second language. Second language speakers may be well aware of differences between the ways that politeness is expressed in their L1 and L2. They aim to be polite in the second language and hold a general aspiration to replicate native speaker norms. However, conflicts between their pre-existing identities and ideologies and those of the target language community result in them being unable or unwilling to follow local norms and ultimately in them failing to convey their polite intentions in a way that fits inside the pragmatic functions of the L2.

As an additional experiment, for the five participants who used contaymal in more than just isolated utterances on the “friend” role-play, I decided to repeat the recording with roles reversed, in other words, with the L2 speaker taking the role of the “friend” who was receiving rather than providing the apology. I was interested to see if the speakers would continue to use contaymal now that the roles were reversed. Except for Holly, who continued to avoid panmal altogether, all other participants used a significantly higher percentage of panmal in the new role of the “angry friend” rather than the previous role of the “apologetic friend”. In the following extract, Russell uses panmal in his blunt orders to the friend to show him the camera. Remember that Russell had used honorific language in the original situation to “show respect” and “smooth things over”.

(24) Role-play: Russell

1 Russell poye cw-\'{E} ‘show me-{E}’
2 ku khameyla cikum poy-e cwe ‘show me the camera now-{E}’
3 eti- ‘where’
4 Friend poy-e cwu-myen . an toy-l kes kath-a ‘I don’t think I should show it to you-{E}’
5 Russell a: poy-e-to tw-\'ay ‘oh you can show it to me-{E}’
6 poy-e-to tw-\'ay ‘you can show me-{E}’
7 poy-e cw-e ‘show me it-{E}’
All four participants who increased their rate of *panmal* on repeating the friend role-play agreed that this was due – at least in part – to the shift of roles. In the role of the “angry friend” rather than the “apologetic friend”, there was no circumstantial need to show “respect” or “sincerity”. Moreover, under less situation pressure to be polite, it was simply easier to use *panmal*.

As Julio remarked, “when you’re getting angry at someone and they’re the same age or younger, I think it’s just very easy to talk in any language”.

However, on this point it should be noted that Mieko only put the change of roles down as the secondary reason for her increased use of *panmal*. She pointed out that it was also easier to use *panmal* in the re-run due to the fact that she had already seen the native speaker interlocutor act out this role and was able to copy her behavior. Despite this, the evidence here is fairly conclusive that some L2 speakers of Korean use speech styles as markers of modulation as well as indexical politeness. Such usage at times differs quite markedly from anything reported on L1 honorifics usage and is inherently linked to different perceptions regarding what it means to be polite or to show respect.

### 6.4.2 Use of forms of address

In this section, after looking at the address forms used towards the “friend”, I switch my attention to first person pronouns.

Although the application of first names and second person pronouns are extremely limited in Korean, both can be used to a friend of equal age. Looking at the use of free forms of address first of all, it is common for friends to reciprocate first name in conjunction with the vocative particles -(y)a or -i. As can be seen in the Table 33, the L2 speakers applied this pattern in the vast majority of cases (70.9%). First name only also occurred on six occasions, which represents an acceptable if somewhat blunter term of address. The name+ssi pattern was used only on one occasion (Chin-u). Although this form of address is would not normally be appropriate between close friends, its usage by Chin-u could be viewed as consistent with his application of the {Y} speech style (see Chapter 2).

In Section 6.3.3, we saw how participants used the repetition of *kyoswunim* ‘professor’ in the “professor” role-play as a means of emphasizing the status difference and thus modulating their speech. In a similar way, some subjects in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 33. Free terms of address in friend role-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name + vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“friend” role-play used first name+vocative as a mode of modulation politeness to emphasize solidarity with the intimate and thus mitigate face-threat. In the following extract, Hiroki uses Chŏng-min-a (first name+vocative) before uttering an apology IFID (for being late). This usage acts to remind the hearer of his/her close relationship with the speaker. It hints at an expectation that the friend should accept the apology and forgive Hiroki for his misdemeanors, reminiscent of Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 107) positive politeness strategy of “use in-group identity markers”

(25) Role-play: Hiroki
1 Hiroki → a cengmin-a a manha-ɣ
‘oh Chŏng-min oh I'm sorry-{E}’
2 a manha-ɣ
‘oh I'm sorry-{E}’
3 [com]-
‘a little-’
4 Friend [a] a cikum myech si-ya?
‘oh oh what's the time now?-{E}’

In line with observations made in Section 6.3.3, although there is no direct evidence that L1 speakers employ this kind of politeness “strategy”, it seems reasonable to suggest that such usage may be universal. These examples reiterate that language learners are at times able to successfully apply universal politeness knowledge onto their L2.

The “friend” role-play data provides a less clear picture regarding the use of pronouns and other bound forms of address. Although 20 out of the 24 bound forms of address featured appropriate use of the intimate second person pronoun ne, such usages were limited to only six speakers. The four other bound form tokens consisted of using first name only. This avoidance of pronouns represents somewhat more reserved usage, which may be applied by native speakers towards less-intimate friends or when situational factors dictate the need for additional reserve. Due to the fact that eleven speakers did not use any bound forms at all, I provide no further discussion of this part of the honorifics system at this stage and instead refer readers back to discussions in Chapter 5.

Finally, I briefly comment upon the use of first person pronouns in the “friend” role-play. When interacting with an intimate status equal, the plain na represents the generic means of referring to the self. In total, the L2 speakers applied this form in 154 out of 164 occurrences (93.9%). Only three speakers broke from this norm and inappropriately used the humble ce (Julio, Chin-u, Julie). For the first two of these speakers, their use of ce seems to correspond with the fact that they
struggled to control *panmal* or even purposefully used *contaymal* strategically for modulation politeness. For Julie, a heritage learner who was generally comfortable with *panmal*, her one use of *ce* represented a more isolated production error.

### 6.5 Conclusion

By means of conclusion, I summarize the main points of this chapter in relation to the two goals outlined in the introduction section:

1. confirmation of previous claims regarding the knowledge that L2 speakers possess of honorifics
2. analysis of the affects of "politeness ideology" on the way that L2 speakers use honorifics

Regarding point (1), the role-play data largely confirms the analysis established in Chapter 5 that L2 speakers under-use referent honorifics when addressing status superiors on the one hand and at times avoid *panmal* when addressing equals/ inferiors on the other. Although most participants accepted that they should show respect to the professor, this intention was colored by a lack of awareness regarding the use of high honorifics. In the "friend" role-play, a more marked resistance to using non-honorific styles was identified on the part of some speakers. In addition, the analysis revealed that even advanced learners of Korean experience pragmalinguistic problems with the Korean honorifics system that complicate their attempts to be polite and negotiate "face". Regarding speech styles, even though some participants aimed to use the \{P\} speech style with referent honorifics to the professor and the non-honorific \{E\} and \{T\} styles to the friend, their inability to control these styles often resulted in them resorting to the more familiar \{Y\}.

This chapter provides clear evidence that the way L2 speakers apply honorifics is connected to their perceptions and beliefs regarding politeness. Firstly, the data shows that speakers avoid honorific forms that are considered either "too high" or "too low" due to the incongruity between such forms and their existing social values pertaining to egalitarian and reciprocal human interaction. Certain speakers saw the use of *panmal* towards the friend as potentially "disrespectful", especially according to the contextual factors of the role-play.

More importantly, the role-play data has revealed a fascinating tendency for L2 speakers to manipulate honorifics according to modulation politeness, the mode of human interaction emphasized in Western cultures. In the professor role-play, some participants were shown to upgrade to \{P\} style when apologizing and employ repetition of honorific titles and self-humbling pronouns as linguistic
tools to mitigate their utterances. In the friend role-play, speakers made marked shifts from the non-honorific speech styles to the honorific styles to emphasize "respect" and "sincerity" or otherwise repeated intimate terms of address to accentuate "solidarity". On this point, it should be noted that the strategy that differed the most from native speaker honorifics use was the upgrading to honorific styles as a sign of "respect" when addressing the friend. The belief of some L2 speakers that using honorific speech styles in such situations could "smooth over" the situation or make the friend "feel better" represent frames of honorifics use that are not normally available in the Korean context. As for the other strategies, even though they were not necessarily incompatible with L1 usage, it was remarkable that L2 speakers had acquired these usages in such a developed way, while their development of honorifics in their primary function as social indexicals still frequently showed less variation and sensitivity than what might be expected.
Data analysis: Natural interactions

7.1 Introduction

The two previous chapters identified a number of salient trends in the honorific competence of L2 speakers of Korean. These salient patterns of honorifics use, it has been claimed, do not only reflect the pragmatic knowledge of these speakers, but are also closely tied up with their social identities and their pre-existing ideologies regarding politeness.

However, due to the fact that these two chapters employed artificial means of data elicitation, the analysis has remained incomplete on two accounts. Firstly, there has been no means to confirm how this elicited data correlates with the way that these speakers employ honorifics when they interact naturally with Korean speakers in the real world. Secondly and more importantly, this data has not been able to explore how these patterns of honorifics use and the identities and ideologies reflected in them are actually negotiated and constructed during the contacts that L2 speakers have with the Korean community. The use of authentic natural interactions in the current chapter and the application of "learner stories" in Chapter 8 show that the way L2 speakers use honorifics is not something that they individually impose on the target language community. Rather, honorifics use and what constitutes politeness in L1-L2 encounters is constantly under joint negotiation between the native and non-native parties, with the former as well as the latter initiating salient patterns of usage.

The goals of the current chapter are twofold. Firstly, through the analysis of patterns of honorifics usage emerging in stretches of authentic conversational data, I look at how the identities of L2 speakers are both reflected in and perpetuated through their use of these forms. The data shows that these patterns of honorifics use depend not only on the attitudes and ideologies of the L2 speakers themselves, but also on the attitudes held towards them by the local Korean community. I claim that the salient use of honorifics at times perpetuates social relationships and "faces" that fall outside of typical society "norms". Secondly, I explore in more depth the influence of ideologies pertaining to politeness on the honorifics systems of L2 speakers. The authentic conversational data shows that these pre-existing identities had a profound effect on the way that speakers used honorifics and on the "face" that they presented for themselves in Korean society.
The way that the data is framed and the structure of the chapter follow a similar pattern to Chapter 6. After considering methodological issues in Section 7.2, the data analysis is split across two sections: interactions with status superiors and new acquaintances (Section 7.3) and interactions with intimate status equals and inferiors (Section 7.4). These two frames not only reflect two broad modes of honorifics usage (i.e. honorific *contaymal* and non-honorific *panmal* respectively), but also two distinct modes of identity construction and politeness. The conclusion (Section 5) summarizes the findings in relation to identity and politeness.

7.2 Methodology

In the following discussion of methodology, I cover two broad issues. Firstly, I present the rationale for collecting naturally occurring conversational data. Secondly, I outline the techniques by which the recordings of natural conversations were collected.

The use of naturally occurring data in interlanguage pragmatics has proven increasingly popular in the wake of Firth and Wagner's (1997) seminal calls for a more social and context dependent approach in SLA research (see Chapter 1). Using naturalistic data is the only way to truly capture the way that language use and learning takes place *in situ*. Recordings of natural interactions thus have the advantage over all other methodologies in that the data represents "a true sample of L2 speech ... uninfluenced by artificial aspects of an elicitation method" (Chaudron 2003: 767). Such samples of speech are thus not only more "natural" in the kind of interactions they capture (i.e. between the participant and real colleagues, friends, etc.), but also in that they are "less influenced by the learner’s careful monitoring or application of learned rules of production" (Chaudron 2003: 767).

Methodological problems identified with utilizing recorded naturalistic data have generally concentrated around two concerns: the "participant-observer paradox" (Duranti 1997: 118) and difficulties with gathering sufficient data. Regarding the first of these concerns, the paradox in question is that the presence of the observer and/or his/her recording device may affect the interaction, but the only way to completely diffuse such problems (and stay within research ethics) would be to not observe/record the interaction at all! On this point, Duranti (1997: 118) argues that participants quickly cease paying attention to the presence of the researcher/recording device. In addition, even if participants should modify their behavior, this does not necessarily mean that the data is wholly "unnatural" or that it does not represent a valid target for research. Although participants may alter the way they present themselves, Duranti (1997: 118) points out that this does not mean that they "*invent* social behavior, language included, out of the blue".
As for the second concern, Kasper and Rose (2002: 83) point out that "it may take an unreasonable amount of data to obtain sufficient quantities of the pragmatic feature under study". As well as the danger that data may simply lack sufficient examples of the phenomenon being researched, the collection and analysis of natural interactions is often frustrated by poor quality of sound recordings or other technical difficulties (Chaudron 2003: 767). Although recorded data may be more "natural", insufficient evidence of L2 performance may threaten validity.

I now explain the process by which I obtained recordings of natural interactions from the participants in the current study and steps I took to reduce the potential problems outlined above. First of all, in order to reduce observer affects and to obtain a wider and more interesting range of interactions, I applied what Iino (1996: 9) calls the "remote observation method". Instead of observing the interactions directly, I supplied each participant with a digital recording device over a week-long period with the instructions to record for themselves as many of their normal everyday conversations as possible, similar to the methodology used by Siegal (1994) and Du Fon (1999) in studies of the acquisition of L2 politeness in Japanese and Indonesian respectively. As a minimum, all participants were required to record at least one interaction with an intimate of similar age and one interaction with either a status superior or a new acquaintance. This allowed me to assess linguistic performance in two broad interactional frames and two major patterns of honorifics use: contaymal to superiors/strangers and panmal to intimates.

Participants were issued with instructions and training as to how to carry out the recordings with maximum efficiency and were also briefed regarding the ethical code they were expected to observe. The written instructions are reproduced in Appendix 4, along with a chart in which participants were asked to log their interactions. Discussions of performance on the natural interactions were included in the interview/introspection sessions that I held with each participant.

Through the application of these research techniques, I was able to collect over twelve hours of data consisting of 70 different interactions. However, it should be noted that the amount of recorded data I obtained from each participant varied dramatically, with some speakers being more willing and others more reticent to record natural interactions. In addition, the quality of some recordings was not sufficient for them to be included in the database either because they were inaudible or because the dialogue appeared to be too "staged". On this second point, although I requested participants to provide "natural" interactions, at times the recordings were more akin to pre-arranged language interviews, with the L1 interlocutor taking the role of interviewer/teacher. At such times, the use of honorifics itself was sometimes agreed upon. In one interaction provided by Andriy, this speaker and an intimate Korean interlocutor are heard
agreeing that they should use *contaymal* for the recording. In another interaction, Mark and an acquaintance agree to practice *panmal*. Although the fact that I was supplied with such interactions may provide food for thought for those interested in the adoption of teacher-subject positions in L1-L2 conversation (see for example Wilkinson 2002), the recordings were deemed unsuitable for the current study and were not included in the database.

After the data was collected and transcribed, I set about classifying the interactions into two broad categories: (1) interactions with status superiors and new acquaintances and (2) interactions with intimate status equals and subordinates. These two categories reflect the broad distinction made by Yoon Kyung-joo (2004: 194) between (1) people who should be addressed in/spoken about in honorifics and (2) people who do not need to be addressed/spoken about in honorifics. The adoption of these categories allowed me to differentiate not only between two frames of honorifics use, but also between two different modes of identity construction and negotiation of “politeness ideology”. As shall be seen in the data analysis, these two types of interactions engendered different questions of face and politeness and different patterns of negotiation between L1 and L2 speakers.

During the process of classifying the interactions, I applied the following guidelines:

(1) **status superiors and new acquaintances:**
- all interlocutors 5+ years older
- with discretion, interlocutors 1–4 years older (some exceptions were made when the interlocutor was equal/inferior according to other hierarchical dimensions and/or was sufficiently familiar for mutual non-honorific language to be agreed upon)
- with discretion, interlocutors who were actually younger, but were superior in terms of other hierarchical dimensions
- all adult interlocutors being met for the first time
- with discretion, other adult interlocutors who were not yet sufficiently intimate or did not have an established relationship

(2) **intimate status equals and subordinates:**
- interlocutors of equal or younger age and considered by the L2 speaker to be “intimate” or who had a pre-established relationship (except, with discretion, when other factors came into play – see above)
- with discretion, interlocutors who were 1–4 years older (see above)
- all non-adults

Contrary to expectations, the upshot of the classification was that I had more recording of interactions with status superiors and new acquaintances (41
recordings) compared with intimate status equals and subordinates (29). Several participants complained that recording a conversation with an intimate constituted a more serious breech of their privacy. Furthermore, a small number of the “professionals” lamented that they did not have many close friends with whom they interacted regularly in Korean.

The transcribed data contained a range of different honorific forms. Tables 34–37 summarize the number of tokens of each speech style, referent honorific term and first person pronoun appearing in the natural conversational data. As shown in Table 34, one interesting occurrence of honorifics that appeared in the data was an isolated token of the \{S\} speech style. As noted in Chapter 2, this power-laden and authoritative style has largely disappeared in spoken Korean. However, graduate student and part-time martial arts instructor Holly was recorded using this style during an interaction with a child in her taekkyon (traditional Korean martial art) class.

### Table 34. Speech style tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>{P}</th>
<th>{Y}</th>
<th>{E}</th>
<th>{T}</th>
<th>{S}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 35. Referent honorific tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-si- verbs</td>
<td>nouns</td>
<td>verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 36. Terms of address tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name only</th>
<th>Name + vocative -a</th>
<th>Fictive kinship term</th>
<th>Title + nim</th>
<th>Pronoun ne</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 37. First person pronoun tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ce</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Interactions with status superiors and new acquaintances

The natural interaction data shows evidence of two salient patterns of honorifics use in conversations between L2 speakers and status superiors or new acquaintances. The first pattern involves the usage of non-honorific styles to superiors and new acquaintances – a mode of honorifics use not manifested either in the DCT or role-play data. The second concerns the more general pattern identified previously in the DCT and role-play data of using honorific speech styles, but omitting referent honorifics and other language connected with higher deference and formality. I discuss these two patterns in turn and show how they are tied up with the negotiation of identity and politeness ideology.

The use of non-honorific panmal to status superiors and new acquaintances represents a pattern of usage with the potential for severe face-threat. As outlined in previous sections, omitting honorifics when addressing a superior can be socially taboo and using panmal to strangers is increasingly considered incongruent with modern Korean society. However, the conversational data analyzed in the current chapter, in combination with the interview transcripts and learner “stories” (Chapter 8), show that such usage may at times be negotiable for L2 speakers in their identity as “foreigners” and “language learners”, particularly for certain non-heritage speakers in the exchange student group.

British exchange student Richard was one speaker who found that he was frequently able to use panmal in his interactions around the university even with interlocutors he was meeting for the first time or with those several years older, particularly when they were female. This was not, however, a pattern of honorifics use that he necessarily initiated on his own. The example I look at here comes from a recording made with a new acquaintance – a female student “Su-mi” from the university who was the same age as Richard but whom he was meeting for the first time. Richard had agreed to help this student with her English homework and they had been introduced by a mutual friend just minutes before the recording took place. In contrast to their relationship as “strangers”, the recording captures Richard and Su-mi reciprocating panmal from the start. According to Richard, it was not he but Su-mi who had initiated the use of panmal, which he reciprocated even though he found it “weird”. This observation suggests that it may at times be the L1 rather than the L2 party who triggers salient patterns of honorifics use in L1-L2 encounters. Note in this extract how Su-mi uses the non-honorific {E} speech style in all utterance units, even those with higher potential face threat such as imperatives (lines 4 and 5). Also note Richard’s one slip into the {Y} speech style in line 2, perhaps betraying some discomfort in using panmal to a non-intimate:
(1) Richard: coffee shop, just after ordering coffee, only minutes after they have first met

1 Su-mi  i ke nay ke-ya?
'is this one [coffee] mine-{E}?'

2 Richard  i ke-yo?
'this one?-{Y}'

3 molu-keyss-e
'I don't know-{E}''

4 Su-mi  ne meke pw-a
'have a taste-{E}''

5 ney key tal-myen i ke-n nay ke-ya
'if yours is sweet, then this one's mine-{E}''

6 cokum-man mek-e
'just try a little-{E}''

7 Richard  mas-iss-e ((laughter)))
'it's good-{E}''

8 Su-mi  kulay ((laughter)) . kulem nay ke-nka po-ta
'Alright, then it must be mine-{T}''

9 both  ((laughter))

10 Richard kunyang na-nun khokhoa-na masil ttay selthang manhi neh-umyen [coh-a]
'It's just that when I drink cocoa, I like to add a lot of sugar-{E}''

11 Su-mi  [ung ung]
'yeah''

12 kuntey way ilehkey mall-ass-e?
'so, why are you so thin-{E}''

To an extent, for the exchange students, the reciprocation of non-honorific pan­mal speech styles with new acquaintances did not represent a pattern of honorif­ics use wholly out of tune with the university context. Korean universities have a clear hierarchical structure in which students know fairly quickly who their senpay 'seniors', hwupay 'juniors' and status-equal classmates are and who they may and may not use panmal to. Having said that, the establishment of such roles and relationships do not necessarily apply to Richard and Su-mi. Although they are the same age, they are not classmates, nor do they have an established relation­ship of any other kind. Richard is not meeting Su-mi as a friend, but to help her with homework on a one-off basis. In sum, these factors make the reciprocation of panmal more marked.

Before considering how this reciprocation of panmal corresponded with Richard's beliefs regarding politeness, I pause briefly to consider the reasons why
Korean interlocutors, particularly females, may have quickly downgraded to *panmal* in this way. Firstly, it could be hypothesized that girls such as Su-mi were simply romantically interested in Richard and used panmal as a strategy to increase the level of intimacy. Secondly, during the interviews, Richard expressed the opinion that Koreans tended to use panmal to him from the start due to his non-Korean identity (“I think it’s because I’m a foreigner”). This hints at an apparent belief amongst some Koreans that honorifics are not necessarily required in interactions with non-Koreans, a point I return to in subsequent discussions. Thirdly, the use of panmal also seems to be connected to Richard’s common complaint that Korean females, on hearing him speak Korean, would tell him (rather patronizingly) that he was ‘cute’ (“kwiywewe”). This repeated comment seemed to reveal that these females, rather than seeing Richard as a fully-formed adult member of the community, instead viewed him more like a cute child, towards whom the use of panmal was most appropriate. In summary, the subject position available to Richard in these interactions was that of a cute, younger foreign friend who was a possible object of romance and who thus did not need to be addressed in contaymal.

Although Richard was aware that he was being treated differently due to his non-Korean identity, his attitudes towards this treatment were somewhat mixed. Although he found using *panmal* more “comfortable”, he also felt that there had to be at least a short phase of *contaymal* before this was initiated (“obviously first meeting- the first meeting, there has to be some *contaymal* involved, otherwise I get a little bit irritated”). However, once he had met someone a few times and felt that he was at least on the way towards establishing intimacy, he was happy to receive *panmal*, regardless of age differences. He was happy to receive non-honorific language from those younger than him. Indeed, he would actively encourage this by “telling them to use *panmal*.”

The interview transcripts showed this active encouragement by L2 speakers for their L1 interlocutors to use *panmal* is a common behavioral pattern for L2 speakers. James, for example, reported that he would encourage “friends” up to ten years his junior to use *panmal* to him, commenting that “I’m not going to sit there and say you have to respect me by the rules of your society that I’m not actually really- I think that’s kind of stupid”.

Returning to the case of Richard, for this speaker the belief that *panmal* could be reciprocated regardless of age/rank differences also extended to interactions with his superiors. In the following extract from the interview files, Richard expresses the opinion that it would be possible for him as a “foreigner” to negotiate the use of *panmal* with those older than him “to almost any age”:
Richard's claim that "almost any" age difference can be overcome "at some point" by familiarity represents an obvious break from the Korean L1 reality, where, as previously mentioned, such usage towards notable superiors is taboo. On this point, it is unclear to what extent Richard has actually attempted to negotiate such usage in his real world interactions. During the interview sessions, he discusses using panmal to those up to eight years older, but there is no evidence that he has applied this strategy to his teachers or to noin (elders'), etc.

In the extract above, we see a tension between Richard's statement that he aims to "speak Korean like a Korean" and his claims that, due to his non-Korean identity, he may be able to establish a more egalitarian pattern of language usage. His comment that Korean interlocutors "actually feel more comfortable" in situations in which he has negotiated panmal usage in the face of status differences is particularly interesting. Although this claim is impossible to verify, it reveals that the "foreigner" identity may at times be perceived as an advantage rather than a disadvantage when it comes to establishing intimate relationships with Koreans. In this case, being able to suggest the use of panmal despite age differences was a strategy available at times to Richard as a "foreigner" to establish closer relationships with Koreans that fell outside normal hierarchical roles and responsibilities. The fact that the relationships available to "foreigners" in Korea may at times
permit higher levels of intimacy than those commonly available in native speaker interactions is a point I elaborate on in the Chapter 8.

I now briefly analyze one further example of non-honorific panmal that was classified under this section. Although the reciprocation of panmal in the above example of Richard appears to fall outside the Korean “norm”, the use in this next example is not so easy to judge in this way. Rather, the relationship itself appears to exist outside the more typical (or stereotypical) dimensions of Korean social relationships and thus necessitates the negotiation of its own previously unspecified mode of honorifics. In this example, Austrian exchange student Patrick is in conversation with Yu-mi, a woman in her 30s, in other words, at least seven years older than himself. Despite the age gap being sufficient for this to be categorized as an interaction with a “status superior”, Yu-mi is actually Patrick’s long-term girlfriend. During this conversation recorded in a restaurant, Patrick and Yu-mi reciprocate the {E} and {T} non-honorific styles. It is also noticeable that, in line 9, Patrick addresses Yu-mi with the intimate pronoun ne, which is not normally used in L1 talk towards those older than oneself and is also unusual in a dating context.

(3) Patrick: at restaurant with older girlfriend
1   Yu-mi  ya han pen meke pw-a
       ‘hey, try some of this-{E}’
2   Patrick ung:
       ‘yeah’
3   Yu-mi  kwainchah-ci?
       ‘it’s okay, isn’t it-{E}’
4   com cca-ci?
       ‘it’s a bit salty isn’t it-{E}’
5   Patrick [cokum]
       ‘a little’
6   Yu-mi  […]
7   mek-e
       ‘eat some-{E}’
8   nao-keyss-ci mwe
       ‘yours will come soon-{E}’
9   Patrick kulay ne-to mek-e
       ‘ok you eat too-{E}’
10  Yu-mi  ung:::
       ‘yeah’
11  saykkkal-un yeppu-ta
       ‘the color’s so pretty-{T}’
According to age dimensions, the gap is large enough for the use of *panmal* and *ne* by Patrick to be quite marked. However, does the fact that the two speakers have a romantic relationship cancel out such concerns? If we attempt to answer this question in reference to ideologically invested social norms of the Korean language, it is difficult to establish a clear position. In the case of younger girlfriends addressing older boyfriends, it is the "norm" for the former to use *contaymal* to the latter. However, it is not totally clear whether this applies to cases where it is the boyfriend rather than the girlfriend who is the younger party; or whether the extra power derived from the man's gender should trigger a different pattern of honorifics use. The fact is that the practice of a man dating an older woman is still somewhat frowned upon in Korean society and thus there are no clear guidelines for honorifics usage in such situations.¹ For a man to date an older woman does not only go against tradition, but is also seen as undesirable precisely for the fact that it conflicts the normal ways that power and hierarchy are supposed to work – the power advantage that the boyfriend should possess from his gender is complicated by his inferior age. Thus, the honorifics use between Patrick and Yu-mi cannot be compared or judged against any social norms for the very reason that the relationship itself falls outside normal social parameters. In such situations, the use of honorifics becomes a matter for the two speakers to negotiate between themselves. It appears impossible to argue with Patrick's explanation that "being her boyfriend, I'm allowed to use *panmal* to her".

I now consider the second salient pattern of honorifics use that emerged in recorded interactions between L2 speakers and status superiors/new acquaintances. This involved the pattern already commented upon in Chapters 5 and 6 of L2 speakers applying the honorific {Y} and {P} speech styles but omitting referent honorifics and other modes of (linguistic) behavior that were associated with high "separation". Through the study of natural conversations, the analysis is able to confirm that this pattern extended to real-world interactions and look more specifically at the face concerns and politeness ideologies at play.

---

¹ One anonymous reviewer, whose comments I am most grateful for, expressed the view that use of *panmal* by the boyfriend may in fact constitute the most common mode of interaction and could therefore be considered the "norm". However, not all native speaker informants who I have discussed this point with necessarily agree; a minority preferred the use of *contaymal* (generally according to reciprocal patterns). Ultimately, although I agree with the reviewer that *panmal* may well be the most frequently used speech style in such circumstances, its usage seems to fall short of a clearly established social norm. Thus, my claim that there are "no clear guidelines" would appear to be largely justified.
I begin by reconfirming and elaborating on previous observations that L2 speakers have a tendency to use honorific speech styles but with referent honorifics dropped, this usage being motivated by the impression that referent honorifics were “too high” and represented a mode of linguistic behavior that was subservient and out of tune with their identities as “Westerners”. Interestingly, the natural interactions confirm that this incongruity between a hierarchical mode of interaction and a more egalitarian politeness ideology did not only extend to those born in Western countries, but also to the two UK-resident Japanese participants. The example I look at here was recorded between Hiroki and a Korean student (“Min-su”) two years older than himself who he was meeting for the first time. Extracts from the same conversation were previously analyzed in Brown (2010b: 255–258), although from a slightly different perspective.

In the opening exchanges of this conversation, Min-su asks Hiroki his age:

(4) Hiroki: at the university

1 Min-su \( \rightarrow \) nai-ka etehkey tway-\textit{yo}? \\
    \textit{how old are you-\{Y\}?}\textit{?}

2 Hiroki nai-nun-. phal-sam-nyen-sayng-i-nikka hankwuk nai-lo sumwul= \\
    \textit{my age- because I was born in 1983 in Korean years I am twenty=}ˈ

3 Min-su =sumwul ney sal? \\
    \textit{=twenty four years?}

4 Hiroki sumwul neys \\
    \textit{twenty four}

As noted in Brown (2010b: 255), this question functions to assist speakers in “placing” each other on the age-rank hierarchy and often begins a process whereby speakers adopt honorifics use that reflects their age-based relationship. In line with this, discovering that he is younger than Min-su, Hiroki subsequently suggests that he should address Min-su as hyeng (‘elder brother’) in line 2 below. This use of kinship terms towards an interlocutor of marginally older age is also common, particularly in casual relationships between younger speakers.

(5) Hiroki: at the university

1 Hiroki [laughter] ce- hye- hyeng \\
    \textit{Uh- hye- hyeng [elder brother]}ˈ

2 Min-su \( \rightarrow \) hyeng-i-lako pwulle-to toy-nuntey phal-sip-il-nyen-sayng-i-\textit{eyyo} \\
    \textit{you can call me hyeng [elder brother] since I was born in 1981-\{Y\}ˈ}

With it now having been established that Min-su is Hiroki’s “hyeng”, it would represent the “norm” in Korean native speaker talk for Hiroki to faithfully apply
referent honorifics, at least until intimacy was established. However, as can be seen in the following extracts, Hiroki departs from this “norm” by omitting the referent honorific -si- in all subsequent questions that he asks to Min-su. Notably, (6d) also features the plain term for ‘person’ (salam) which could be substituted for the honorific lexical item pwun when addressing a new acquaintance of superior age.

(6) Hiroki: at the university
   a. Hiroki yeki tayhakwensayng-ie-yyo?
      ‘are you a graduate student here-{Y}?’
   b. Hiroki kwuntay acik an ka-ss-eyo?
      ‘you haven’t been to the army yet-{Y}?’
   Hiroki wenlay sewul- sewul simin-i-eyyo?
      ‘are you originally a Seoul citizen-{Y}?’
   d. Hiroki a: pwusan salam-i-eyyo?
      ‘ah, are you from Busan-{Y}?’

During the introspection sessions, I questioned Hiroki regarding these omissions of -si-. He reported that, although he would use honorifics to people “much older than me”, he did not feel the necessity to use honorifics to non-intimates of marginally older or similar age. Thus, for Hiroki, establishing that the interlocutor was only two years older actually acted as a signal that he did not have to use honorifics:

(7) Interview data: Hiroki
1 Hiroki I have a feeling that if I use too much like eti kyey-si-eyo [where are you-shon-{Y}?] like kyey-si-eyo is very kind of very high, so I wouldn’t use that to somebody who is um... like unless the person is much older than me. I usually use iss-eyo [be:PLA-{Y}]
2 LB So in this situation, he is maybe two years older than you or=
3 Hiroki =two or three years older=
4 LB =two or three years older than you.
5 Hiroki Right.
6 LB So you think with someone who is two years older than you and you are meeting for the first time, you wouldn’t normally use such language?
7 Hiroki I- ... No, I wouldn’t use, no. Maybe it’s inappropriate, but-

For Hiroki, using referent honorifics to a non-intimate of marginally higher status simply felt “too high” and he thus omitted them even though he was aware that
doing so was perhaps "inappropriate". This case directly mirrors the findings of
the DCT analysis in Chapter 5, in which L2 speakers were shown to avoid referent
honorifics at a significantly higher frequency than L1 speakers when addressing a
senp\u00e2y ('senior student') they were meeting for the first time. At that point it was
observed that L2 speakers, in contrast to Korean native speakers, saw age gaps
of two or three years as not being large enough to index through language and
preferred the more egalitarian comfort zone of the \{Y\} speech style with refer-
ent honorifics dropped. Notably, Hiroki's dropping of referent honorifics not only
departs from typical Korean native speaker norms but also from Hiroki's back-
ground in Japanese, where a similar pattern to Korean would be expected.

The above example moreover reveals a tendency for L2 speakers to associate
referent honorifics more strictly with power and age and be less aware of the need
to apply them to adult strangers. This lack of awareness as to the need to use refer-
ent honorifics to strangers may also be influenced in part by the way that honorif-
ic s are taught in the KSL classroom, where the emphasis is firmly placed on using
such forms when a "honored being" such as a teacher or grandparent appears in
subject position rather than on usage towards strangers and non-intimates.

In addition, as previously noted, the exchange student identity limited the
opportunities for developing hierarchical modes of interaction and exposure to
honorific forms that indexed high "separation". "I actually don't have so many op-
portunities to use these kinds of words", complained Hiroki, "it's very difficult for
foreign students to kind of- unless I integrate into Korean society very much".

One final observation regarding this interaction between Japanese-born Hi-
roki and Min-su concerns the honorifics use of the latter. As noted above, after
they had exchanged ages, Hiroki failed to apply referent honorifics, despite being
fully aware that he was the younger party. Interestingly, the opposite applied for
the native speaker Min-su. Despite confirming that he was the elder and agreeing
that Hiroki could address him as hyeng, Min-su makes no attempts to relax his
honorific speech. Admittedly, the fact that they were meeting for the first time
and had no established relationships ( i.e. they were not members of the same de-
partment, university club, etc.) may have blocked a direct drop-down to panmal.
However, the "stranger's" continued use of referent honorifics is somewhat more
surprising, as evidenced in the following excerpts:

(8) Hiroki: at the university
   a. Min-su i pen hakki o-si-ess-eyo?
      'did you come this semester-si-{Y}?'
   b. Min-su ilpon kwukcek-to kaci-ko kyey-si-nun ke-ey-yo?
      'do you have Japanese nationality-si-{Y}?'}
c. Min-su  ilpon mal-to cal ha-si-ci-yo?
   'you can speak Japanese well too, can't you-si-{Y}?'

d. Min-su  → kulemyen .. encey kkuthna-si-eyo? kyohwan haksayng-
   'so when do you finish-si-{Y} as an exchange student'

e. Min-su  → i-pen hakki ha-ko ka-si-nun ke-eyyo
   'after finishing this semester then you're going-si-{Y}?'

In previous discussions in this very section, it was noted that Korean speakers at times drop into panmal more readily when in conversation with L2 speakers. However, the example here shows that the opposite may also apply; in other words, Koreans may continue to use ‘high separation’ forms for longer when interacting with ‘foreigners’. The fact that this latter pattern is actually more commonly attested is confirmed in subsequent discussions. For the time being, I note that in this particular interaction, the reluctance of Min-su to use anything but the highest honorific forms coupled with Hiraki’s inappropriate dropping of referent honorifics results in a pattern of honorifics use wholly out of tune with their clearly established age-rank relationship. Put simply, it is the older Korean rather than the younger L2 speaker who is using the higher honorific forms. Such observations show that L2 speakers’ identities as “foreigners” coupled with their ideologies regarding politeness and human interaction at times result in patterns of honorifics use in L1-L2 encounters that cannot be predicted by factors such as power or distance, even when such factors have been clearly established in the discourse.

It has been stated at several junctures that the avoidance of “high” or subservient honorific forms on the part of L2 speakers reflects the value that these language learners placed on egalitarian language usage, which appears at times to override concerns of abiding by Korean cultural norms. However, I have not yet commented in depth about the perceptions of native speakers towards such use. Did they ever feel that the use of lower honorific forms towards them was face threatening? If they did, what was the result for the L2 speakers both in terms of their presentation of face and also regarding other discourse or personal goals? For insights into these questions, I turn to the case of part-time martial arts instructor Holly and a set of recordings she made while interacting with other members of a thalchwum (a Korean masked dance) group where she was learning this traditional art form. Not only was Holly learning thalchwum out of a general interest in Korean minsok noli (‘folk games, activities’), but she was also collecting data for her Masters dissertation related to minsok noli. The recordings show that whereas status superiors were ready to ignore or accommodate deletion of referent honorifics in more casual one-on-one encounters, such accommodation did not always extend to multi-party speech events, or when the sub-deferential language was accompanied by other face threats.
I look first at one casual encounter between Holly and an elder in which the omission of referent honorifics appeared to go unnoticed and not to result in any obvious face threat. In this extract, Holly is in conversation with another member of the group, Yong-suk, who is in her 50s and also happens to be the wife of the thalchwum instructor. Although Holly reported that they were “quite close”, the age factor should be too great to allow for the dropping of referent honorifics. This is particularly the case given the fact that the Yong-suk is the teacher’s wife. This is a position that traditionally occupies a high level of respect in Korean culture and, indeed, carries its own honorific term of address – samonim ‘one’s teacher’s wife’. However, as Holly questions Yong-suk regarding her reasons for taking the class, note the omission of the subject “honorific” -si- in lines 1 and 4.

(9) Holly: at thalchwum class
1     Holly → i ke encey sicakha-yss-eyo?
       ‘when did you start this-[Y]?’
2     Yong-suk sam-nye:n- sa-nyen twa-yss-na- sa-nyen
       ‘it’s been three-four years-four years-[E]?’
3     sa-nyen cen-ey sicakha-yss-eyo
       ‘I started four years ago-[Y]’
4     Holly → ku mwe: namphyen suwep-i-lase ilehkey? cheum-ey o-ass-eyo?
       ‘that-well-did you come at first because it is your husband’s class-[Y]’
       Yong-suk yey
       ‘yes’

Yong-suk shows no evidence of discomfort from Holly’s lack of honorific language. In addition, she does not display any sign of taking offence from being constantly interrogated by this L2 speaker, in a discourse pattern that differs from the passive mode of interaction typically adopted by Korean subordinates towards their superiors. In fact, the impression given is that she actually enjoyed having this American take such an interest in her and was prepared to accommodate any language use that differed from L1 politeness norms. With Yong-suk also using primarily honorific speech styles, the mode of interaction between this “foreigner” in her 30s and the teacher’s wife in her 50s is egalitarian and reciprocal.

However, another recording that Holly made at thalchwum suggests that other native speakers may not be as lenient, particularly when the omission of referent honorifics occurs in the presence of other bystanders or when the interaction is high in perceived face-threat. In this next extract, Holly is in conversation with three senior members of the thalchwum organization and is asking them about the structure of the administration, evidently with her research firmly in mind. One
point of immediate note here is that the three seniors apply honorifics towards Holly that assert the age-rank relationship; in other words, they use non-honorific *panmal*. For these native speakers, there is no suggestion that they are prepared to negotiate a more egalitarian pattern of language use with Holly, at least not in front of other seniors. A misunderstanding arises following Holly's unwelcome question in lines 1 and 2 as to why the three interlocutors were selected for their posts. The underlying problem is the inherent face-threat of the question itself, which brings up a topic that the interlocutors are not comfortable in discussing, at least not in public. This face threat is increased by the Korean cultural context, in which any public questioning of the authority or rights of seniors or the elderly is heavily disapproved of. Far from attempting to mitigate the face threat of this sensitive question, Holly asks the question "bald on record" and accompanied by non-honorific and casual language. Her repeated use of the plain *myeng* instead of the honorific *pwun* as the counter for "three people" represents one instance of potentially impolite language. This is accompanied by her use of the expression *soli* (literally 'sound'; but also a casual or even somewhat derogatory expression for 'speech, voices, opinions') when referring to the speech of the three. The question and the way it is framed provoke anger from "senior2", who reacts with repeated angry shouts of 'why?' in *panmal* Korean (line 5) and in English (line 7). The use of English appears to mark an attempt to make salient to Holly that she has flouted politeness norms. "Senior1" attempts to placate "senior2" by explaining that the question is related to Holly's studies and it is quickly agreed that the matter should be ignored and asked at a later date and on a one-to-one basis. The suggestion of "senior3" in the final line to ask just "one person" underlines that Holly's linguistic behavior is perceived as inappropriate in this multi-party setting.

(10) Holly: at the thalchwum group

1 Holly ku: yeki-ey ettehkey sey- sey myeng sentaykha-yss-eyo?
   'so here how were the three of you chosen-\{Y\}?'

2 ku yeki an-eyse ku yeki an-eyse sey myeng soli [ttalase]-
   'according to the three of you in here-

3 Senior1 [kuleh-ci]
   'that's right-\{E\}'

4 wuli aneyse- wuli [aneyse-to]
   'between us- even between us'

5 Senior2 [way] way way way? ((angrily))
   'why why why?'

6 Senior1 <X>
   (inaudible)
As previously remarked upon during the analysis of role-play data in Chapter 6, the honorifics use of Holly showed the least variation of any participant in the project – she used the \{Y\} speech style without referent honorifics in the majority of interactions. Given that she had lived in Korea long term, had used Korean extensively in her research and work, had been exposed to ample *contaymal*, had an apparent aptitude for language learning (she spoke Chinese and was learning Tibetan, her husband’s mother tongue) and had an active interest in Korean culture, it was remarkable that her ability to use referent honorifics had not developed further.

Based on the discussions I held with Holly during the interview sessions, I arrived at two conclusions regarding her low frequency of referent honorifics. Firstly, dropping referent honorifics was indicative of a wider “strategy of least effort” (see Chapter 4) that had pervaded her language learning and that had resulted in her relying on the repeated use of a small range of simple and fossilized grammatical forms and vocabulary. As well as ignoring the need for referent honorifics, she also used modality markers and case particles at low frequencies, explaining that she would prefer to drop such elements altogether “rather than making a mistake”. The Korean language was primarily a tool that she required in order to carry out her research and work and this had resulted in her putting a
higher emphasis on the need to use language functionally and to be understood rather than to speak with a fine degree of accuracy or politeness.

Secondly, her low use of referent honorifics was indicative of how she perceived her position in Korean society. Having lectured at universities and being a black belt in thaykkyen (the martial art that she taught), she claimed a degree of social superiority that went beyond her age or position as a graduate student. She also attached importance to the fact that she was a native speaker of English and saw this as giving her extra influence at the university:

(11) Interview data: Holly

I noticed that a lot of professors continued to use honorifics to me even though they were older than me and above me in rank. Maybe this was partly due to the fact that I did not fit into the normal hierarchy that Koreans have. But also, I was very important to them because I was the only person around who was a native speaker of English but could also speak Korean. They knew that they had to maintain good relationships with me because I could write them perfect English abstracts.

As can be seen in this extract, although Holly is aware that her social position as a foreigner "did not fit into the normal hierarchy", she also views her powerful position as a native speaker of English who can also speak Korean as providing her with extra social mobility. Rather than seeing herself as being subordinate to the Korean professors and reliant on them for their assistance or benevolence, she views her language abilities as creating a situation in which the professors are dependent on maintaining good relationships with her. Despite Holly viewing her social position in this way, it is of course impossible to verify whether the Korean interlocutors would have shared such views. Indeed, as shown previously in example (10), positioning herself in this way may in actual fact have compromised her local discourse goals, particularly when operating in multi-party settings. I shall comment further on the honorifics use of Holly in the forthcoming section.

7.4 Interactions with intimate status equals and subordinates

The recordings of natural interactions confirm that speakers of Korean as a second language may display salient patterns of honorifics use not only when interacting with superiors and strangers, but also when conversing with friends and those younger than them. In total, out of twenty-nine recorded interactions classified as those with "intimate status equals and inferiors", approximately one
third featured honorific *contaymal* rather than the more normative *panmal*. The data confirms that this salient usage of *contaymal* was generally limited to certain speakers – particularly professionals and non-heritage speakers. I begin the section by considering some of the more fluent examples of *panmal* occurring in the data and by looking at the roles and identities available for certain speakers to develop competence in this part of the language. I then turn my attention to speakers who experienced difficulties in establishing relationships where non-honorific language could be applied and provide detailed analysis as to why this should be the case, particularly in relation to politeness.

The natural interaction transcripts provide direct evidence of the advantage that the “exchange students” possessed over the “professionals” when it came to developing identities in which the use of *panmal* was appropriate. Although the position of exchange students within the overall university structure was not always clearly defined (see Chapter 4), they nonetheless gained acceptance as “peers” by fellow Korean students of same/similar age that they met through *tongali* (‘university clubs’) or through other casual interactions. Through interacting with such “peers”, the exchange students were socialized into casual, intimate relationships in the Korean context and the use of informal language, including *panmal*. Often recorded in the coffee shops and bars around the university, these interactions generally featured discussion of relatively superficial subject matters, typified by the following extract recorded by Patrick. In the extract, this Austrian exchange student from an Australian university discusses with two intimates of similar age (“A-rům” and “Sang-hun”) whether to order more ice cream:

(12) Patrick: ice-cream shop
1 Patrick a mas-iss-ta  
‘*oh it tastes good*—[T]’
2 tto mek-ko siph-ney  
‘*I want to eat more*—[E]’
3 A-rům tto mek-ko siph-e?  
‘*do you want to eat more*—[E]?’
4 Patrick hana te mek-ulkka?  
‘*shall we eat one more*—[E]?’
5 A-rům ((laughter)) akka way cak-key sikhy-ess-e?  
‘*why did you order such a small one before*—[E]?’
   [...]  
6 Patrick ettekha-ci?  
‘*what should we do*—[E]?’
7 te mek-ulkka?  
‘*shall we eat some more*—[E]?’
This short extract displays several key patterns of the language usage and socialization of the exchange students. Firstly, the fact that *panmal* was used by all speakers – including Patrick – confirms that the exchange students could generally gain acceptance into groups of Korean friends at the university, even if they were of non-Korean heritage. When interacting within these groups, the way they were treated – including the language and honorifics they received – rarely differed significantly from how the other Korean native speaker group members related to each other. Secondly, thanks to these kinds of opportunities to interact and socialize, speakers such as Patrick developed accurate and fluent *panmal* extending over a number of sentence forms and functions, which, as attested in the previous chapter, was not always the case with non-heritage "professionals". In the example above, Patrick is shown employing the {T} speech style in an exclamatory expression (line 1) and the {E} speech style with the epistemic modal endings -ci- (line 6) and -ney (line 2) and with the tentative interrogative -ulkka (lines 4, 7, 16).

Thirdly, and on a more negative note, the example underlines that these interactions with "peers" were generally simple in structure, both at the discourse and at the sentence level. Contributions by the L2 learners often consisted of monoclusal peripheral comments rather than utterances with developed propositional content. By using such utterances, the second language speakers managed their participation in the dialogue and aligned themselves with their Korean interlocutors. However, the frequencies at which they maintained longer turns or used
more complex grammatical structures or vocabulary were limited. The upshot was that although these learners developed fluency with non-honorific speech style endings, their knowledge of advanced grammar, vocabulary - and of course with the formal and deferential language needed when interacting with status superiors – often lagged behind the fluency of their casual Korean.

The natural interaction data suggests that these opportunities to establish casual panmal relations extended to some of the heritage speakers within the professionals group as well. James and Julie in particular showed evidence of widespread panmal relationships. In the case of James, this contrasted to some extent with the DCT data in Chapter 5 which showed him to be a cautious user of non-honorific styles. However, in natural interactions with intimates, he was revealed to be a confident and fluent panmal user, as in the following conversation with an intimate female (“Hye-rim”) two years his junior:

(13) James: at James’s home
1 James ne tayhakkyo eti tani-ess-ni? ‘where did you go to university-{T}?’
2 Hye-rim tongtek yeca tayhakkyo-lako ‘it’s called Dongduk women’s university’
3 yetay nao-ass-e ‘I graduated from a woman’s university-{E}’
4 James ((laughter)) yeksi ne-lang ‘no wonder you and=’
5 Hye-rim =cal ewully-e? ‘=it suits me-{E}?’
6 James ni-ka ttak yetay yay-ya ‘you are a girl just like those in woman’s universities-{E}’
7 Hye-rim nay-ka? ‘me?’
8 James ung ‘yeah’

Similar to the observations made regarding interaction (11) above, (12) shows James to be fluent in a range of different panmal speech style endings and associated non-formal language. In addition to consistently applying the {E} speech style, he uses {T} in an interrogative in line 1 – a form reserved for addressing age-rank inferiors. In line 6, James uses two intimate and colloquial forms of address to refer to Hye-rim: ni (‘you’ – variant of the canonical ney) and yey (literally meaning ‘child’ – translated above as ‘girl’). Thus, although both speakers are reciprocating panmal, James’s use of {T} as well as ni and yey work to index his
position as marginally older, reflecting the fact that he is two years senior. Not only is James comfortable in this role, but Hye-rim also appears willing to accept him as an “older brother”. This can be verified from the way that she never “challenges” the way that James indexes his position in this way. As such, we can see that heritage speakers such as James could successfully negotiate intimate relationships that fitted typical Korean modes of interaction. This contrasts with the experiences of some non-heritage professionals, who will be shown in Chapter 8 to be less successful in casting themselves in roles such as “older brother”.

It should be reiterated at this point that the added fluency that heritage speakers enjoyed in their application of panmal did not always correlate with an advanced knowledge of when these forms could be appropriately used. Looking back at DCT data in Chapter 5, although results showed heritage speakers to come closer to the L1 norm than their non-heritage counterparts, they nevertheless differed from L1 speakers in vital ways. As a case in point, even fluent panmal users such as James tended to undergeneralize the application of non-honorific language on the DCT. In addition, interview transcripts from other heritage speakers including Eun-chae showed that these participants could also suffer from uncertainty and insecurity when it came to downgrading to panmal:

(14) Interview data: Eun-chae
   The main problem I have is knowing when to use panmal. When I joined a tongali ['university club'], I just used contaymal to everyone, because I didn't want to step on anyone's toes. But this kind of annoyed some people, because always using contaymal is not very good for developing friendships.

Ultimately, being exposed to Korean in the home environment did not necessarily entail any advantage when it came to developing frames of knowledge regarding what constituted appropriate honorifics use in wider society. As noted by Jo Hye-young (2001), despite the early exposure to the language that heritage learners enjoy, they generally lack the context to practice various levels of honorifics. For heritage learners to be socialized in a wider range of honorifics use, regular contact with the extended family has been deemed important (see Park Eun-jin 2006). However, none of the heritage speakers participating in the current study had enjoyed regular chances to participate in such interactions throughout their childhood.

I now discuss the tendency for the “professional” identity to limit the opportunities to negotiate casual panmal relationships, even for some of the heritage speakers in this category. The possibilities for establishing casual relationships were first of all complicated by the absolute ages of these participants, which was
30.3 years on average. Even for Korean native speakers, initiating or maintaining casual panmal relationships becomes more difficult with increased age. As Lee and Ramsey (2000: 268) point out, from "around the age of marriage" social relationships become "more serious and formal" and the establishment of panmal relationships becomes thus more restricted.

In addition, whereas the exchange students could, to a certain extent, treat other students in the university as their status equals and peers, establishing such relationships proved more problematic for the professionals and this greatly limited their chances of developing competence in panmal. For those working in Korea as English teachers, editors or voice actors, their position often lay somewhat outside of the hierarchical structure of the Korean organization and they thus had no clearly defined peers as such. As for the graduate students, relationships with fellow classmates were not as casual as those of the exchange students and their "foreigner" identity often resulted in the reciprocation of honorific contaymal. "Professionals" were thus simply not as accustomed to using panmal and operating in the degree of casualness that it entailed. "I don't hear that much panmal", complained Australian graduate student Russell, "and when I do hear it, it sounds a little bit rough, so I tend to avoid roughness."

I begin my analysis of the tendency for contaymal to be widely reciprocated during interactions featuring "professionals" by looking at an extract recorded by heritage speaker Alice. The recording captures her in conversation initially with two Korean native-speaker classmates ("Po-ram" and "So-yŏng") at the international graduate school she was attending in Seoul. Despite being of similar age and intimate with these interlocutors, Alice reported that they always reciprocated the honorific {Y} speech style, except perhaps, in her own words, "if we're really drunk". However, the extract suggests that this reciprocation of {Y} within the graduate school only extended to interactions involving L2 speakers and that the native speaker students would use panmal amongst themselves. In this extract, Alice reciprocates {Y} with Po-ram and So-yŏng up until line 6. However, when a third Korean student ("Kyo-min") enters the room, the balance of the interaction is somehow altered and the three native speakers all slip into the non-honorific {E} and {T} styles. The only speaker to use {Y} after the entrance of intimate 1 is Alice (lines 8, 10).

2. According to official government marriage and divorce statistics for 2005, the average age at which South Koreans marry for the first time was 30.9 for men and 27.7 for women. Given that the average age of the professional group was 30.1, these speakers could have been perceived as being "around the age of marriage".
Alice did not appear unduly concerned by the fact that the mode of honorifics employed in this international graduate school differed from the widespread Korean pattern, nor that it was herself and the other “foreigners” who seemed to be giving and receiving most of the contaymal. During the interview sessions, she commented that this created a work-like environment which suited her. And if people erred on the side of caution with the contaymal, then this simply made sense seeing as the graduate school contained overseas students from a variety of backgrounds. In such a setting, Korean cultural norms did not necessarily apply. Besides, as previously noted in Chapter 5, Alice was one of the participants for whom using the \{Y\} speech style represented the most “comfortable” mode of interaction. Neither too casual nor too formal, \{Y\} represented the ultimate strategy for balancing her pre-existing politeness ideologies with a semblance of
Korean-style deference (see Chapter 5). Seeing as Alice was of Korean ancestry, this example constitutes additional evidence that heritage speakers may also opt for caution when it comes to using non-honorific language, despite their exposure to such forms during childhood. In addition, the example reveals that heritage speakers despite their “Korean” identities may at times receive honorifics that differ from typical native speaker norms.

For other speakers, the avoidance of *panmal* represented a more obvious transfer of native language politeness ideologies. This particularly applies to the case of Holly, the part-time martial arts instructor whose unconditional use of the {Y} speech style without referent honorifics has already been commented upon both in this chapter and the previous one. Although she admitted that one reason for her near total avoidance of *panmal* was that she simply did not have “a bunch of Korean friends that are incredibly close to me”, the recordings show that she avoided non-honorific language with those few intimates who she had the opportunities to interact with.

The following example is from a conversation recorded between Holly and an intimate several years younger than herself. During the interviews, Holly reported that this interlocutor was someone she was highly intimate with and who she considered to be her *tongsayng*. This term, literally meaning ‘younger sibling’ can be used in a fictive sense to refer to younger intimates. As noted in Brown (2010b: 258), it is particularly used towards “a younger intimate that the speaker feels a particular attachment towards and is prepared to protect and nurture, as one may do towards a biological younger sibling”. In some ways, the dialogue between Holly and the “*tongsayng*” displays language and behavioral patterns that we may expect to occur in the Korean context between speakers in this kind of intimate but non-egalitarian relationship. As in the extract below, Holly initiates all of the question-response turns, here asking the “*tongsayng*” about his plans for the next day. She then provides advice regarding the best way for the “*tongsayng*” to travel. However, what differs from native speaker “norms” is Holly’s refusal to use non-honorific speech. During the introspection sessions, Holly reported that this “*tongsayng*” had requested to her on several occasions to “*mal-il noh-usi-eyo*” ‘put down the language’, in other words, to use non-honorific speech styles to him. This request represents the conventionalized way for asymmetrical patterns of honorifics use to be initiated in situations where one speaker is of higher age-rank than the other. However, she had refused to accept the offer and had continued to use honorific *contaymal*.

---

3. A different extract from this same recording was previously analyzed in Brown (2010b: 259).
The interview sessions revealed Holly's reasons for avoiding panmal in interactions such as the above to be rather complex. First of all, she was quick to point out that she had actually "learned" panmal when she first came to Korea and was living in the provincial city of Daegu (Gyeongsang-do) through "drinking with Korean friends". However, the variety of panmal she had acquired was heavily infused with Gyeongsang dialect, featuring a number of non-honorific endings that do not occur in Seoul Korean. This resulted in frequent misunderstandings or negative reactions from Korean interlocutors. One example of these endings and the problems associated with it was captured in the recording of an interaction between Holly and a child pupil (Hyŏn-jin) in her martial arts class. In line 1 of the following extract, Holly rounds off the predicate with the ending -ka, which is used in Gyeongsang dialect to indicate a yes/no question. Hyŏn-jin fails to understand the utterance, prompting Holly to recast in line 3. This time, she nominalizes the verb with the construction -(nu)ń kes in a rather un-native attempt to
avoid adding a speech style ending. With Hyŏn-jin still struggling to understand, Holly finally gives up on *panmal* and resorts to the {Y} speech style in line 7.

(17) Holly: at *thaykkyen* (traditional Korean martial art) class

1. Holly → *ilki ssu-l ttae hankwuke-lo sse-ka?*
   ‘when you write a diary do you write in Korean-ka?’

2. Hyŏn-jin ney?
   ‘yes? [=pardon?]’

3. Holly hankwuke-lo *ssu-nun ke?*
   ‘the thing you write it in Korean?’

4. Hyŏn-jin *mwe-yo?*
   ‘what [do I write in Korean]-{Y}?’

5. Holly *il:ki:*
   ‘diary’

6. Hyŏn-jin ney ilki
   ‘yes, diary’

7. Holly hankwuke-lo *sse-yo?*
   ‘do you write in Korean-{Y}’

These kinds of problems understanding Holly’s use of dialectal speech style endings may well have been chiefly limited to child interlocutors, who were perhaps less familiar with Gyeongsang dialect. In the case of adults, Holly reported that they would generally understand the utterance, but greet it with peels of laughter and that this discouraged her from using non-honorific speech. “That pisses me off”, she complained, “I don’t want you to crack up when I’m talking to you […] this stops me using *panmal* so much”.

However, the negative reactions to Holly’s Gyeongsang dialect only tell half the story as to why she avoided non-honorific speech styles. The interview sessions revealed that she had no desire to use these speech styles anyway, except perhaps with children (see above) or when angry or insulting people (see below). Rather, as noted in my previous discussions of this participant in Brown (2009) and Brown (2010b: 258–260), her principal reason for not using non-honorific *panmal* was that she viewed these forms as being “impolite” and believed that it would be “disrespectful” to use them, even towards people who were of lower age/rank or whom she was intimate with. As such, Holly’s understanding of the social meanings of using *panmal* towards intimates differs markedly from the perception of such forms in Korean native speaker interaction, where such usage is commonly associated with reduced power and distance and with feelings of closeness and intimacy.
As observed in Brown (2009) and Brown (2010b: 260), Holly’s perception of *panmal* as being “impolite” and “disrespectful” appears to be influenced by culturally-specific meanings of “respect” in Korean and “Western” society. In Korean culture, “respect” is discussed in terms showing appropriate deference to elders or superiors and is closely associated with language and the use of *contaymal* (尊待말; ‘respect speech’). In Anglophone culture, “respect” can also have similar meanings, but is more commonly discussed in terms of revering someone for their achievements or just respecting someone as a fellow human being and not infringing on their human rights. Thus, whereas the use of “non-respectful” language in the Korean context merely indexes that the hearer is “equal” or “below” the speaker in the status hierarchy, for Holly the use of such language became tied up with altogether more negative feelings of slighting that person or infringing their human rights.

Although Holly perhaps represented an extreme case, readers will remember that this feeling that using *panmal* could be “disrespectful” also appeared during discussions in the previous chapter regarding the reasons for participants to upgrade to the {Y} speech style when apologizing in the “friend” role-play. In addition, heritage speaker Chin-u commented during the interview sessions that using *panmal* towards women felt “disrespectful” to him, although he clarified this by adding that the fact that he was “not used to it yet” was probably a contributing factor. The learner story data in the following chapter (Chapter 8) also includes an incident involving one participant feeling that he was being disrespected when a superior spoke down to him in *panmal*. These examples provide perhaps the clearest evidence of L2 learners directly transferring “Western” ideology pertaining to politeness directly onto their perception and usage of Korean honorific forms.

During the interview sessions, Holly was quick to point out that there were some situations in which she would use *panmal* in addition to the faltering attempts with children discussed above. Of most interest to the current discussion, these situations were those in which she thought she did not need to show “respect”, at least according to the Western conceptualization of the term. More specifically, when she felt that someone had shown a disregard for her own rights and

---

4. As noted in Brown (2010b: 260), these different commonsense conceptualizations of “respect” are mirrored in dictionary definitions of the term. Korean “*contay*” is defined as: (1) “to deal or treat someone by deferentially elevating them”, and (2) “to deal with someone in a respectful manner of talking”, and (3) “to use honorifics such as the respectful verb endings -*pnita*, -*supnita* and -*psita* [the {P} speech style] when the listener is higher than the speaker or in the expression of special respect” [source: kwukpkwukkeyenkwwuen phyocwunkwuketasese; translation my own]. English “respect”, on the other hand, is defined as: (1) “a feeling of admiration for someone because of their qualities and achievements”, (2) “due regard for the feelings or rights of others” [source: Oxford English Dictionary].
feelings and had therefore forfeited their right to respect, she would purposefully use *panmal* in her subsequent expression of anger. In Brown (2009) and Brown (2010b: 260), I quoted Holly claiming that she used *panmal* “when I get pissed off” and “as soon as someone is an asshole to me” and presented the example of Holly using *panmal* towards a taxi driver who had mistaken her for a “Russian prostitute”. Here, I present another similar example:

(18) Interview data: Holly
I have also yelled at a people in *panmal* in stores. Like, I go in there and I have been in their store 30 minutes asking about sizes, colors, shapes, styles. And then when it comes time to like add up the bill, they stick the calculator in my face. Then I will tell them in *panmal* – “do you think I can’t understand Korean?”. When I’m in the wrong mood, I’ll start yelling. I’m kind of irritable.

On the surface, Holly’s use of *panmal* to express anger does not greatly differ from some of the “strategic” uses of honorifics in native speaker conversation reported in the literature. Indeed, the example appearing in Brown (2009) and Brown (2010b: 260) of Holly using *panmal* towards a taxi driver is in some ways reminiscent of an example discussed by Lee Jung-bok (1999: 112), although in this case it is the driver himself who uses *panmal*. After a minor collision on the motorway, the male taxi driver in question uses *panmal* to the female driver of the other car in what Lee describes as a conscious attempt to express anger and draw out his power advantage. The difference between this example and that of Holly is that the native speaker taxi driver could be said to have firmer grounds on which to assert his authority and use non-honorific language towards the other driver, who after all is younger than himself. Evidently, such concerns do not feature in the decision by Holly to “yell” at taxi drivers (or sales assistants) in *panmal*. Moreover, whereas for Korean speakers, using *panmal* to express anger is very much a secondary or additional mode of usage, for Holly this appears to represent her primary usage of non-honorific speech.

Fascinating as Holly’s attitudes towards *panmal* may seem, it is important to recognize that these beliefs did not extend to all of the “professionals” who underserved the non-honorific styles. Others aimed to use *panmal* but were frustrated by their inability to establish non-honorific relationships and complained about being continually addressed in *contaymal* by their Korean interlocutors. Such participants saw the gap between the language Koreans used with other Koreans and the language that developed in their own encounters as something that stigmatized them as “foreigners”. For these speakers, the extra “separation” of *contaymal* blocked their attempts at developing intimacy with their peers or becoming fully accepted into social groups. Mark, for example, complained that, both at the
university and at the church he had been attending, “I hear a lot of panmal going on, but when they speak to me, it’s almost always in contaymal, so it’s kind of like a barrier”. This participant complained that he had relationships in which he felt panmal should be being spoken, but the other party never suggested it and he himself lacked the confidence to “jump in” with it first, being unsure where the “line” between contaymal and panmal lay. The recorded data included the following interaction with a Korean student (Sang-gün) a few years younger than himself that fitted this category:

(19) Mark: at coffee shop
1 Mark wuli-nun onul kyohoy-eyse mwusun cwungkwuk senkyosa wuli kyohoy-ey o-ass-eyo
‘today at our church some kind of Chinese missionary came to our church-[Y]’
2 Sang-gün a:
‘ah’
3 Mark wuli ku salam-hako iyaki manhi ha-yss-ketun-yo
‘we spoke a lot with him you see-[Y]’
kul salam-un wenlay-nun mikwuk- mikwuk salam-i-ntey caki pwu-mo-nun mikwuk salam-i-ko tayman-ey calan-ass-eyo
‘he’s originally an American and his parents are American and he was brought up in Taiwan-[Y]’
4 tayman-eyse thayenako cikum cwungkwuke cayensulepkey yuchanghakey mal hal swu iss-ko yenge mal hal swu iss-eyo
‘he was born in Taiwan and now he speaks Chinese naturally and fluently and can also speak English-[Y]’
[...]
8 cwungkwuk-ey tayhayse kulen iyaki manhi ha-yss-eyo
‘we spoke a lot about China-[Y]’
9 Sang-gün towum-i twa-yss-na-yo?
‘did it help-[Y]’
10 Mark yey?
‘what?’
11 Sang-gün ce pen ttay iyakiha-yss-ten key com towum com twa-yss-eyo?
‘did it help with what you were talking about last time-[Y]’
12 Mark molu-keyss-eyo
‘I don’t know-[Y]’

Mark shared none of the negative attitudes towards panmal reported in the previous discussions of Holly. To the contrary, he described panmal as being “fun to use”, “much more interesting [than contaymal]” and commented that using it
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"feels like a different world". However, in large part due to the lack of opportunities to interact in panmal that were available to him as a graduate student, he lacked clear "frames" pertaining to the usage of non-honorific styles. Without this knowledge, he did not possess the confidence to initiate panmal himself and assert an intimate Korean identity. "Maybe if I just jumped in with panmal everything would be great", reflected Mark, blaming his more reserved personality for being unable to do this - "I think its easier for people with a more open personality who fit in with groups more easily"

7.5 Conclusion

Discussions in the current chapter have confirmed that two of the salient patterns recognized in the elicited data in Chapters 5 and 6 extend to real world interactions and has uncovered the presence of one further pattern. The two patterns evidenced in all three data sets involve (1) the tendency for L2 speakers to omit referent honorifics or other forms connected with high separation and (2) the tendency for some L2 speakers (particularly professionals and/or non-heritage speakers) to avoid panmal. The one new pattern emerging in the data is for some exchange students to reciprocate panmal with strangers and even potentially with those several years older than themselves, although the application of this pattern would appear to be somewhat limited. In this conclusion, I summarize the findings regarding these three patterns and comment on how these usages fit in with the identities and politeness ideologies of the participants.

Looking at the new pattern of panmal use towards strangers/elders first of all, it was shown that this pattern was facilitated by the "exchange student" identity and was strongly influenced by the attitudes of the Korean community. On the most basic level, being an "exchange student" and operating in the more casual university setting allowed for panmal relations to be established more quickly and as a matter of course. However, such uses of panmal were not necessarily initiated by the L2 speakers, but more typically by their L1 interlocutors. It was posited that some L1 speakers might conclude that honorifics are not required when conversing with "foreigners", particularly those who are "English speakers". As a result, exchange students such as Richard had developed liberal pragmatic frames regarding the contexts in which panmal could be appropriately applied, and mistakenly believed that such forms could be negotiated with speakers of all ages.

The tendency for L2 speakers to omit referent honorifics was shown to be influenced both by a lack of pragmatic knowledge and also by the incongruity between such forms and the more egalitarian politeness ideology of "Westerners". I argued that L2 speakers have a distinct lack of awareness of the need to apply
such forms in interactions with strangers, marginal status superiors and intimate superiors. In part, this was accounted for by a "strategy of least effort" on the part of these speakers and the possibility of dropping such forms without affecting the propositional content of their speech. However, it was also maintained that the use of these forms went contrary to the identities of participants and also to the social positions they claimed for themselves in Korean society. Since they did not perceive themselves as being socially inferior to those marginally older than themselves (or to intimate notable superiors), L2 speakers preferred to drop referent honorifics and establish a more egalitarian mode of interaction. However, as a caveat, it was shown that such flouting of social "norms" might compromise the discourse goals of L2 speakers, particularly in multi-party encounters.

Finally, the use of natural interactions established the reasons why some L2 learners – particularly professionals and/or non-heritage speakers – may under-generalize or even totally avoid non-honorific panmal. The data analysis featured examples of the kind of interactions and socialization into casual panmal usage from which exchange students and heritage speakers benefited and contrasted these with the continued maintenance of contaymal in the recordings provided by professionals. The absolute ages and social positions of the professionals compromised their opportunities to establish casual social relationships. They thus lacked not only the fluency in these forms, but also the knowledge of when they could be applied. In addition, the case of graduate student and martial arts instructor Holly shows that different cultural ideas regarding what it means to show "respect" may play a key role in explaining the avoidance of non-honorific panmal by some speakers. This speaker was shown to deliberately avoid non-honorific styles out of a belief that they were universally disrespectful and impolite.
CHAPTER 8

Data analysis: Honorific sensitive incidents

8.1 Introduction

For the final segment of the data analysis, I maintain the focus on honorifics use in real world interactions. However, the data employed here does not consist of recorded interactions, but learner stories — accounts of actual incidents that participants had experienced during their interactions with Korean native speakers. These stories, which were collected during the interview sessions, involve situations in which the use of honorifics either of the learners themselves or of their interlocutors led to misunderstandings, confusion or questions regarding identity or "face". Inspired by Helen Spencer-Oatey’s (2002) study of politeness in the interactions of Chinese students living in the UK, I rework her original terminology of "rapport sensitive incidents" into the more specific "honorific sensitive incidents" to refer to these stories.

The analysis of these narratives allows for in-depth discussion of the effects of social identity on the use of honorifics. I focus primarily on analyzing stories that concerned, on the one hand, honorifics use that reflected the attitudes of the local community and the identities that they offered to the L2 speakers (Section 8.4) and, on the other hand, honorifics use that was tied up with the attitudes of the L2 speakers and the faces that they tried to claim for themselves (Section 8.5). However, I pause briefly in Section 8.3 to look at stories that involved pragmalinguistic deficiencies, which result in complications in the presentation of face for these L2 speakers.

8.2 Methodology

Movements in interlanguage pragmatics towards a more emic perspective on language learning in which the individual experiences, attitudes and emotions of learners are fore-grounded rather than side-lined have resulted in increased interest in language-learning stories. The difficulty for researchers has been how to package learner voices into a structured research framework.
One methodology with something of a recognized research tradition has been the use of "diary studies", in which data is collected either from the language learning journals of researchers themselves (for example Schmidt and Frota 1986; Cohen 1997) or from groups of language learners, typically undergraduate students on their language year abroad (see Polanyi 1995; Miller and Ginsberg 1995 and Brecht and Robinson 1995 for reports on the largest study of this kind).

An alternative methodology pioneered in cross-cultural pragmatics and politeness research is the collection of what Spencer-Oatey (2002) calls "rapport sensitive incidents". Spencer-Oatey asked 14 Chinese students in the UK to keep written records of any incidents that involved issues of politeness or face concerns – more broadly packaged as "rapport" in Spencer-Oatey's framework. The students were asked to take note of incidents that "had some kind of particularly negative effect" and instilled emotions such as being "annoyed, insulted, embarrassed, humiliated" as well as incidents that "had some kind of particularly positive effect" and caused them to feel "happy, proud, self-satisfied". The 73 stories collected are analyzed in terms of the kinds of face concerns or cultural conflicts that they embody. Spencer-Oatey's approach thus allows for the focused analysis of incidents that involve dispute or conflict between the cultural knowledge and identity of language learners and the norms and expectations of the local community.

The current study draws on Spencer-Oatey's idea of collecting retellings of incidents that involved conflict, but re-aligns the methodology according to important differences between Spencer-Oatey's project and my own. Firstly, due to the specific focus of my book on Korean honorifics, I only collected incidents that were related to these forms – "honorific sensitive incidents". Furthermore, since the current study employs cross-sectional rather than longitudinal methodology, it was not possible to collect reports of incidents as they happened in real time. Instead, I asked participants to report incidents retrospectively, looking back over their recent experiences using Korean. These stories were collected orally during the interview sessions that I held with each participant. During these sessions, I questioned participants in detail about the honorifics they used and received in every day life, employing the questions reproduced in Appendix 5 as a guide. These questions included one particular item designed specifically to elicit salient incidents, as shown in Figure 24.

One difference between the methodology adopted in the current study and that of Spencer-Oatey (2002) was the focus solely on collecting experiences that had a "negative effect". During the interviews, participants were not specifically asked to supply narratives regarding positive or empowering experiences using honorifics. In asking for incidents that caused "discomfort" (see Figure 24), I
(18) Finally, I would like you to think of any incidents that happened when you experienced “discomfort” due to either your own or another person’s (mis)use of honorifics. “Discomfort” includes emotions such as being offended, angry, irritated and embarrassed or just feeling that either your own or another’s behavior was incongruous, inappropriate, shocking and strange. The incidents might be times when you experienced difficulty in using honorifics, times when people reacted to your honorifics use or times when you were surprised by the honorifics use of others.

Figure 24. Sample item from the interview questions

extended Spencer-Oatey’s idea of “negative” to include feelings of incongruity and inappropriateness in addition to emotions more directly associated with face concerns such as offence and embarrassment. This move was inspired by the research of Tsuruta (1998) and her use of the broad notion of “discomfiture” as a barometer for measuring negative reactions to “impoliteness”. Due to the focus on negative and face-threatening narratives, readers will notice that themes of anger, frustration and estrangement run through many of the “stories” that were collected.

Collecting stories in this way proved extremely productive and I was able to amass a database of 122 incidents. However, when it came to analyzing the data, one problem was that many of the stories were constructed across multiple turns of the interview. Not only did this complicate the analysis of the stories, but it also posed the problem of how to present such data clearly and efficiently in the current chapter. After considerable thought, I made the difficult decision to abridge the stories into coherent bodies of text, omitting my own contributions and any comments by the participants not directly related to the “story”. I also deleted unnecessary repetition, created sentence boundaries and made occasional alterations to sentence order. However, I was careful to maintain the original language used by the participants and to preserve something of the “spoken feel” of the narratives. To satisfy ethical concerns, all of the re-written incidents were shown to participants for their approval.

After converting the stories into this more easily manageable form, the next task was to organize the incidents for analysis in the current chapter. Narratives were classified according to whether they primarily involved pragmalinguistic deficiencies on the part of the L2 speaker him/herself (analyzed in Section 8.3), feelings of being treated differently by receiving inappropriate non-honorific language (Section 8.4.1) or honorific language (Section 8.4.2) and finally negotiations of a Korean identity (Section 8.5.1) or of an identity that fell outside Korean “norms” (Section 8.5.2). The numbers of narratives that corresponded to each of these categories are displayed in Figure 25.
This opening section of the data analysis looks at a large body of “honorific sensitive incidents” in which the L2 speakers recount pragmalinguistic failures in their application of Korean honorifics. In the majority of the 26 incidents collected, this pragmatic failure resulted in some kind of negative feedback (correction, reaction, etc.) from native speaker interlocutors (20 incidents). On this point, it should be noted that the discussions classified under “negotiation of face” in Section 5 also include incidents in which L2 speakers received comments on their honorifics use. However, narratives discussed in this latter section are shown to depend more on issues of identity rather than on linguistic deficiencies per se. In other words, incidents in Section 5 involve L2 speakers purposefully applying honorifics contrary to standard L1 norms or having their use of honorifics judged “inappropriate” due to their identities as non-Koreans. Such incidents thus differ in character from those discussed in this section in which speakers more simply suffered from low organizational knowledge of or lack of control over the use of honorific forms.

To begin, I look briefly at the small number of stories (six in total), in which the pragmalinguistic failure of the L2 speaker did not incur any reaction from those present at the speech event. These stories consisted of incidents in which speakers reported self-correcting their misapplication of honorifics (such as (1) below) or in which they had been aware of using inappropriate forms but found themselves lacking the linguistic resources or control to speak more appropriately (2):

1. I do not take this as evidence that native speakers necessarily correct non-native speakers in the majority of situations in which the latter apply honorifics inappropriately. The participants were of course more likely to be aware of or be able to recall instances of pragmatic failure in which their inappropriate usage was actually corrected.
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(1) Interview data: Patrick
When I went over to my friend's house in Korea, I omitted "yo" [the [Y] speech style ending] when talking to their parents. It was just a mistake and I corrected myself.

(2) Interview data: Mieko
I have a landlord that invited me for dinner quite often. With the background of English speaking you feel like you have to say "you". So I think I called him tangsin [second person pronoun] a couple of times. I kind of felt bad.

Such stories are largely unremarkable in the way that they chart the "blurs" (i.e. pragmatic slips of the tongue – Thomas 1983) and momentary deficiencies that accompany the day-to-day usage of an L2. However, incident (2) is worthy of additional comment on two accounts. Firstly, it provides reconfirmation that the second person pronoun tangsin can be overgeneralized in L2 honorifics due to an apparent assumption that it is the closest equivalent to a universal second person pronoun such as the English "you". Secondly, it is noticeable that this speaker quoting a background of "English speaking" is actually one of the two Japanese nationals. The example thus underlines that the two Japanese participants' use of language and attitudes towards such usage was heavily influenced by the language and culture that they had been exposed to from secondary school.

Discussions now shift to a more detailed analysis of the larger body of incidents in which the pragmalinguistic failures of the L2 speakers resulted in negative feedback from their L1 interlocutors. The relatively high frequency of these stories suggests that there is a significant amount of feedback available to assist L2 speakers in their development of competence in honorifics. This abundance of feedback perhaps differs from the situation in Japanese. Previous research suggests that Japanese native speakers only rarely correct L2 learners. Marriott (1995: 218), for example, notes that exchange students in Japan "could rarely, if ever, remember having received negative feedback about their stylistic choice".

However, one notable source from which negative feedback appeared to be lacking was from Korean language teachers. Despite specifically discussing the question of teacher correction with each and every participant, only two participants could recall ever receiving negative feedback from their teacher on their use of honorifics. It was also noticeable that these corrections involved comparatively marginal areas of the honorifics system. One of the incidents involved forms of address and was reported by Japanese-born Mieko. This participant was corrected for using the suffix -ssi in combination with a surname in isolation, in a pattern that appears to show negative transfer from Japanese. Whereas the corresponding Japanese suffix -san may appear following a surname, Korean -ssi typically
only accompanies a given name or full name. The second incident involved an alternation discussed in Chapter 2 under the heading of “beyond honorifics” (Section 2.3.4). Patrick was corrected for using the more casual volitional marked -lkey instead of the more formal -keyss- when addressing a mature-student classmate. There were thus no reported incidents of teachers correcting Korean learners on their use of speech styles or, most crucially, referent honorifics. As noted in previous discussions (Chapter 5), Korean language teachers frequently allow advanced students to omit referent honorifics even when addressing the teacher him/herself. Given that for many learners their Korean teacher is the only notable superior with whom they are in regular contact, this situation is expected to have an important influence on the acquisition of these forms.

I now comment on the kinds of pragmatic failures that the participants were corrected or received feedback on. As can be seen in Table 38, the failures were fairly evenly spread between each aspect of the honorifics system, including what I term “general failures”. I comment on these different categories of pragmatic failure in turn.

Incidents classified as “general failures” involved recollections of a particular situation in which the participants had received feedback either on several aspects of honorifics use or on their general level of politeness. Typical of such stories was the following from heritage learner Eun-chae:

(3) Interview data: Eun-chae

When I worked part-time at the OOOO [name of popular Korean broadsheet newspaper], many of the senpay ['seniors'] gave me advice on using honorifics. It was never in a reprimanding tone and was never about how I used honorifics to them, but how I should speak to other superiors, Like, they would say to pwucangnim ['department head'], you should say this and this.
Stories classified as “inappropriate use of non-honorific speech styles” typically involved incidents in which L2 speakers were reminded to add -yo onto the end of their utterance units and thus upgrade from the non-honorific {E} to the honorific {Y}. One particularly curious incident in which this occurred was reported by Japanese-born Hiroki. During discussions of domestic chores at a house meeting in the shared accommodation where he lived, Hiroki is told to use contemptual not due to his relationship with the hearer (who is an intimate of younger age) but due to older people being amongst the bystanders and the general formality of the house-meeting scene:

(4) Interview data: Hiroki

We were discussing the fact that some people had been ignoring their household duties. I said to everyone in contemptual that people had not been throwing away the rubbish on the day they were meant to and then turned to the person next to me, who was younger than me, and said in personal “you haven’t been throwing away the rubbish, have you?” Someone next to me said that actually in this situation when older people [up to 40 years-old] are present, you should talk in a more formal way. I did not understand why I should be corrected there.

In this incident, it appears that Hiroki has either under-generalized the use of speech styles as pure “hearer honorifics” (without any consideration of the setting, bystanders, etc.) or has not “framed” the house meeting as a formal scene in the same way as the native speakers. There is also the possibility that Hiroki’s use is influenced by his native language Japanese, where honorific forms can be more readily omitted within the confines of in-group relationships (see Chapter 2). However, it also appears that the correction is somewhat fastidious. The use of personal is not directly face-threatening towards the older parties and it is difficult to imagine that a native speaker would be pulled up for such usage. Noticeable here is the fact that Hiroki “did not understand” the reasons why his use of personal was considered inappropriate, hinting that pragmatic feedback is not always transparent to L2 speakers. Unsure as to the reasons why he was corrected, it is unlikely on this occasion that Hiroki could take advantage of this incident to construct new frames pertaining to the use of Korean speech styles.

Passing over “inappropriate use of honorific speech styles” (of which there were only two examples), I move on to discuss “inappropriate omission of referent honorifics”. Two of these four stories involved the omission of the subject honorific pre-final ending -si- (Andriy and James) and one concerned confusion between the subject honorific malssum hasita and the object honorific malssum tulita, both with the referential meaning ‘to speak’. The remaining example was
the rather more unusual story of exchange student Andriy. In this story, Andriy was taken aside by his Japanese teacher and told that he needed to use higher honorific forms towards her. However, the story is contradictory on the point of exactly which honorific forms the teacher was referring to. According to the way Andriy recounts the story, the teacher first of all told him that he had to use “nophimmal” – a term for ‘honorifics’ literally meaning ‘elevating speech’ that generally denotes referent honorifics. However, when the teacher elaborated on what she meant by nophimmal, she did not raise questions of referent honorifics, but instead told Andriy that he should be using the “deferential” {P} speech style instead of the “polite” {Y}:

(5) Andriy
After Japanese class one day, my teacher took me to one side and talked to me about my use of honorifics. She said that she was the teacher and that she was older and of higher status and that I had to use nophimmal to her. She said that -yo forms [{Y}] were not enough when speaking to her. She said that I should always use -pnita [{P}]. She spoke in a friendly way, but I was a little confused because other Korean students often spoke to her using -yo [the {Y} speech style]. That was strange.

As previously stated in Chapter 6, use of the {P} speech style by students towards their teachers may be preferred by the latter, who perceive it as more deferential and polite. However, given the fact that, as observed by Andriy, Korean students frequently use {Y} towards their lecturers, asking Andriy to only use {P} would represent a rather unreasonable request. Thus, it seems to me more likely that it was actually Andriy’s omissions of referent honorifics that the teacher had issue with rather than his use of speech styles. Not only would this correspond to the teacher’s reported use of the term nophimmal but also to Andriy’s inconsistent use of these forms reported previously.

However, if the teacher was referring to referent rather than hearer honorifics, the problem arises as to why an instance of the latter – the {P} speech style – was put forward as an example of the honorific forms that Andriy should be using. To answer this question, I venture two possible explanations. Firstly, the teacher may have noticed that Andriy’s speech differed from L1 norms, but lacked the metalinguistic knowledge either to pinpoint the exact cause of the problem or to explain it effectively. Secondly, given the low awareness of Andriy towards the use of referent honorifics, the example may represent Andriy’s interpretation of what the teacher meant by nophimmal rather than her actual words. Whichever explanation is correct, this story is interesting for the way that the Japanese teacher explicitly pointed out to Andriy that the language he was using was inappropriate
for addressing a teacher. This contrasts with the situation that Andriy and other exchange students encountered in Korean language classes, where they seemingly never received such explicit correction.

Incidents in which learners received feedback on “inappropriate use of forms of address” included another example of the pronoun tansin. On this occasion, Holly applied this term when addressing a middle aged stranger during an incident on the bus:

(6) Interview data: Holly

I was on a bus and there was this acessi [lit. ‘uncle’, ‘middle aged man’] who was really drunk and disturbing everyone. I just figured I was the person with more cojones than everyone else and I was going to tell the guy to shut up. My Korean was not up to it and I ended up calling him tansin. He was about 60 years old and it did not go over well. He was already a drunk asshole and now I was using the wrong Korean. Instead of bothering everyone, he then focused particularly on me and was more or less spittingly angry in my face. It was not so enjoyable.

In this incident, conflict arises due to Holly’s lack of pragmalinguistic competence and the different social meanings of pronouns in Korean and Western cultures. It appears that Holly attempted to apply the pronoun tansin merely as a general way to refer to a nameless stranger, perhaps similar to the universal way that “you” can be used in English. However, Holly’s generalized application of this pronoun does not match the extremely specific social meanings of tansin and the tight restrictions on the use of this term. As noted in Chapter 2, in contemporary Korean, this pronoun is conventionally used only in certain restricted contexts, such as in conversations between married couples and also in advertising. When used outside these spheres, tansin can take on negative connotations and even be used as a form of insult. As noted by Lee and Ramsey (2000: 226), particularly during confrontations, tansin “is habitually used as a sign of some disrespect”. By using tansin, Holly thus only succeeds in insulting threatening the face of the drunk stranger and making herself the target of his anger.

Finally, examples of L2 speakers receiving reaction for features “beyond honorifics” included the following example of Lisa using ung (‘yes’, commonly used with non-honorific language) instead of yey/ney (‘yes’, commonly used with honorific language). This story is noteworthy for the violent reaction it incurred from an L1 bystander who counters the inappropriate use of non-honorific language with “way panmal-i-ya? [‘why are you speaking panmal?’]”. This response is interesting as it represents the customary way that L1 speakers may rebuke native speaker children or young adults for using non-honorific language inappropriately. As such, this incident represents the one and only reported example
in the current project of L2 speakers being forcefully reprimanded on their use of 
*panmal*. In addition, the story is interesting as it captures the exact moment when 
Lisa “noticed” that *ung* was associated with *panmal* and became aware that her 
speech fell short of local politeness norms.

(7) Interview data: Lisa

I was out for dinner with a bunch of Korean folk music teachers and perform­
ers. During the dinner, someone asked me a question I didn’t understand and I 
just answered “*ung*”. Everyone laughed, but I didn’t really know why at the time. 
Then, when getting ready to leave, some people stood up and were being very 
formal. In the midst of this, one man in his 40s turned to me and asked me a 
question. I just answered saying “*ung*” again. And this other guy was like “*el pan­ 
mal*! *way panmal-i-ya*? [hey! *panmal*! Why are you speaking *panmal*’?]?” And I 
was like “oh shit, I’m using *panmal*”. I think I apologized somehow, but he was 
really pissed.

To summarize this section, discussions have shown that even L2 speakers of ad­ 
vanced fluency are prone to occasional “blurts” in their application of honorifics, 
or gaps in their knowledge regarding the application of such forms. These “blurts” 
at times result in behavior that is perceived by native speakers as being inappro­ 
priate or face-threatening and thus work to complicate the self-presentation of 
these L2 speakers. Although Korean language teachers may often be slow to cor­
rect language learners on their use of honorifics, the stories show that other Kore­
ans were not always so reticent and would frequently provide negative feedback.

8.4 “Separation” from Korean community

Previous discussions in this book have focused more on the honorifics that L2 
speakers use themselves rather than the honorifics they receive from native 
speaker interlocutors. However, it was noted in the previous chapter that the sa­ 
lient patterns of honorifics use emerging in L1-L2 conversation – and what con­
stitutes politeness – are by no means constructed exclusively on the part of the 
L2 speakers. Indeed, it may often be that it is the native speakers rather than the 
non-natives who apply different norms in such interactions and initiate patterns 
of honorifics that would rarely occur in L1-L1 conversation. This, in turn, can 
only be expected to influence the ways that L2 speakers perceive honorifics and 
appropriate usage of these forms for themselves. In the current section, the use of 
“honorific sensitive incidents” allows me to investigate this situation further.
The analysis shows that, in the majority of cases, this divergence from local norms on the part of the native speakers is due either to uncertainty as to the position or identity of L2 speakers in the social hierarchy or out of sincere and good-willed attempts to accommodate towards another set of politeness norms. However, the current section also includes a number of reported interactions in which Korean native speakers attempt to take advantage of presumed lack of knowledge on the part of L2 speakers as to how the honorifics system works. In addition, even in cases where L1 interlocutors harbor no such negative intentions, L2 speakers perceive the application of different honorific norms as being at times discriminatory, impolite and as a barrier “separating” them from the community of practice.

The “honorific sensitive incidents” data confirms observations made in the analysis of natural conversations in Chapter 7 that the non-canonical use of honorifics by L1 speakers in L1-L2 conversation can follow two contrasting patterns. Whereas in some situations L1 speakers may downgrade to *panmal* quicker in interactions with L2 speakers, in other situations higher forms of *contaymal* may be preserved longer than in native-native interactions. The following two subsections examine stories involving these two different patterns in turn.

### 8.4.1 By use of non-honorific language

The current section demonstrates that L2 speakers of Korean occasionally encounter situations in which they are addressed in non-honorific language by adult strangers, status subordinates or even children. Although both occupational and both ethnic groups are shown to encounter such situations, the greatest number of incidents were collected from younger exchange students of non-Korean heritage. Discussions reveal that these salient and potentially face-threatening honorific usages were due either to strategic attempts by L1 speakers to take advantage of the under-defined social position or supposed linguistic weaknesses of L2 speakers or out of a general preconception that honorifics were not necessarily required in interactions with non-Koreans.

A number of exchange students participating in the study complained of receiving *panmal* from adult strangers of superior age and a feeling that such usage allowed the Korean native speakers to draw out their power advantage both in terms of age and language expertise. It should be reemphasized that, as noted in Chapter 2, speakers of middle age or above may at times address young adult strangers in *panmal*, but that such usage is becoming increasingly perceived as out of tune with modern society. With their limited language proficiency, L2 speakers may be particularly susceptible to receiving this kind of high handed and
authoritarian use of honorifics. The following example shows that native speakers may quickly switch down to *panmal* in L1-L2 interaction due to situation-specific needs to emphasize their authority:

(8) Interview data: Julio

Yesterday I went to a driving range right behind the *hakwen* [language school] where I’m working part-time. It’s not free, but I didn’t know. So I go out there with my friends club and I’ve been out there for about 10 minutes and this guy comes up and he starts speaking English because he doesn’t know I can speak Korean. “You! You! Right! Out!” I started speaking Korean and he starts really bad mouthing me with all this *panmal*. I was very upset. They don’t think that you know how the language is supposed to work and they abuse it and that kind of hurts my feelings. He would never have used *panmal* to a Korean in this situation.

Despite Julio’s certainty that the man at the driving range “would never have used *panmal* to a Korean in this situation”, it could be argued that Julio’s age in addition to his language ability or ethnicity enabled the interlocutor to use non-honorific speech. However, Julio’s comment that L1 speakers may take advantage of the presupposition that non-Koreans don’t “know how the language is supposed to work” is insightful and is borne out in other examples. In the next extract, the participant in question is actually a professional heritage speaker, who encounters this authoritarian use of honorifics in the work environment. When James is addressed in *panmal* by the *pwucangnim* ‘department manager’ at his first job in Korea, it is noticeable that this emphasizing of a power advantage is identified by others in the office as being due to James’s identity as a “foreigner”. The example thus shows that heritage speakers may also be cast in the role of “foreigner” according to the local discourse goals of their interlocutors, particularly if their claims to Korean identity are undermined by a lack of linguistic expertise.

(9) Interview data: James

When I first got here, in my very first job, the *pwucangnim* ['department manager'] immediately started speaking to me in *panmal*. Everyone else in the office thought that was very rude and weird. Everyone pointed out that it was a power thing and that he was doing this immediately because I was a foreigner and my Korean was not that great.

Other examples of L2 speakers inappropriately receiving *panmal* stemmed less from such specific strategic motivations and more from an apparent supposition
that honorifics did not necessarily need to be used in interactions with non-
Koreans. As noted in previous chapters, some L1 Korean speakers may assume
that honorifics do not apply to such interactions, or at least that “foreigners” are
not going to demand the same high standards of honorifics that native speak-
ers might do. “I just get the sense that people feel I’m not going to be hung up
on their use of contaymal”, commented Alice during the interview sessions, “so
they don’t have to be vigilant” However, L2 speakers did not always share the
view that L1 interlocutors did not need to use honorifics towards them:

(10) Interview data: Patrick
There was a conversation going on about whether people should use honorif-
cics to foreigners between myself and three Koreans, two older and one younger
than me. And one of them said that he thought you wouldn’t need to use honor-
fics to a foreigner. At that time, I felt a bit offended.

Indeed, an analysis of other incidents reveals that L2 speakers could feel that
their face was being threatened when they did not receive appropriate honor-
ific forms. In Brown (2010b: 262), I discussed the example of Canadian graduate
student Matthew perceiving the use of non-honorific language towards him by
a younger graduate student as being “bad-mannered” Similarly, in the follow-
ing extracts, we see Lisa, Chin-woo and Mark expressing discomfort when adult
strangers addressed them without honorific speech styles. This discomfort can
be perceived in the layman terms by which these speakers refer to their own
reactions or perceptions of the behavior, such as “pissed off”, “no manners” and
“disrespectful”. It is interesting that both the first two examples involve receiv-
ing this kind of usage from taxi drivers, which is perceived by both of these L2
speakers as a recurring pattern.

(11) Interview data: Lisa
Also, even taxi drivers, like if they are older, sometimes they will just be talking
to me in panmal. Like “elmana tw-ayss-e”. Like you know “How long have you
been here?” whatever. And I just speak contaymal of course. And they just con-
tinue with panmal. That really pisses me off.

(12) Interview data: Chin-woo
Taxi drivers are usually the worst when it comes to strangers speaking panmal to
me. I will be speaking to them in contaymal, but then as they start talking to me
on the way they will start switching and then they’ll just drop down to panmal.
I kind of expect it from taxi drivers. I think they’re just like that. No manners.
(13) Interview data: Mark

One time this old guy in his 60s or 70s started talking to me on the street for no reason whatsoever. And I didn't know what he was saying. I have a really hard time understanding older people. And suddenly he starts talking *panmal* and ending sentences with "imma" [a term of address contracted from "i nom-a" 'this bastard-voc', which is used, often at the end of a sentence, either towards close intimates or otherwise to be derogatory]. That felt like the step beyond *panmal*. It felt like he was being disrespectful. I'm not sure if it was because I was a foreigner - I thought that he might well do the same to young Koreans.

A common theme running through such anecdotes is that the “discomfort” experienced by the L2 speakers results not from use of honorifics that contradicts age-rank dimensions, but from receiving non-honorific language from someone who they are not intimate with. This is consistent with previous observations that although L2 speakers do not necessarily expect or enforce honorifics based on age rank, they attach importance to being addressed in honorifics by strangers or non-intimates. The example also confirms previous observations that it may be the L1 party who initiates salient and possibly impolite honorifics usages in L1-L2 encounters.

Evidence provided by participants involved in full or part-time teaching suggests that this apparent notion held by some Koreans that “foreigners” fall outside the scope of honorification has its roots in early child socialization. Several participants (Holly, Alice, Mark, Lisa and Chin-woo) reported that middle- and high-school children had tried using *panmal* to them, in ways that would be difficult to imagine were the teacher a Korean native speaker:

(14) Interview data: Lisa

There's this girl in the design class I teach at the high school who can be a little bitchy at times. She's not too bad most of the time, but sometimes she will use *panmal* with me. I think she thinks that I don't know the difference or that my Korean is not so great. Or maybe she just doesn't care.

(15) Interview data: Mark

When I worked at a *hakwen* [private language school], once or twice a student in class would throw in an "annyeng" ['hi-PLA'] and I'd have to beat him over the head or whatever. When that happened, I got very upset especially because I am the teacher in that case.

(16) Interview data: Chin-woo

In my school last year, I had just finished a Saturday English camp class and I was walking down the hall when this girl who was in about fifth grade came up to
me. She stopped and gave me a deep bow and said “annyeng sensayng” ['hi-PLA teacher-PLA']. I stopped dead in my tracks and said “what did you say?” I made her say it again properly. She was really shocked that I understood she was being rude and trying to make fun of me.

Martial arts instructor Holly put this use of panmal by children in her martial arts class down to the fact that, for many Korean children, the only opportunity they had to interact with non-Koreans was at private English schools. In such contexts, the teachers seldom had any fluency in Korean and acted more as playmates rather than serious educators. Not only did such teachers frequently lack the metapragmatic knowledge of Korean needed to correct any use of panmal, but the teacher-pupil relationship itself lacked the hierarchical dimension that would necessitate contaymal.

(17) Interview data: Holly

Sometimes when I’m teaching thaykkeun and hapkito [two Korean martial arts] to kids they will use panmal to me. They go to hakwen ['private language school'] and at hakwen the teacher is like a walking talking panda or something. It's fun and cute and you can play games with it. And in most hakwen situations, the kids aren't taught that you have to give the same respect to your foreign teachers. Then when they meet me at the cheyyukkwan ['gymnasium'] and they interact in Korean with me in the same way as their hakwen teacher. If they do it more than a few times, I get them to do push-ups. I’ve also seen the kwacangnim [manager] before get on students and say “she's sapwunim ['master' – high rank in martial arts] and you can't speak to her like that”.

Although L2 speakers may experience discomfort due to receiving panmal from children or non-intimates, the same does not seem to apply to interactions with adult intimate age-rank subordinates. Provided that intimacy was sufficiently high, L2 speakers generally expressed a preference for the dropping of honorifics. However, in such situations, the fact that some younger interlocutors moved into panmal faster than they may have done with native speakers at times caused problems for the linguistic hierarchy of the group as a whole. In the following extract, heritage speaker Hyŏn-chŏl recalls an experience when he was made to feel uncomfortable by younger students in his university club using panmal to him. The source of discomfort for Hyŏn-chŏl was not that he objected to receiving panmal as such, but a worry that this might irritate other members of the group who were applying honorifics according to strict levels of age-rank:
(18) Interview data: Hyŏn-chŏl
In my tongali ['university club'], one of a group of students who were two years younger than me started to speak to me in panmal. This made me a little uncomfortable. The reason was because other people his age all spoke to me in contaymal, so I thought it might irritate other people. But, after a while all of the people his age just copied him. The exception was one girl, who continued using contaymal. I told her she should use panmal as well, but she wouldn't. I just wanted all of them to do the same so as not to upset the atmosphere. But I did think that the reason why this started might have been because I am kyopho ['an overseas Korean'].

Another exchange student – Richard – experienced a similar situation during his participation in a university club, although this time it involved being unexpectedly told to use panmal rather than unexpectedly receiving non-honorific language. The club in question was the university broadcasting society, which had a particularly strict rank-based hierarchy maintained by non-reciprocal honorifics use by juniors to seniors. Despite the prevalence of non-reciprocal language patterns, Richard found himself reciprocating honorific contaymal with all members, regardless of rank. This situation was then complicated by the vice president asking Richard to reciprocate panmal with her. As previously noted, Richard was a speaker who liked to use the non-honorific styles as much as possible, so in some ways this usage resonated better with him. However, he was aware that this made the linguistic environment particularly complex, since it not only contradicted typical norms within the society, but also differed from the blanket contaymal he was receiving from everyone else:

(19) Interview data: Richard
On Monday, I went to the OOOO [name of university broadcasting club] attendance meeting. The vice president [female; same age] came out and sat right next to me. Seeing as she is vice president and I am just a new member, I should be using contaymal to her. But on Monday, the first thing she asked me was if I knew how to speak panmal. I said "yeah, of course". What all this was working up to was telling me it was ok to speak panmal to her. Now, I use contaymal to everyone in OOOO except the vice president to whom I use panmal. And everyone else uses contaymal to her, except the other managers. And all the other seniors use panmal to everyone, except to me.

The final example in this section regards the use of forms of address. All participants in the study noticed a tendency for Koreans to address them by their first name in situations where this would not normally happen in L1-L1 interactions. In the story below, Matthew notes that, during his previous experience at a rural
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Korean graduate school, he rarely found himself addressed as oppa ‘older brother of a female’, hyeng ‘older brother of a male’ or senpay ‘university senior’, despite the fact that he used such terms himself when he was the junior party and made efforts to “play” both the “younger brother” and the “older brother” roles.

(20) Interview data: Matthew
When I was at O0 University, I used to be bothered a little bit by the fact that all the other slightly older men were getting oppa-ed [i.e. called oppa], hyeng-ed and senpay-ed and I was just getting “Matthew”. When I was the younger party, I did my best to play the role and call those older than me hyeng, nwuna [‘older sister’] and senpay. I also felt like I played the older brother role as well and bought food and alcohol for the younger students. But even though I played the role, I felt I did not get the respect that came with it. But I gradually realized that people felt it was not natural to call me hyeng or oppa. I also realized that female friends actually felt more comfortable with a man who did not demand the oppa, so it actually worked to my advantage. I have now made peace with my lack of oppa-ness.

The extent to which female friends really did feel “more comfortable” with a man who did not insist on being addressed as “older brother” is of course impossible to externally verify. Despite this, the story reveals an important realization on the part of Matthew that although his relationships with those at the university were different in some ways to Korean-Korean relationships, they were not necessarily inferior. Indeed, Matthew believed that, in his position of “foreigner” or “outsider”, he may actually be able to negotiate “closer” relationships with younger female friends. The observation that in certain contexts “foreigners” may be able to negotiate more intimate relationships than those available to L1 speakers contradicts the findings of previous research regarding the positions of those placed in the subject positions of “foreigner” or “outsider”. It is generally assumed that these positions limit opportunities for participation in the culture. For example, in Norton’s (2000) ethnography of Canadian immigrants learning English, it is claimed that these speakers were deemed “unworthy to speak” or “illegitimate” and therefore “sequestered” (Norton 2000) from the community. I return to discuss the implications of this finding in more depth during the concluding chapter.

2. In Korea, when visiting a restaurant or bar, it is customary for the oldest or most senior person to pay the bill. More broadly, as previously noted in Chapter 3, in return for the respect that they receive, seniors are expected to take responsibility for and nurture their subordinates, including providing for them financially.
8.4.2 By use of honorific language

The impression that L2 speakers did not "fit" into the social hierarchy did not always result in the abandonment of honorifics noted in the previous sub-section. To the contrary, the more widespread pattern was for native speakers to retain honorifics longer when addressing L2 speakers, particularly in the case of the older "professionals".\(^3\) The reasons for this appear to be two-fold. Firstly, this correlates with the pattern for honorific rather than non-honorific language to be applied as default in situations where the appropriate level of honorification is unclear, as it may be when addressing a "foreigner" or "outsider" whose social status is undefined. This is seen elsewhere in cases where the identity of the hearer is unknown (for example, when responding to a knock on the door or answering the telephone – Cho Eui-yon 1988: 107). Secondly, use of non-honorific *panmal* is closely tied up with a range of casual Korean usage that L2 speakers may not necessarily be expected to know. Both Richard (example (13) above) and Patrick reported situations in which they were asked by L1 speakers if they "knew" how to use *panmal*, Patrick commenting that "I think when Koreans see a foreigner they assume that you only know *contaymal*".

As noted in Chapter 7, some L2 speakers saw the reluctance of L1 speakers to use *panmal* towards them as being a barrier to establishing intimate relationships and to negotiating identity. Although the continued usage of *contaymal* may not have been face-threatening, it nevertheless resulted in L2 speakers feeling excluded and uncomfortable. Interestingly, as shown in this first example from heritage speaker Lisa, this feeling of being kept at a distance by the use of *contaymal* was perceived by the heritage speaker professionals as well as the non-heritage speakers.

(21) Interview data: Lisa

There is one group of friends I have who are two years older than me and one of them I knew from before I came to Korea. They use *panmal* to each other but continue to use *contaymal* to me. So that's just a weird, awkward situation. I kind of understand that we don't hang out enough so that we are super, super buddy-buddy, but even so.

\(^3\) I make this claim despite the fact that I actually collected more stories in which L2 speakers complained of inappropriately receiving *panmal* rather than *contaymal* (23 compared to 11). I take this frequency as evidence not that the former pattern was more widespread, but that it was more salient, potentially face-threatening and more likely to be noticed by L2 speakers.
Besides feelings that this continual use of "separation" forms was discriminatory and distancing, the next incident shows that use of inappropriately high honorifics angered some speakers. In this particular incident, Alice reports feeling furious when someone she considered her friend used the self-humbling first-person pronoun ce to refer to himself in a text message and thus "reclassified" their relationship as "something entirely different":

(22) Interview data: Alice
A friend [1 year older than me] sent me a mwunca ['text message'] using ce [self-humbling first person pronoun] and I just got so angry about that. I sent him a series of furious text messages, asking him "why are you using ce" and "what's wrong with you'. I'm really not comfortable with it. He considers himself to be a "yey ppalu-n salam" ['a polite person'], but a mwunca ['text message'] seems to be a very strange place to use ce. He was very surprised I was that angry, but I thought it reclassified our friendship as something entirely different. I still tease him about that from time to time.

There were also situations in which L2 speakers felt that the reluctance of L1 interlocutors to use panmal towards them was more of a deliberate strategy to maintain distance and block friendship. In the following extract, heritage speaker Julie notes how one coworker rebuffed her attempts to establish intimacy by continuously using formal Korean or just English. The conclusion drawn by Julie was that this interlocutor was happy to have an English-speaking acquaintance, but was not interested in establishing a friendship in the Korean context.

(23) Interview data: Julie
There was one coworker [the same age as me] at the school I worked. At that time, I was at the end of what I thought would be my last semester at the school. She was like "if only you were staying longer, then we could develop our friendship" and was very friendly at that time. But then, when I ended up staying at the school, it turned out that she didn't want the friendship after all. When I tried to speak to her in panmal, she replied either in very formal language or in English. It was very uncomfortable. She pretty much set the standard – I don't want friendship with you, just English.

Finally, in addition to receiving honorifics from those they considered to be their intimates, L2 speakers also reported a tendency for status superiors to avoid dropping down to panmal when addressing them. Typical of the treatment that these speakers received from their teachers, professors or other superiors is Richard's interesting observation regarding the teacher of the Chinese language class he was taking at the university as the only overseas student in the group:
(24) Interview data: Richard

My Chinese teacher of course speaks contaymal to the class, but panmal to the students individually. The only exception is that she speaks contaymal to me. I think she is not sure how to address me more than anything else.

In sum, this section has shown that L2 speakers may frequently experience being addressed in honorific contaymal in situations where panmal would be the more common L1 “norm”. Although this tendency may not be as immediately face threatening as the use of panmal discussed in the preceding section, it nonetheless resulted in “discomfort” for the L1 participants, who perceived such usage as discriminatory and as limiting their access to “close” Korean relationships.

8.5 Negotiating “face”

Whereas the incidents reported in the previous section focused on patterns of honorifics use that were initiated by L1 interlocutors, discussions now consider situations in which the L2 speakers were actively involved in the negotiation of face. In other words, I now look at incidents in which speakers set out to negotiate an identity for themselves through their use of honorifics. I divide these stories broadly between those in which the L2 speakers made active attempts to create a Korean identity or take on Korean roles (Section 8.5.1) and those in which they were involved in the negotiation of a “non-Korean face” – an identity that fell outside normal society roles (8.5.2).

8.5.1 Negotiating a Korean face

The current sub-section charts the experiences of L2 speakers as they attempted to take on native-like roles in the local Korean community and adopt the patterns of politeness that went with this. As previously noted in this book, the majority of participants in the study were actively involved in Korean social groups and within such structures were frequently expected to adopt Korean identities and apply the honorific forms that such identities entailed. Although discussions elsewhere suggest that speakers were often ultimately successful in doing this, the methodology employed in the current chapter (i.e. the collection of incidents that evoked negative emotions) results in an emphasis on situations in which speakers encountered problems in negotiating a Korean face.

The narratives reveal two different perspectives from which the establishment of Korean modes of interaction became problematic. On the one hand, the stories
show that native speakers at times reacted negatively to the use of certain honorific forms by the L2 speakers, not because the forms were necessarily inappropriate in the Korean context, but because they were somehow out of tune with the dynamics of the particular relationship and the L2 speaker's non-Korean identity. From the opposite angle, we see that L2 speakers were hampered in their negotiation of a Korean face by the difficulty in adjusting to a new mode of linguistic politeness and accepting the roles and responsibilities that accompanied certain relationships.

L2 speakers sometimes receive negative reactions to their use of honorifics, not because such usage necessarily deviates from community norms but because it is seen as inappropriate for them as "foreigners". Korean native speakers may first of all object to L2 speakers initiating *panmal* to establish their status superiority. To refer to an example previously discussed in Brown (2010b: 264), graduate student Matthew reported that, when he was TA-ing a course, he used *panmal* towards a student seven years younger than himself. Although he believed such usage to be consistent with how he had observed Korean professors addressing their students, he discovered later that his use of *panmal* had "annoyed" the graduate student.

Brown (2010b: 254) notes that, to an extent the story reveals a mis-match of frames on the part of Matthew. In his position as a TA, his use of *panmal* is more marked than it would be for a professor. However, the fact that such usage provoked a negative reaction from the Korean student appears to be tied up with Matthew's non-Korean identity. Although Matthew was only a TA, the seven-year age difference would normally be sufficient in inter-Korean relationships to license the use of *panmal*, even if it may be regarded as high-handed by some. The student's objection, I would contend, was influenced by the incongruity between this power-laden use of honorifics and the more egalitarian relationship she may have expected with a non-Korean teacher. Additional evidence exists to back up this perception that Koreans may not perceive it as suitable for non-Korean teachers to adopt authoritative modes of honorifics use. During the interview sessions, Australian law school graduate student Russell recounted an experience in which his dinnertime comment to a newly-arrived German professor that it was okay to address students in *panmal* was contradicted by a Korean lawyer eating at the same table who said that the "foreigner" professor should always adhere to the {Y} speech style.

The question of when it was appropriate for non-Koreans to downgrade to *panmal* also influenced more casual or intimate relationships. Staying with Australian Russell for the next example, this speaker reported inconsistent signals from Korean native speakers (especially females) as to when it was appropriate for him to use *panmal*:
(25) Interview data: Russell

One girl seven years younger than me who I met yesterday for the first time in class, told me to use *panmal* within minutes. But, in another incident, I was corrected for using *panmal* by a girl four years younger than me who I had met quite a few times. "You shouldn't be using *panmal*, you should use -yo [the {Y} speech style]. We don't know each other well enough. Until I say use *panmal*, you must use -yo." I'm not sure in this kind of situation if they're trying to educate me as to Korean behavior.

The contrast between one female interlocutor of younger age telling Russell to use *panmal* and another correcting him for using it could be interpreted in at least three ways. Firstly, Russell's own suggestion that the second female was positioning herself in the role of "teacher" and attempting to educate him in polite Korean is a useful observation. As observed by Wilkinson (2002), L1 speakers frequently assume the "teacher" position in L1-L2 interactions and their linguistic strategies can thus often be understood through consideration of pedagogical functions or didactic intentions to teach "proper" language. Secondly, the contrast might be attributed to different communication goals on the part of the native speakers. It is possible that the first speaker encouraged Russell to use *panmal* as part of a strategy to increase intimacy, while the second speaker instructed him *not* to use it as a strategy to maintain distance.

Although both of these factors probably contributed to some extent, I believe a third factor best explains the situation. The two incidents seem to capture contrasting views as to how the two native speakers conceptualized their relationships with Russell. Whereas the first speaker immediately constructed their relationship as that of Korean college senior/junior (and thus initiated honorifics use to match this frame), the second speaker perhaps did not view their relationship as fitting such frames. On this point, it is evident that many Korean interlocutors do not perceive their contacts with non-Koreans as having the same hierarchical roles and responsibilities as inter-Korean relationships, even when the context is distinctly Korean and the language used in the relationship is Korean. Indeed, when interacting with Westerners, Koreans may quite reasonably expect that the relationship will be more egalitarian than it may otherwise be in the Korean context. After meeting Russell on several occasions and having interacted with him as a status-equal "friend", the second speaker perhaps reacted negatively to the Australian's downgrade to *panmal* perhaps because it added a power dynamic to their relationship that she did not particularly share or value. Allowing Russell to use *panmal* (while she continued with *contaymal*) would have created a non-reciprocal relationship that may have contradicted the more equalitarian basis on which their relationship had been established. The only
other option would have been for her to reciprocate *panmal*, but doing so would have entailed a particularly high level of intimacy (given the four-year age gap) that she was not yet comfortable with. Thus, by taking advantage of her supposed authority as native speaker and telling Russell that he could not use *panmal* until he received her permission, she was able to preserve a non-hierarchical relationship based on reciprocal *contaymal*.

The negative reactions of Korean native speakers towards native-like applications of honorifics extended to L2 initiation of fictive kinship terms.

(26) Interview data: Richard
With a girl who is four years older, I never used any names when we met directly. But then when we first chatted on messenger, I called her *nwuna* ['older sister'] and she said “don’t call me *nwuna*”.

(27) Interview data: Russell
Sometimes I want to call someone *hyeng* ['older brother'], but I get a bad response. This has happened a few times around school. They might ask me “*kapcaki way hyeng*? ['why hyeng all of a sudden?']”, you know. I don’t know the reason for this.

(28) Interview data: Matthew
I’ve encountered some resistance from Koreans when I have used *hyeng* ['older brother']. People didn’t seem to much like it.

(29) Interview data: Patrick
There were a couple of Korean girls younger than me amongst the [name of ‘buddy system’ at university for matching exchange students with Korean ‘buddies’] people and most of them who I was close with call me *oppa* ['older brother']. But then there is one girl who like implied that she found it funny for those other girls to call me that. At that time, I felt that was really a rude thing to say. She was laughing about it. […] At that time, I kind of felt bad.

(30) Interview data: James
There is this girl who is five years younger than me who always calls me James and never *oppa* ['older brother']. I thought it was kind of weird when I found out that she uses “*oppa*” to all other guys who are older than her.” I had just guessed that she never called anyone *oppa*.

In line with the above discussions, I would posit that the reactions of these native speakers were primarily motivated by the fact that none of them particularly saw their relationships with these non-Koreans as being hierarchical or age-based. The use of *nwuna, hyeng* or *oppa* was thus incongruous with the way that they
conceptualized their dealings with these non-heritage speakers, either as status equals or as “foreigners” to whom the social hierarchy did not apply. More often than not, the feeling that L1-L2 speaker relationships do not necessarily fit the fictive sibling model was shared by L2 speakers. Mark, a speaker who confessed to never having used fictive kinship terms, reported that the reason for his non-use of hyeng [‘older brother’] was “because I have never found myself in a relationship in Korea where I’ve felt it was a hyeng relationship”.

Moreover, the negative reactions towards “foreigners” applying kinship terms may be influenced by the fact that this area of the honorifics system is closely tied up with Korean in-group membership. Forms of address such as nwuna or hyeng are learned by native speakers through a process of socialization that begins inside the nuclear family and the ways they address their actual older siblings. Using such terms thus implies a degree of Korean identity and in-groupness that may be difficult for “outsiders” to make a legitimate claim to, particularly non-heritage learners who have no “inherited” links to the community of practice. In summary, the examples analyzed so far in this section have shown that the way politeness norms are perceived in L1-L2 interactions does not always follow the native-speaker pattern. Honorifics usages that are polite in native speaker encounters may at times be deemed unsuitable for L2 speakers to adopt.

Approaching the problems of establishing a “Korean face” from the opposite angle, the “honorific sensitive incident” data is rich with stories that chart the problems of aligning Korean interaction with a more Western politeness ideology. Although many of the participants may have sought the establishment of a Korean identity, they also experienced difficulties when they found themselves being treated “just like a Korean”, particularly when they were in the role of subordinate. As in the following example, due to their inherited Korean identity and the resultant expectation that they would be familiar with Korean cultural norms, it was often the heritage speakers who experienced these problems most acutely. At times, these speakers found the process of aligning Korean modes of social behavior with their “Western” ideologies regarding human interaction to be particularly painful:

(31) Interview data: James

When I got into an argument with my producer at work, it really frustrated me that he started yelling at me and treating me like a little kid. This was good in a way because he was treating me the same as he would treat a Korean with the same age difference. But it was awkward for me coming from America because I felt I was being disrespected professionally. I wanted to say something but I just bit my tongue and kept on apologizing. I was so mad afterwards that I wanted...
to quit my job. I had to have a long talk with my writer about the cultural differences, how I would not have stood for it in America. And I felt a lot of it had to do with his ability to speak to me in *panmal* because he had established that from the beginning. Because that dynamic was there, he felt he could abuse me in a sense, verbally. That really upset me at the time, although I understand it makes sense in the culture.

In this extract, we see a clash between, on the one hand, James realizing that it was “good” that the producer was treating him “the same as he would treat a Korean” and that this “makes sense in the culture” and, on the other hand, James’s Western politeness ideology and a feeling that he was “being disrespected professionally” and “abused”. Similar to observations made regarding “respect” in the previous chapter, James experiences difficulties aligning the lack of respect shown to him by the producer with his native speaker conceptualizations of politeness. Although he is aware that the producer speaking down to him and using *panmal* indexes a hierarchical Korean relationship, he cannot escape from a feeling that the lack of respect entails a more personal form of abuse or “disrespect” in the Western meaning of the term.

### 8.5.2 Negotiating a non-Korean face

Whereas the previous section analyzed instances in which L2 speakers attempted to position themselves in Korean roles but discovered that such attempts were complicated by their identity as non-Koreans, I now turn my focus to instances in which L2 speakers more consciously positioned themselves in the role of “foreigner” A reoccurring theme within these discussions is the negotiation on the part of the L2 speakers of a more equalitarian pattern of honorifics use better suited to their native politeness ideologies. The preference that Western learners of Korean have for symmetrical patterns of honorifics use has already been commented on extensively in previous chapters. At this point, I am able to look more specifically at how these symmetrical patterns – and the non-Korean faces they entailed – were negotiated across certain sensitive incidents. I look first of all at deliberate attempts by L2 interlocutors to initiate equalitarian patterns of language usage. I then discuss situations in which such usage stemmed more directly from the fact that the relationships and the identities themselves fell outside the normal roles and responsibilities available in the Korean context. In particular, I note a tendency for this to be the case in situations where speakers code-switched between Korean and English.
I begin by commenting on "honorifics sensitive incidents" that featured a general resistance on the part of L2 speakers towards establishing hierarchical or non-reciprocal use of Korean. One particular area of resistance confirmed by the "honorific sensitive incidents" data was the opposition towards receiving or using contaymal when age differences were small and intimacy was high. Exchange students Richard, Patrick and Daniel reported feeling "uncomfortable" when Korean intimates between two and four years younger addressed them in contaymal. More interestingly, the data also captures an incident in which exchange student Richard initiates a pattern of reciprocal panmal use with an interlocutor older than himself:

(32) Interview data: Richard

There was this one girl who was four years older than me. We were conversing and it was obvious that we were getting quite close. So I asked her if it was okay to speak panmal. And she just said "yeah." It would probably be fairly bad manners to do that if I was a Korean. But she didn't have any complaints and we both just dropped down.

Of particular interest here is Richard's comment that suggesting panmal in this way "would probably be fairly bad manners ... if I was a Korean". Indeed, this instance of the younger party asking if he himself can use panmal contrasts with the more typical way that downgrading works in native speaker interaction, where it is customary for the younger speaker to invite the elder speaker to "mal-ul noh-usi-eyo" ('put down the language'). The usage is, however, in line with Richard's comments reported in the previous chapter to the effect that, as an L2 speaker of Korean, it was possible for him to negotiate reciprocal panmal use with the vast majority of interlocutors, irrespective of age.

The data also captures more strategically motivated attempts by L2 speakers to establish a non-Korean identity through the deliberate flouting of local norms. The following extract is once more connected to the difficulties that heritage learner and voice actor James encountered in accepting the subordinate role in Korean society. On this occasion, after having been insulted by a hyeng ['older brother'] in his 40s, James makes the conscious decision to assert himself as a "half-foreigner", stepping outside of the respecting passive role of the Korean 'younger brother'. By swearing at the hyeng (in panmal), he breaks a social taboo that causes considerable loss of face for the other party. Interestingly, given James's heritage speaker identity, this salient flouting of local politeness norms leads to him being cast in the role of "foreigner" as others at the table attempt to placate the hyeng. The example shows that heritage speakers may use noncompliance to Korean politeness norms as a tool for establishing that they are only "half-native"
(as James described it) and for creating freedom to operate outside of the more
typical boundaries of Korean social roles:

(33) Interview data: James
I was out with a group of about eight bar friends, all Korean except two Cana­
dians. I was having a conversation with the Canadians in English. Suddenly, the
oldest of the Koreans who was a hyeng ['older brother'] in his 40s shouted at us
"ya i saykki-tul-a ['hey you sons of bitches'], what the fuck are you doing speak­
ing English over there at that end of the table?" It was like as the eldest member
of the group he had decided he was not getting enough respect. He was feeling
insecure and felt that he had to exercise the hierarchy thing. I decided to stand
my ground as half-foreigner, half-native. I said "cayswu epse ['you suck!']" or
something like that to him. He got very upset. The others at the table tried to
calm him down by saying that I was a foreigner.

More typically, the application of equalitarian use of honorifics and modes of social
behavior in L1-L2 interactions stemmed less from such situation-specific needs to
assert a non-Korean identity and more from the fact that the relationship itself did
not fit within the typical parameters of Korean hierarchy. As noted in the previ­
ous sub-section, neither L2 speakers nor their Korean interlocutors may expect
L1-L2 interactions to have the same hierarchical restrictions as Korean-Korean
conversation, even when the context is distinctly Korean. The "honorific sensi­
tive incident" data showed that this was particularly the case in situations where
interlocutors did not interact exclusively in Korean but code-switched with Eng­
lish. Given that English is by far the most widely taught foreign language in South
Korea, it was not uncommon for the L2 speakers' acquaintances to have some flu­
ency in the language and also a desire to practice it with their non-Korean friends.
In addition, particularly for those employed in English teaching work, there were
situations in which interlocutors made their first contact in English before later
switching to Korean. If such speakers maintained an egalitarian honorifics-free re­
relationship when interacting in English, they did not always apply rigid hierarchical
restrictions and elaborate honorifics when shifting to Korean. A general tendency
was thus found for English-Korean code-switching to result in the reciprocation of
first names, simplified honorifics and sometimes universal panmal:

(34) Interview data: Alice
Generally, people who I meet first in English switch straight into panmal when
we start speaking Korean, including my closest Korean friend. Even people who
are a little younger tend to this and I don't mind. For them, it's not exciting, but
it's like "well as long as she's comfortable with me using panmal".
At times, however, this translation of English egalitarian patterns of interaction into universal *panmal* was not so straightforward. First of all, in multi-party settings, the adoption of *panmal* was not always approved by all speakers. In an example discusses in Brown (2010b: 265), I noted an instance where Lisa began to reciprocate *panmal* when socializing after class with students to whom she was teaching English conversation. For Lisa (and apparently for most of the students), reciprocation of *panmal* was reported to be logical, reasonable and “appropriate” given the fact that the relationships within this group had been established in an English-speaking environment and along egalitarian lines. However, one of the students in the group, who was eight years younger than Lisa, appeared to disagree with translating these egalitarian norms into Korean and continued to apply honorifics towards the teacher and older students. This usage was perceived negatively by Lisa and, apparently, by other students as well, who perceived it as creating “a distance that doesn’t need to be there”. As noted in Brown (2010b: 265), this example provides clear evidence of the unstable and contested nature of politeness norms in interactions involving L2 speakers, a point I return to in the closing chapter of this book.

Secondly, when age-rank differences were larger, the application of universal *panmal* became more complicated as it represented a pattern of use in marked opposition to powerful Korean cultural norms. In such cases, it may be that speakers avoid switching into Korean as doing so would force them into a choice between *contaymal* and *panmal* that would be difficult to resolve while maintaining the dynamics of their relationship and staying within Korean politeness “norms”. As the final incident in this chapter, I consider one story in which the difficulties of translating a non-hierarchical relationship from English into Korean resulted in the total avoidance of Korean, despite the fluency of the L2 speaker in question. Mark discusses how he has established a “friendship” with a former student who is now of college age (approximately 12 years younger than him). This relationship in itself, it would seem, is outside the normal conceptualization of social roles in Korea. To be sure, an age difference of 12 years and a former teacher-student relationship may not exactly be conducive to friendship in any society. But in the Korean context, the social and linguistic barriers to this happening are close to insurmountable. To be *chinkwu* (‘friends’) in the Korean context entails that the speakers are of equal age; even an age difference of one year will re-define the relationship as one of older/younger or senior/junior. What is more, regardless of age, a teacher always remains a target of respect and using anything but *contaymal* represents serious social taboo. It is therefore easy to understand what Mark means when he says that talking in Korean would seem “strange” since there would be no way for them to graft their intimate relationship onto the hierarchical linguistic framework of Korean. For the younger party, both *contaymal* and *panmal* would
be inappropriate since the former would index their relationship as something that it wasn't and the latter would be socially taboo:

(35) Interview data: Mark
There is one student who I taught English to and is now just entering college. We still meet now as friends. Most of our conversation is in English. We could talk in Korean, but it would seem so strange because I don't know whether we should use *panmal* or *contaymal*. *Contaymal* would be totally inappropriate from me and it might be even inappropriate for him because we have grown so close to each other. Age-wise maybe he should, but relationship-wise maybe he shouldn't.

8.6 Conclusion

The "honorifics sensitive incidents" analyzed in this chapter have permitted fascinating insights into the negotiation of politeness and identity that accompanies the use of honorifics by L2 speakers. By means of conclusion, I summarize the three areas covered in these discussions: pragmalinguistic deficiencies, the attitudes of the local language community and active attempts to negotiate "face" on the part of L2 speakers.

The analysis of narratives charting pragmalinguistic deficiencies underlined that even learners of Korean who have studied the language to an advanced level are let down by occasional lack of knowledge or control and that this complicates their presentation of face in the target language community. I attached particular significance to the fact that L2 speakers appeared to receive a frequent stream of feedback on such pragmatic failures. However, this apparent abundance of negative evidence came with two caveats. Firstly, it was noted that little if any feedback was provided by Korean language teachers. Secondly, the data reveals that the feedback provided by native speakers was not always transparent to the language learners.

Looking next at the negotiation of "face", the narratives showed that participants often felt that the honorifics used towards them differed from more typical Korean norms and that this compromised their subject positions. The application of "different" honorifics could entail receiving forms that were either "too low" or "too high". In the majority of cases, such salient honorifics use resulted from the under-defined social position of L2 speakers in Korean society or a general feeling on the part of native speakers that interactions with non-Koreans did not necessarily follow the same "rules" as Korean-Korean conversation. In addition, it was shown that native speakers at times try to take advantage of the apparent
lack of honorific knowledge on the part of language learners and apply sub-native patterns of honorifics for their own strategic ends. Either way, the result was that L2 speakers at times found such usage discriminatory or face threatening and perceived it as creating a barrier between themselves and the Korean community. On this point, however, the stories show that although non-Koreans were treated differently through the honorifics they received, this “barrier” was not an absolute one that barred them from participation in the community. Although they may have been treated differently, this is not to say that they were “marginalized” (Wenger 1998) or denied participation in the community of practice.

Finally, the chapter considered narratives that more specifically captured the L2 speakers’ active involvement in the negotiation of face. I looked both at incidents in which L2 speakers attempted to claim a Korean identity and those in which they opted to place themselves as “foreigners”. In the case of the former, it was shown that Korean native speakers at times reacted negatively to non-natives claiming Korean social roles such as “teacher” or “older/younger sibling” and using the kind of non-reciprocal honorific forms that went with these identities. Here, I claimed that Korean interlocutors did not always perceive it as appropriate for non-Koreans to apply modes of honorifics use that were tied up with Korean ingroupness or that indexed hierarchical relationships. It was pointed out that neither Koreans nor the L2 speakers themselves necessarily expected L1-L2 interactions to follow the hierarchical modes of Korean social interaction, even when the setting was Korea and the language being used was Korean. These discussions were extended when I considered situations in which L2 speakers more actively departed from hierarchical use of honorifics and attempted to negotiate egalitarian modes of interaction. In some cases, the negotiation of modes of honorifics use that fell outside native speaker norms was actually necessitated by the fact that the relationships between L1 and L2 speakers did not always fit within the Korean social hierarchy. In such situations, establishing what constituted “polite” honorifics use was always open for negotiation but never easy to establish. On the one hand, following the norms of the wider Korean community appeared inappropriate when the relationship itself seemed to fall outside such social structures. On the other hand, abandoning such norms could result in the establishment of patterns of honorifics use that contradicted strong ideologies regarding human interaction and politeness in the Korean context.
9.1 Overview

By means of conclusion, the current and final chapter serves three functions. In Section 9.2, I summarize the main findings of the book in relation to the research questions originally formulated in the introduction. In Section 9.3, I discuss the implications of the study for interlanguage pragmatics, Korean applied linguistics and the teaching of Korean as a second language. Finally, in Section 9.4, I comment on future directions for the study of Korean honorifics in the L2 setting.

9.2 Summary of main arguments

This section provides a concise synopsis of the principal findings regarding honorifics, politeness and L2 pragmatic development. The discussion is split into three parts – one section to address each of the research goals of the book. In 9.2.1, I review findings regarding the honorific competence of L2 speakers. I then position this competence in relation to the identities of these L2 speakers (9.2.2) and politeness ideologies (9.2.3).

9.2.1 Honorifics competence of L2 speakers

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 identified a number of salient patterns that characterize the honorifics competence of L2 speakers. I summarize these findings in relation to the area of the honorifics system that they relate to: (1) hearer honorifics, (2) referent honorifics and (3) forms of address.

9.2.1.1 Hearer honorifics (speech styles)

The data revealed tendencies for L2 speakers (particularly “professionals” and “non-heritage speakers”) to over-generalize the application of honorific contay-mal speech styles at the expense of non-honorific panmal styles. Speakers frequently select the strategy of “playing it safe” and wait until intimacy is high before downgrading to panmal. In extreme cases, speakers use the honorific {Y}
and {P} speech styles in most or all interactions, including those with intimate status equals and subordinates. Instead of using speech styles to index social relationships, the role-play (Chapter 6) and interview data show that some L2 speakers use speech styles primarily as markers of modulation politeness. This included upgrading from non-honorific {E} to honorific {Y} when performing face-threatening speech acts in conversations with intimates – a pattern of honorifics use unlike anything reported in the literature on L1 use. Finally, the data revealed that even L2 speakers with high competency struggle to control the pragmalinguistic application of different speech style endings. Problems of control detected in the role-play data included slips between the {E} and {Y} speech styles and difficulty in consistently applying the {P} style and the formal mode of self-presentation it entails.

9.2.1.2 Referent honorifics
Whereas L2 speakers overuse honorific speech styles, the opposite pattern seemed to apply for referent honorifics: L2 speakers used these forms at a significantly lower rate than native speakers on the DCT (Chapter 5). Although learners omit both subject and object honorifics, the role-play data (Chapter 6) showed that L2 speakers find the application of the latter to be more problematic, perhaps due to the added organizational complexity of object honorifics and the low frequency of such forms in the input. In particular, it was noted that L2 speakers undergeneralize the use of referent honorifics to interactions with non-intimate notable superiors, otherwise omitting them when conversing with marginal superiors, intimate superiors, strangers, etc. In addition, speakers struggled to control the subject honorific -si-, frequently deleting it in relative clauses and dative-subject constructions.

9.2.1.3 Forms of address
The most salient pattern of address forms identified in the DCT data was the tendency to over-generalize personal names, typically at the expense of titles or kinship terms. One particular personal name pattern that is overused by L2 speakers is the name+Ssi format – an address pattern that indexes distance without necessarily being deferential or placing the speaker in a subordinate position.

The data revealed a number of other patterns of address forms that characterize the talk of L2 speakers. The DCT and "learner stories" included some inappropriate uses of the second person pronoun tangsin. Although this pronoun has a restricted use in L1 talk, L2 speakers may inappropriately apply it out of apparent similarities with a universal second person pronoun. In addition, the role-play
data showed that L2 speakers – and heritage learners in particular – use repetition of address forms and/or the self-humbling first person pronoun ce as modulation politeness strategies. Finally, although some L2 speakers are comfortable with and claim to actively enjoy using fictive kinship terms, other speakers found this usage unfamiliar or “strange”.

To summarize the honorifics systems of L2 learners, an underlying trend was discovered for these speakers to undergeneralize honorific forms that indexed either a high degree of “separation” (particularly referent honorifics) or conversely a high degree of “connection” (particularly non-honorific {E} and {T} speech styles). Instead, speakers preferred to adopt a honorific “code” that occupied the middle ground and was more egalitarian in that it avoided language that was either too “low” and subservient or too “high” and condescending. Typical features of this “code” were the {Y} speech style, the name+ssi form of address and the humble first person pronoun ce.

To an extent, the application of this mixed honorific/non-honorific code was explained through the “frame-based” knowledge of these speakers and the relative difficulty of different components of the honorifics system. Indeed, both the undergeneralization of non-honorific panmal on the one hand and the “underuse” of referent honorifics on the other was in line with the lack of attention paid to these elements in the KSL classroom, as I comment upon in more depth below. In addition, the low frequency of referent honorifics appears to mirror their organizational complexity, which at times results in L2 speakers experiencing difficulties in understanding their function. L2 speakers have a low conscious awareness of referent honorifics and also tend to undervalue the importance of applying these forms.

However, simply arguing that the honorifics use of L2 speakers reflected questions of complexity and knowledge acquired in the language classroom only goes so far in explaining the preference of L2 speakers for a more egalitarian mode of honorifics use. The data has revealed a variety of incidents in which speakers admitted applying honorifics in the ways they did despite knowing that such usage could be inappropriate. The fact was that this more egalitarian pattern of honorifics suited the participants better in terms of their social identities as “Westerners” and the ideologies regarding politeness that these identities entailed. In addition, even if learners did lack awareness of certain aspects of the honorifics system, this lack of awareness itself was influenced by their social position as “foreigners” and the resultant (lack of) opportunities for exposure to honorifics, participation in the local community and claims to a Korean “face”.

Chapter 9. Discussion and conclusion 251
9.2.2 Honorifics usage and identities of L2 speakers

The way that L2 speakers use honorifics reflects their general social identities in Korea as "Westerners" and "foreigners". In addition, the kind of honorifics competence that speakers developed was influenced by their occupation, ethnicity and, to an extent, by their gender. The use of authentic conversational data (Chapter 7) and learner stories (Chapter 8) revealed that these identities and the honorifics use that went with them were co-constructed between the L2 speakers and their L1 interlocutors. In other words, the patterns of honorifics use reflected not only the values of the L2 speakers themselves but also the attitudes that Korean native speakers held towards these speakers and their language use. In this section, I recapitulate these different identities in turn and summarize the way that they were involved in the application of honorifics.

9.2.2.1 Westerners

The identity of "Westerner" proved crucial to the understanding of honorifics use in L1-L2 interactions. I reiterate at this stage that I use "Westerner" as a general label for all those raised and educated in Europe, North America or Australasia and who thus share common cultural values. The fact that all participants in the current study shared a common layer of ideology regarding human interaction (and politeness in particular) was underlined throughout the data analysis and by the problems that even heritage speakers and Japanese nationals encountered using Korean honorifics.

The identity of "Westerner" proved a major reason for many L2 learners of Korean to stray from native speaker norms in their use of honorifics. If we accept Block's (2007:40) definition of language identity as the "relationship between one's sense of self and a means of communication", the "Western" image of the self was found to be at odds with the non-egalitarian and non-reciprocal use of honorific forms and the emphasis placed on values such as age and rank. Not only did being a "Westerner" limit the importance that participants attached to appropriate honorifics use, but it also at times resulted in L2 speakers deliberately straying from or flouting L1 norms. I summarize my findings regarding these points in more depth in the subsequent section on politeness ideology.

The emphasis on a more egalitarian mode of human interaction implied by the "Westerner" identity also influenced the way that Korean speakers addressed L2 speakers and the way that honorifics use was co-constructed in natural conversation. The conversation and learner story data shows a tendency for neither L2 speakers nor their L1 counterparts to expect exchanges involving "Westerners" to necessarily have the same hierarchical structure as native speaker talk, even when the setting was distinctly Korean and the language being used was Korean.
On the part of the native speakers, this translated into the adoption of patterns of honorific use that would not normally be appropriate in the Korean context. This included either the blanket use of non-honorific *panmal* or the contrary pattern of faithfully applying honorific *contaymal* despite power and distance factors. It was posited that these patterns not only reflected an uncertainty as to where "foreigners" fitted into the social hierarchy, but also a more specific move to accommodate towards the perceived universal egalitarianism of Western cultures. With some knowledge of English language and Western culture, Korean speakers saw it as quite reasonable for them to accommodate towards Western politeness ideology in conversations with L2 speakers. In sum, the identity of "Westerner" precluded a movement towards more egalitarian patterns of honorifics use in encounters between L2 speakers and Korean interlocutors.

### 9.2.2.2 Foreigners

As "foreigners", the identity of L2 speakers typically lay on the peripheries of Korean social groups. With honorifics being irrevocably tied to social, cultural and contextual factors, being a "foreigner" inevitably restricted the way that L2 speakers used honorifics. This point was succinctly summed up by one particularly talented and eloquent participant – Canadian graduate student Matthew:

(1) **Interview data: Matthew**

I think it is possible for me to do it [use honorifics] exactly as a Korean in so far as my social situation in Korea. I don't think there is any particular limit on correct use of honorifics or successful use of honorifics. But the use of honorifics is inevitably tied to your situation. There may be a limit to the social position I can acquire. The fact that I am a foreigner to a certain extent controls my social position, but within my social position I think I can be using honorifics almost entirely correctly, or as correctly as anyone else.

In line with Matthew's comments, the "learner stories" analyzed in Chapter 8 showed that certain social positions, identities and modes of honorifics were particularly problematic for L2 learners to negotiate. For some speakers, developing intimate peer-group relationships and reciprocal *panmal* proved difficult, a situation I discuss more specifically under the heading of "professionals" below. Elsewhere, L2 speakers struggled in their attempts to adopt honorific usages that were tied up with hierarchical social relationships. Speakers found that their attempts to use honorifics that cast them in the role either of status superior (teacher, fictive older sibling, etc.) or status subordinate (fictive younger sibling) were not always judged acceptable for them as "foreigners". In part, such roles were seen as inconsistent with the more egalitarian relationships that Koreans expected
to assume with non-Koreans. In addition, the applications of certain patterns of honorification (particularly *panmal* and fictive kinship terms) were associated with a degree of ingroupness that was perhaps incongruous with the “foreigner” identity. As shall be discussed in more detail below, the “foreigner” tag applied less to the heritage speaker group. However, the natural interaction and learner story data showed that those of Korean heritage also at times found themselves cast as “outsider”, particularly when their linguistic expertise or self-presentation fell short of the native speaker baseline.

Although L2 speakers at times attempted to reject the “foreigner” tag by making conscious efforts to use honorifics according to native-like patterns, at other times speakers found that the application of non-native patterns was actually better suited both to their individual relationships and to their conversational goals. The fact was that the kind of relationships that “foreigners” established in Korea did not always fit the typical patterns of Korean social relationships. Most notably, certain speakers established intimate and non-hierarchical “friendships” (or romantic relationships) both with notable superiors and with notable subordinates. The fact that the relationship itself did not fit the Korean hierarchical pattern seemed to necessitate the negotiation of a mode of honorifics use – and the presentation of face – that also fell “outside” Korean social norms.

A crucial finding was that the weakening of hierarchical role relationships in L1-L2 encounters was at times perceived as an advantage by L2 speakers. Discussions in Chapters 7 and 8 revealed a belief on the part of some speakers that their “foreigner” identity could actually facilitate the creation and maintenance of intimate relationships in some contexts. Previous literature on identity and language learning has generally assumed that L2 learners receiving different treatment due to their “foreigner” identity to be a negative situation, both in terms of their language learning and their social mobility. The findings of the current study suggest that this may not always be the case and that occupying social positions on the peripheries may at times actually be advantageous, at least for negotiating intimate relationships.

9.2.2.3 Localized social identities

The research goals of this study also posited that different L2 speakers may develop different kinds of competence depending on more localized aspects of their social identities. Results from the DCT data found statistically significant differences in the performance of the occupation categories (“exchange students”; “professionals”) and ethnic groups (“heritage speakers”; “non-heritage speakers”). Discussions in subsequent chapters found that these differences resulted from the contrasting opportunities for participation in the local community of practice that these occupations and ethnicities entailed. In addition to considering
occupation (Section 9.2.2.3.1) and ethnicity (9.2.2.3.2) the current section also looks briefly at gender as an aspect of identity relevant to L2 usage (9.2.2.3.3). I summarize the specific competences and attitudes of each participant in turn through the charts in Appendix 6.

9.2.2.3.1 Occupation. Whether a participant belonged to the “exchange students” or “professionals” group was found to be the most powerful factor in predicting the kind of honorific competence that they developed. DCT data in Chapter 5 and subsequent analysis of conversational data and learner stories in Chapters 6–8 uncovered a number of differences between the two groups. I shall now summarize these differences, looking at each area of the honorifics system in turn.

Starting with hearer honorifics (speech styles), the overall tendency for L2 speakers to overgeneralize honorific speech styles at the expense of non-honorific styles was found to apply more to the professionals rather than to the exchange students. Indeed, DCT data showed that this “overuse” of honorific speech styles was only statistically significant in the case of the former. This difference between the two groups was explained through the opportunities for participation tied up with these two occupational identities. Natural conversational data showed that the exchange student identity provided speakers with opportunities to reciprocate panmäl during casual friendships around the university; as a result, these speakers developed the fluency and confidence to use non-honorific language more successfully than the professionals. Indeed, some exchange students were shown to overgeneralize panmäl rather than contaymäl and to negotiate reciprocal non-honorific usage even with strangers and superiors. For the professionals, the absolute age of these speakers and the environments in which they used Korean rendered it problematic for them to establish casual peer-group relations. In addition, as shown in the analysis of natural interactions in Chapter 7, even when the relationships appeared to be close and casual enough, these speakers frequently complained of being kept at a distance by native speakers through the continual use of contaymäl. Related to these experiences, some professionals had developed negative views regarding panmäl, a situation I discuss in more detail below.

Significant differences were discovered between the groups regarding the use of referent honorifics as well. Here, it was the exchange students who differed the most from the L1 baseline. Occupying positions outside the hierarchy of the university, these speakers had few opportunities to interact with status superiors or in formal contexts and develop pragmatic knowledge pertaining to referent honorifics. Turning our attention to the professionals, although these speakers used referent honorifics at a higher frequency, a key finding of the DCT was that this higher usage did not necessarily result in more native-like distribution. Rather than varying their application of such forms according to power and distance, the
professionals applied referent honorifics in a more egalitarian way and tended to (inappropriately) omit these forms in interactions, for example, with non-intimate marginal superiors or intimate significant superiors. Although these speakers may have been exposed to referent honorifics in the professional environments in which they used Korean, the positions they occupied in the workplace or graduate school did not necessarily entail the same hierarchical roles as those of their Korean colleagues and this may explain why their patterns of usage differed in this way.

Looking briefly at forms of address, the professionals displayed the greatest deviation regarding this aspect of honorifics usage. The overall tendency for L2 speakers to overgeneralize the application of personal names at the expense of other patterns of address affected this group more. In particular, whereas the exchange students were generally comfortable with the application of fictive kinship terms, the professionals displayed more resistance to adopting this mode of address.

In sum, these results suggest that the exchange student identity was more beneficial for the learning of honorifics than the professional identity. Although neither identity was advantageous for developing usage of forms that indexed high "separation", being an exchange student allowed speakers to develop casual peer-group relationships and the non-honorifics modes of honorifics use that went with this. From a language acquisition point of view, the finding that the exchange student experience is more beneficial for the development of non-honorific rather than honorific language mirrors previous research such as Marriott (1995) and Cook (2008) regarding learners of Japanese. Marriott (1995) found that learners returning from a year abroad in Japan had developed use of plain styles, but had not mastered referent honorifics.

9.2.2.3.2 Ethnicity. Whether a speaker was of Korean or non-Korean ethnicity was found to have a significant influence on the kind of honorifics competence that they developed. Being a heritage speaker entailed several apparent advantages when it came to learning honorifics. However, not all heritage speakers were able or willing to exploit these advantages. Due to this, the influence of ethnicity was found to be less meaningful than that of occupation.

Regarding speech style usage, heritage learners enjoyed the advantage of being more fluent users of non-honorific panmal; however, this fluency did not always result in improved knowledge of the contexts in which these forms could be applied. Role-play data in Chapter 6 showed that, thanks in large part to socialization in the use of these forms in the family environment, the vast majority of these speakers had native-like control over the non-honorific {E} style and rarely slipped into the honorific {Y} when addressing the "friend". This pragmatic ability was not shared by several of the non-heritage speakers. As shown in the
natural interaction data (Chapter 7), this acted as a further barrier for those of non-Korean ethnicity to gain confidence in using non-honorific speech styles and negotiating intimate relationships.

However, interview and learner story data revealed that heritage speakers also experienced insecurity regarding the application of \textit{panmal}. Uncertain whether using these non-honorific forms was acceptable or not, heritage speakers also selected the strategy of “playing it safe” and used \textit{panmal} at a lower rate than the L1 baseline (DCT data in Chapter 5). As a final point regarding speech style usage, heritage speakers (particularly female professionals) were shown to struggle to control the “deferential” \{P\} speech style and a formal register of speech.

Turning our attention to referent honorifics and forms of address, DCT data revealed that heritage learners came closer to replicating L1 “norms” in both of these areas. However, this was not to say that this usage was necessarily native-like or that their identities and ideologies as “Westerners” did not influence this usage. Indeed, the application of referent honorifics was shown to be inconsistent (Chapters 5, 6), with this inconsistency resulting from a low conscious awareness of the pragmalinguistics and frame-based usage of these forms. The heritage speaker identity in itself did not necessarily preclude extra socialization in the use of forms that indexed “high separation”. Regarding terms of address, one surprising finding was that, despite having been brought up in a Korean family environment, not all heritage speakers were willing users of kinship terms.

Ultimately, being ethnically Korean did not automatically result in heritage speakers being able to claim a Korean identity and adopt the patterns of honorifics usage that went with this. Although the general society expectation for them to adopt local modes of behavior may be viewed as a positive language learning condition, the weight of this expectation actually had some negative effects. Firstly, it resulted in several of the heritage speakers looking outside of Korean society for socializing and friendships or of taking measures to emphasize that they were “foreigners” (including the deliberate rejection of native-like patterns of honorifics use, particularly the use of kinship terms). In addition, the social pressure to “be Korean” meant that these speakers more acutely felt the conflict between “Western” and Korean modes of politeness and at times this resulted in the more salient flouting of honorific “norms” (Chapter 8). Most interestingly, the naturally occurring data collected in Chapters 7 and 8 shows that even heritage speakers are at times cast in the role of “foreigner” and receive honorifics that differ from typical L1 norms. On this point, it seems that sub-native linguistic performance on the part of these speakers – or the active expression of a lack of affiliation to the Korean identity – may result even in heritage speakers being cast as “outsiders”.
9.2.2.3.3 Gender. The book did not explore in depth the influence of gender on the way that L2 speakers use Korean honorifics. However, it was found that female Westerners learning Korean at times struggled to align the weaker and more submissive local female identity with their more egalitarian and feminist views. One particular element of the Korean honorifics system that some female L2 speakers found to be incongruent with their identities as Western women was the kinship term oppa (‘older brother’). Some speakers avoided using this term due to feelings that it was too “girly” and implied a subservient female role. However, in contrast to this, role-play data showed that female speakers tended to undergeneralize the more authoritarian {P} speech style, perhaps due connections between this style and masculinity. In sum, the book offers some support for previous studies (notably Siegal 1994 for Japanese) claiming that Western female learners of non-Western languages experience extra difficulties in establishing an L2 “face” and following the local norms of language use.

9.2.3 Honorifics usage and politeness ideology

A central claim of this book has been that politeness is an important concept in explaining both the knowledge that L2 speakers develop of honorifics and the ways that they choose to apply these forms. In the following summary, I recapitulate three salient patterns of honorifics identified in this book that show clear evidence of “Western” politeness ideologies being transferred into Korean: egalitarian modes of honorifics use, manipulation of honorifics for “modulation politeness” and avoidance of panmal. I comment further on the significance of these findings regarding politeness and language acquisition in Section 9.3.

The most fundamental salient pattern of honorifics use emerging in the L2 data was the preference for more egalitarian patterns of honorifics. In particular, it was noted that speakers overgeneralized application of the {Y} speech style (without referent honorifics) and the name+ssi form of address, at times using this “code” indiscriminate of factors such as “power” or “distance”. Not only does such usage represent simplicity, but it also corresponds well with the politeness ideology of Western learners and the way they may choose to present themselves in Korean society. By interspersing their speech with -yo and -ssi, they felt that they were making efforts to be “polite” in the Korean context. But by applying these patterns in an egalitarian way they also managed to stay within the boundaries of their pre-existing politeness ideologies that stressed the importance of egalitarianism and which were opposed to overt discrimination based on age, rank, gender and so forth. The indexing of relatively small age differences was
found to be particularly difficult to reconcile with the importance these speakers placed on equal usage; marking an age difference of just one or two years was described as "illogical" by some participants.

The use of role-play data in Chapter 6 revealed one further way in which a Western mode of politeness ideology influences honorifics in L2 talk. In addition to favoring a more egalitarian mode of politeness, it was posited that Western politeness ideology places more emphasis on "modulation politeness" (the modifying of the propositional content or the force of an utterance) rather than "indexical politeness" (the signaling of appropriate relationships to addressees, referents and bystanders). Not only did this result in speakers having limited awareness of the need to modify their honorifics use according to the identity of the addressee, but it also prompted speakers to manipulate honorific forms to mitigate their utterances. This was borne out in the way that L2 speakers frequently upgraded their honorifics when they had to perform sensitive speech acts, including apologies. Here, one particularly salient pattern was the upgrading from non-honorific _panmal_ to the honorific _{Y}_ speech style when apologizing to an intimate - a mode of honorifics use according to modulation politeness not normally present in L1 Korean.

Both salient patterns of honorifics use discussed in the two preceding paragraphs involve, at least in part, a move away from _panmal_ to _contaymal_ and the over-application of the _{Y}_ speech style. Indeed, discussions in Chapter 7 revealed a particular ideological resistance to _panmal_ on the part of certain speakers, particularly part-time martial arts instructor Holly. This speaker was shown to avoid _panmal_ even when addressing intimates and subordinates largely due to the lack of "respect" associated with this style. The analysis showed that Holly's Western politeness ideology emphasized an egalitarian conceptualization of "respecting your fellow human beings" rather than the hierarchical "respecting elders" which prevails in Korean society. As a result, for Holly, use of _panmal_ was tied up with slighting the hearer or impinging on their human rights, rather than merely indexing social relationships. Due to such concerns, she avoided _panmal_ and tended to apply the _{Y}_ speech style universally. Fascinatingly, the data showed that the only instances in which she would use _panmal_ were cases in which she was angry, wanted to be rude or felt that her interlocutors had forfeited their right to be shown respect. The fact that some L2 speakers may perceive _panmal_ in this way raises serious questions for how these forms are taught in the KSL classroom, as I consider at more length in the following section.
9.3 Implications of the study

The current section discusses the implications of the study for politeness research (Section 9.3.1) interlanguage pragmatics (Section 9.3.2) and language pedagogy (Section 9.3.3).

9.3.1 Implications for politeness research

This book has contributed to our understanding of politeness in three aspects.

Firstly, the study represents a rare and much needed attempt to construct a theoretical framework regarding how politeness is “learned”. The workings of the framework have been demonstrated through application to authentic Korean data. The model that I have proposed schematizes the acquisition of politeness in L2 as a process of “re-framing”, in other words, of renegotiating and enriching cognitive representations of contexts and associated language use. Despite the advanced level of competence of participants in the study, the data showed them to at times still involved in this process of negotiating what it meant to be “polite” according to local norms. In some circumstances, speakers lacked the “frame-based” knowledge required to ascertain the appropriate level of honorifics use or to comprehend the social meanings and implications of their choice of honorific forms. The author believes that the “re-framing” approach is particularly relevant to current trends in politeness research due to the way it builds on one dominant strand of emerging politeness theory: the “frame-based” approach to politeness (Terkourafi 2005). Future research is needed to more accurately ascertain the characteristics of “re-framing” and the conditions under which it may take place.

Secondly, as summarized in the previous section, the book has demonstrated how pre-existing politeness ideologies exert a direct influence on the choices that L2 learners make in “real-world” interactions. Evidently, the kinds of ideologies that were uncovered – and the contrasts between Korean and “Western” politeness that they illustrate (for example, hierarchical versus egalitarian conceptualizations of human relationships) do not represent “new” findings as such. Having said this, the significant discovery was that these ideologies directly influence the way that speakers perceive and ultimately apply politeness features in the L2. In some cases, we see participants directly transferring “Western” lay conceptualizations of how politeness should work onto the way that they rationalize their own use of speech styles. Here, participants quoted “(im)politeness” (or “(dis)respect) as being the motivation for them applying speech styles in a certain way. However, closer analysis showed that this “politeness” was imbued with “Western” rather
than Korean social values, including, most crucially, the want to treat others in an
equal and egalitarian fashion.

Thirdly and more generally, the study has added additional support for the
view that face and politeness are constituted through a process that is interac­
tional and discursive. In encounters between L1 and L2 speakers, “frames” of po­
liteness are by no means automatically prescribed along typical local community
norms. Indeed, in some instances, it may be that these “norms” are not considered
appropriate for L2 learners, or don’t apply to the dynamics of specific individual
interactions (Brown 2010b: 266). In the struggle for politeness in L1-L2 interac­
tions, it cannot be presumed that it necessarily only the L2 speaker who runs the
risk of threatening the face of the L1 speaker. Rather, L2 speakers may also experi­
ence loss of face, particularly when they perceive L1 speakers applying language
use that works to discriminate against them as non-native speakers. Consistent
with the frame-based view of politeness (Terkourafi 2005: 253), the book found
that what constitutes politeness is “transient” and always “subject to revision”.

9.3.2 Implications for interlanguage pragmatics

The current study has contributed to the understanding of interlanguage prag­
matics on three counts.

Firstly, the data has confirmed that pragmatic performance cannot be judged
purely in relation to pragmatic knowledge and that speaker identities and associ­
ated ideologies regarding language use play an important role. The current project
thus provides strong evidence supporting Kasper and Rose’s (2002: 295) statement
that L2 speakers “may not conform to societal expectations for reasons other than
incompetence” and has added to a growing body of research looking at the con­
nection between identity and pragmatic development.

Secondly and more importantly, through the introduction of the concept of
“politeness ideology”, I have tackled the problem as to what kind of pragmatic
features L2 speakers may find particularly difficult to adopt. The evidence sug­
jects that speakers have low conscious awareness of modes of politeness that are
not ideologically invested in their native (or previous) cultures and are resistant to
aligning these modes with their self identity. Relating this to the Korean context,
as summarized above, it was found that speakers had a tendency to undervalue
the importance of using honorifics according to “indexical politeness” and were
reluctant to use language to overtly mark hierarchical relationships. Politeness
ideologies can be particularly powerful obstacles to adopting native-like patterns
of language usage in that they represent ideals rather than realities. For “Western”
learners of Korean, the difficulty of applying honorifics according to hierarchical
patterns was exacerbated by their pre-existing social ideal that as "Westerners" they did not and should not discriminate according to age, rank, sex, etc. The native pragmatic knowledge that learners bring to the L2 does not always represent objective pragmatic knowledge, but rather knowledge that is necessarily ideologically invested.

Thirdly, the study has shown that the kind of roles, faces and social identities available to different L2 speakers greatly influences the kind of pragmatic competence that they develop. This was shown most clearly in the differences in honorifics usage between the two occupation and ethnic groups, as discussed in Section 9.2.2.3 above. Here, a key observation was that social identities are not fixed, but are constantly contested between the L2 speakers and the local community of practice. As an example, non-heritage speakers were shown to use Korean honorifics as markers for establishing a local identity, just as heritage speakers at times flouted honorific norms to make salient that they were not "completely Korean".

As a crucial extension to this third point, the book has offered a more positive prognosis for language learners who find themselves positioned as "foreigners" by the local community. Previous literature has generally assumed that being treated as a "foreigner" is negative both for language learning and for more general concerns such as social mobility and self expression. Norton (2000) for example claims that speakers who are seen as perpetual outsiders rather than "potential members" of the community may not be deemed "worthy to speak" and are kept linguistically isolated. However, the current study has found that although being cast as a "foreigner" may in some ways limit the kind of interactions that speakers enjoyed, it by no means eliminated participation altogether. Indeed, quite to the contrary, discussions in Chapters 7 and 8, showed that some speakers actually viewed their "foreigner" identity as being an advantage of sorts when it came to using honorifics and forming intimate relationships with Korean acquaintances. For a number of participants in the study, even though being treated "differently" because of their foreigner identity was a frustration, they were also prepared to use their "different" identity to pursue their own conversational goals. With the knowledge that Korean interactional norms (including the norms of honorifics use) did not always apply to them, L2 speakers were prepared to enjoy the freedom this gave them to negotiate more egalitarian patterns of interaction and ultimately to get "closer" to their Korean interlocutors. The conclusion that "foreigners" may be able to negotiate intimate relationships perhaps not licensed in the L1 sphere stands in sharp contrast to the idea of "foreigners" being isolated from the local community due to their identity.
9.3.3 Implications for language pedagogy

This study has focused on the ways that honorifics are used and developed by L2 speakers rather than on how they are taught in the language classroom. However, observations regarding the ways that L2 learners use and perceive honorifics and the issues that they experience in their development should be of direct relevance to teachers, textbook writers and syllabus designers, especially those involved in the teaching of Korean or other languages with complex categories of honorific forms.

9.3.3.1 The role of native speaker norms

The finding that politeness for L2 speakers is negotiated rather than prescribed along L1 lines should have implications for the way that politeness — and Korean honorifics more specifically — are taught in the second language classroom.

If politeness is "negotiated" rather than "prescribed", it is no longer feasible for language teachers to hold L1 speaker use as the unquestioned and absolute goal to which learners have to aspire to and by which their pragmatic performance is judged. For the Korean language teacher, prescribing that learners have to use honorifics "just like Koreans" could in actual fact be counter productive as such usage may not correspond with the "face" that the learners choose to present when interacting with Korean speakers. In addition, it may not even correspond to the expectations of Korean interlocutors who, as demonstrated in this study, frequently expect honorifics use in their interactions with Westerners to be less hierarchy-based. This claim that L1 norms may not always be the ultimate goal of language teaching corresponds to the shift within second language acquisition away from accepting the native speaker as being the ultimate model for L2 speakers to aspire to and the recognition of the competence of a bilingual L2 speaker as being necessarily different from that of monolingual native speakers (see Cook 2008: 173).

However, the fact that L2 norms may be "different" does not necessarily mean that learners should be left to negotiate politeness for themselves, nor that they do not require explicit instruction in politeness "norms". Rather, the role of the language classroom should be to educate learners regarding these local community norms so that they are in a position to make an informed choice regarding the linguistic behavior that they adopt and are aware of the possible social meanings that their stylistic choices may convey. On this point, the data for the current project revealed that even advanced learners of Korean are not always in possession of developed or "accurate" knowledge regarding the social meanings of honorific forms. The most striking example of this was the belief of some
speakers, particularly martial arts instructor Holly, that the use of non-honorific *panmal* was universally “disrespectful”. As previously argued, this understanding of Holly showed marked differences to native speaker understandings of the contextually appropriate dropping of honorific forms when addressing intimates. One of the tasks of educators and textbook designers is to assist learners in better understanding the contextualized meanings of different code choices.

9.3.3.2 Teaching “high” and “low” language

The analysis in the current project has shown that L2 speakers have a tendency to underuse forms that exist at both the “high” and the “low” ends of the honorifics spectrum. By underusing referent honorifics on the one hand and non-honorific *panmal* on the other, L2 speakers prefer a register that is “distant” but not completely deferential. It has been argued throughout this book that the preference for this register is influenced by these speakers’ pre-existing ideologies regarding what it means to be a “polite speaker” and also that this usage is connected to the kind of identities that L2 speakers negotiate in Korean culture. However, in this section I will show that this mixed honorific/non-honorific code is also over-represented in Korean textbooks. This fact, I will claim, is not coincidental and ultimately works to limit L2 speaker knowledge of honorifics and their social meanings.

Previous research looking at the representations of honorifics in Korean textbooks have claimed that these books present a limited picture of honorifics use. Although this observation applies particularly to lower level textbooks, the limitations in the variety of honorific forms presented extends to some degree to advanced level materials, at least in certain textbook series (Brown 2010a:48). The failure of these books to present a varied range of honorific forms has been shown to be rooted in a more general failing to include a diversity of social contexts in textbook dialogues, listening comprehensions and so forth. In a review of three popular textbook series (those published by Korea University, Sogang University and Ewha Womans University), Brown (2010a:40) found that 60.5% of all dialogues featured reciprocal relationships between casual acquaintances appearing to be of similar age-rank. On the other hand, interactions between a status subordinate and a notable superior (such as a professor, boss, etc.) accounted for only 5.8%. Similar data is also reported in Lee On-kyeong (2005) and Choo Mi-ho (1999). As claimed by Brown (2010a:40), “this under-representation of hierarchical and non-reciprocal patterns of communication greatly limits the propensity for these texts to depict a varied range of honorific usage patterns”.

Furthermore, even when contexts arise in these textbooks where “high” forms (i.e. referent honorifics) or “low” forms (i.e. *panmal*) would normally be expected, the books frequently choose not to include them. Brown (2010a) shows examples
of dialogues featuring junior work colleagues not applying referent honorifics (on the one hand) and university "friends" avoiding panmal (on the other). Although a lack of contextual information makes it difficult to judge these individual usages as necessarily inappropriate, the upshot is that referent honorifics and panmal are both underrepresented. Non-honorific panmal speech styles, for example, account for only 12.4% of all utterances across the three textbooks reviewed by Brown (2010a:41) and only 4.4% in one of the books (Ewha). Since the teaching of panmal is generally delayed to intermediate level, its underrepresentation is more evident in beginner level materials. However, even after panmal has been introduced, supposed "friends" continue to be more frequently portrayed reciprocating honorific speech to each other.

Brown (2010a:47) argues that this presentation of honorifics in Korean textbooks cannot be fully explained through the need to simplify language to meet learner abilities. Rather, Brown concludes that the decision of these textbook writers to present honorifics in a less varied and more egalitarian pattern is influenced, at least subconsciously, by preconceptions regarding the kind of language needed by "foreigners" and the social roles that they may possess in Korean society. In other words, the textbook designers seem to harbor the same expectations as lay native speakers (see Chapters 7 and 8) regarding the way that the norms of honorifics use may apply (or not apply) to non-Koreans and this is directly reflected in their choice of how they portray language in the textbooks in question.

Ultimately, the presentation of honorifics in Korean textbooks may play an active role in the process of "negotiation" that accompanies the use of honorifics by L2 speakers. In something of a cyclical process, first the books are written reflecting native speaker preconceptions regarding the use of honorifics by "foreigners". Then, when these books are used as teaching materials, "foreigners" are encouraged to use these very patterns, which are attractive to them given their pre-existing beliefs regarding politeness. The adoption of these patterns by "foreigners" who have learned in this way then works to reinforce the perception that this was how "foreigners" use honorifics in the first place. Although fascinating, establishing how "active" this process really is lies outside the scope of the current study. I leave it to future to research to investigate the extent to which L2 speaker use of honorifics is influenced by the portrayal of honorifics in Korean textbooks.

Ultimately, Korean language textbooks do not do enough to educate learners regarding how honorifics work in native speaker talk and about the social meanings of these forms. Furthermore, the way that honorifics are presented ignores the need for L2 learners to experience language use in more sophisticated social encounters, particularly those with status superiors. In order for learners to develop understanding of the social meanings of honorifics and the frames in which
they are used, a wider range of social interactions and honorifics usages needs to be represented in Korean teaching materials.

9.3.3.3 The argument for explicit instruction and consciousness raising
Previous research has emphasized the important role of explicit teaching and feedback for the development of pragmatics and politeness, both in first and second language contexts. In their review of previous research into pragmatics instruction, Kasper and Rose (2002: 273) conclude that “explicit instruction combined with ample practice opportunities results in the greatest gains”. The need for feedback is emphasized in studies of L1 children, where parents are shown to exert much effort into correcting their children, who do not produce politeness routines and markers spontaneously (Greif et al. 1976; Matsumori 1981; Clancy 1986).

Although the current book has not been able to assess the instruction of pragmatic aspects of honorifics in the Korean language classroom directly, the fact that Korean language teachers rarely provide explicit correction of honorifics was a key observation that emerged in the interview and “learner story” data. Only two speakers could recall ever receiving feedback from their Korean language teachers on their use of honorifics. In addition, learners claimed to be able to drop referent honorifics when addressing their Korean teachers without receiving any correction or sanction. This was particularly noteworthy given the advanced competence of the participants in the current study.

The lack of corrective feedback from teachers, which it appears could extend to advanced proficiency levels, may represent a serious obstacle for L2 speakers to develop frame-based knowledge regarding the contexts in which honorifics need to be applied. For some participants in the current project, their Korean language teacher represented the only status superior with whom they had regular contact. This left them with little or no opportunity ever to receive corrective feedback on inappropriate omission of referent honorifics. For other participants who had opportunities to interact with status superiors elsewhere, the “learner stories” showed that the leniency of the Korean teachers was not always matched by status superiors in the “real world”. Here, Korean native speakers were often critical of L2 speakers for their honorifics use particularly in multi-party settings. This point should highlight to language educators the importance of providing correction for pragmatic failure, particularly at advanced levels where their lack of pragmatic knowledge is not always as easily excused in the “real world”.

Regarding the explicit teaching of honorifics in the KSL classroom, one particular area that needs to be addressed is raising learner awareness of the differences in emphasis between Korean and Western modes of politeness. The results from the current project suggest that one reason for L2 speakers of Korean to
stray from L1 norms of honorifics use was a limited awareness of indexical politeness and an ideologically invested preference for egalitarian language use. Teaching learners to index hierarchical social relationships through the use of honorifics may be complicated from the outset by learner lack of awareness of this mode of politeness in their native language and a (misplaced) belief that their L1 does not index age-rank. This situation is made worse by the all too frequent portrayal of honorifics as being a uniquely Korean mode of language use that is complex and difficult for learners to acquire (cf. Choo Mi-ho’s 1999:78 comment that KSL textbooks “discourage” and “intimidate” learners regarding the complexity of the choice of honorifics).

To raise learner awareness of honorific forms, the current author would like to advocate the use of consciousness-raising activities similar to those described in Byon (2007). In this study, Byon (2007) describes his adaptation of TV talk show materials for teaching the honorific \{Y\} and \{P\} styles. In order to draw learner attention to the alternation between these two forms, Byon (2007) suggests both deductive and inductive approaches. The former involves simply underlining the different speech style endings and discussing their distribution with the students. More interestingly, the second involves blanking out the verb endings and asking students to complete them. This may be done either cloze-style or by providing multiple choice between two or three possible forms. Although Byon (2007) focuses on the use of this technique to teach the \{Y\} and \{P\} styles, the current author has also adapted this technique for teaching the difference between the non-honorific \{E\} and \{T\} styles to upper intermediate learners. Indeed, it appears likely that this technique could be adopted to help promote learner awareness of most if not any set of honorific forms.

Such consciousness raising activities can then be followed by more general discussions of the use of honorifics and their social meanings. Given the low awareness of indexical politeness noted on the parts of “Westerners”, the discussion may benefit from mentioning the ways that English (or the learners’ alternative first language(s)) marks social roles and shows variation according to interlocutor identity and context. The discussion can then move to the added importance that Korean places on this mode of politeness compared with the Korean stress on indexical politeness. An additional benefit of this approach is that it would offset possible learner misconceptions that the lack of stress placed on modulation politeness in Korean (and the apparently more direct nature of certain Korean speech acts and low use of terms corresponding to English “politeness markers”) renders the language and its speakers “impolite”.

Towards a pragmatic approach to teaching honorifics

Discussions in the opening chapters of this book (Chapters 2 and 3) underlined that describing honorifics purely in grammatical terms is unsatisfactory in a number of ways. I reiterated that a variety of honorifics usages emerging in native speaker discourse cannot be understood without resort to pragmatic factors. These observations particularly applied to the subject honorific "marker" -si- which although traditionally described as being controlled by grammatical agreement is in fact extremely sensitive to extralinguistic factors.

However, a review of leading Korean textbooks reveals that -si- is still frequently taught primarily through grammatical description and the idea of "agreement". In Yonsei Korean (written at and published by Yonsei university) for example, -si- first appears in relation to talking about family members of superior age (i.e. parents and grandparents) with the following being provided as the first example in a textbook dialogue.

(2) pwumomin-un eti-ey kyeysi-pnikka?
parents-TOP where-DAT stay:SHON-INT:{P}
"Where are your parents?"
(from Yonsei Hankwuke 1, Yonsei University Press, p. 76)

The dialogue containing this sentence is accompanied by a table showing non-honorific and honorific verb forms. The column of non-honorific forms is headed by a picture of a small girl and the title "yetonsayng-i" 'younger sister-NOM' and the column of honorific forms is headed by a picture of an elderly woman labeled "halmoni-kkeyse" 'grandmother-NOM:HON'. This is an apparent attempt to illustrate what sentence subjects honorific and non-honorific forms should appear with (although, with no further explanation provided, it seems unlikely that learners would be able to deduct the rule for themselves). In the grammar notes at the end of the chapter, it is noted that -si- is used to "express respect for the subject of the sentence" with no mention of the sociopragmatic conditions under which thus may be required (page 84).

Not only is presentation of honorifics as "agreement" with 'grandmother' or 'younger sibling' poorly thought out, introducing referent honorifics first in third-person sentences also appears ill-advised. Previous research suggests that L2 learners have particular difficulty understanding the mandate for applying referent honorifics when talking about absent third parties. To take one example, in his autobiographical account of learning Japanese, Cohen (1997), noted that he found the need to index "respect" when talking third parties to be "illogical" and, coupled with the sporadic representation of honorifics in classroom material, ended up questing whether these forms were not just an extra "burden" that could
be “ignored”. The current study has furthermore shown a tendency for speakers to undervalue the importance of referent honorifics and to undergeneralize their usage. Although the study has not properly investigated the influence of classroom instruction and teaching materials on the knowledge of -si- by L2 speakers, it can at least be claimed that Korean education is not doing enough to educate learners as to the pragmatic behavior of these forms and the social meanings they take on.

Instead of teaching -si- as an instance of grammatical agreement, this form can also be taught according to its pragmatic functions. These functions can be identified, separated and taught at a level that reflects their organizational and pragmatic “difficulty”. Given the problems that learners seem to encounter in understanding the function of -si- with third person sentence subjects, the current author advises delaying the teaching of such sentences to at least low intermediate level. At ab initio level, -si- can first be taught in second person sentences, namely personal questions and imperatives. In actual fact, this approach has already been adopted by some Korean textbooks including Elementary Korean (King and Yeon, Tuttle) and Sogang Hankwuke, Sogang University Press) As can be seen in the following examples (which are taken from the textbook dialogues where -si- is first introduced), the first of these books teaches subject honorifics first in personal questions and the second book employs imperatives:

(3) yocum mwel ha-si-eyo?
   these-days what do-shon-\{y\}
   ‘What are you doing these days?’
   (from King and Yeon, Elementary Korean, Tuttle, p. 119)

(4) 62-pen pesu-lo ka-si-eoyo
   62-number bus-by go-shon-\{y\}
   ‘Take the number 62 bus’
   (from Sogang Hankwuke 1A, Sogang University Press, p. 124)

According to the experiences of the current author, learners can be more easily convinced of the importance of using honorifics when taught first using the above two sentence types. By accompanying the teaching of these sentence patterns with discussion of the pragmatic contexts under which honorifics are used, learners can be introduced more gradually into workings of politeness without feeling intimidated by the complexity of the system. Then, when honorifics are taught later with third person subjects and more sophisticated sentence patterns and contexts, learners experience less of the feelings of that these forms are “burdensome” or “illogical”
While accepting that Korean textbooks cannot be expected to provide all of the relevant socio-pragmatic information required to understand the use of honorifics in its entirety, it is my firm belief that textbooks at all levels can at least provide useful guidelines to assist language learners. Indeed, as argued in Choo (1999) and Brown (2010a), basic pragmatic information regarding the use of speech styles does not necessarily need to be that complex. Indeed, the basic conditions under which -si-, for example, is normatively required may be taught by means of a few basic rules of thumb (starting for example with “use in personal questions and imperatives addressed to non-intimates, strangers and people older than you”). As students progress to intermediate and advanced levels, more complex restrictions and patterns of use can be introduced.

9.4 Future directions

The current book has explored the pragmatic competence in Korean honorifics of L2 speakers and has found this competence to differ in vital ways from L1 usage. Rather than merely reflecting a lack of pragmatic knowledge, it has been argued that the more egalitarian pattern of honorifics usage emerging in the L2 data is constructed in relation to these speakers’ identities as “Westerners” and “foreigners” and their pre-existing ideologies pertaining to “politeness”. Crucially, the discussions have revealed key differences between the ways that speakers of different occupational groups, ethnicities and genders may apply honorifics and a variety of motivations, ideologies and identities that underpin such usages. At this concluding stage, I thus recognize that further research into different groups of speakers learning and using Korean in a wide range of different settings may throw up new perspectives that will enrich our understanding of this pivotal point of L2 development. Furthermore, through the use of more extensive DCT formats, the application of further role-play scenarios and the recordings of more varied natural interactions, future research may shed light on L2 honorifics use in a wider variety of social settings. In order to more accurately compare L2 use to that of native speakers, future research should apply more extensive L1 baseline data where appropriate to make sure that L2 research “keeps pace” with the ever-changing face of honorifics use in Korean society. As a more specific point, I acknowledge the need for future research specifically addressing the developmental aspect of the problem. In other words, future studies will need to look more

1. As quite fairly pointed out by one anonymous reviewer, if all sociopragmatic information regarding the use of honorifics was explicitly provided, this may well double or triple the size of your average textbook!
directly at the contexts and ways that learners actually form their knowledge of and attitudes towards honorifics. One particular area requiring more developed future study is the presentation of honorifics in the KSL classroom and the role that this portrayal plays in developing the attitudes of L2 speakers towards the Korean honorifics system.
Appendices

Appendix 1. Discourse Completion Test

Korean language survey

This survey looks at how you use the Korean language in two different situations and with a variety of different people. Because the way that even native speakers use language varies greatly from speaker to speaker, there are no “correct” answers to any of the questions. Rather than thinking too deeply about what you should say or what you were taught in your Korean class, just fill in the survey naturally, using the language that you would use if these were real situations. As these are spoken situations, try to use language that would be appropriate in normal speech.

Situation 1

You are having lunch with some students and professors (all native Korean speaker) from the Korean university at which you are studying. You are having a one-on-one chat with the person next to you, who is male. You are talking about a movie you have seen. You want to ask the person you are talking to if they have also seen this movie:

너는 그 영화를 보아?

How would you say this sentence if you were talking to the different people listed in the tables below?

** If you need it as a term of address, the name of this person you are talking to is 이정민.

You are meeting the person for the first time and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Person</strong></th>
<th><strong>Your answer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Professor (Age = 50)</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를-generator replaced text-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Senpay (2 years older)</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를-generator replaced text-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmate same age</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를-generator replaced text-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hwupay (2 years younger)</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를-generator replaced text-?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have met the person three times before (but are not close) and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Senpay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are close with the person and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Senpay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 영화를 ___________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Situation 2

You are a student representative attending a departmental meeting with 10 other students and 5 professors (all native speakers of Korean) from the Korean university at which you are studying.

The aim of the meeting is to choose some new computer software for the department. One of the other participants in the meeting talks about one particular piece of software. By chance, you saw a report about this same piece of software on the news last night. You mention this to the room and then ask the original speaker, who is male, (across the room with everyone listening) if he also saw the news report:

네는 그 뉴스를 봤어?

How would you say this sentence if you were talking to the different people listed in the tables below?

** If you need it as a term of address, the name of this person you are talking to is 이정민.
### You are meeting the person for the first time and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Senpay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### You have met the person three times before (but are not close) and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Senpay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### You are close with the person and they are ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Professor</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Age = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Senpay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Classmate</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hwupay</td>
<td>은/는 그 뉴스를 ____________?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*☆ 수고 많이 하셨습니다*
*감사합니다*
Appendix 2. DCT raw scores

L2 participant aggregate use of honorific features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech styles</th>
<th>Ref hon -si-</th>
<th>Forms of address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{P} {Y} {E} {T}</td>
<td>P+Y</td>
<td>E+T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYÖN-CH</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P = \{P\} speech style, Y = \{Y\}, E = \{E\}, T = \{T\}.
### L2 participant speech style use on each question (questions 13–24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CH</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P = {P} speech style, Y = {Y}, E = {E}, T = {T}.
### L2 participant referent honorifics use (questions 1–12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroki</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun-Chae</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mieko</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyon-Ch</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin-U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S = inclusion of -si-, X = omission of -si.
L2 participant referent honorifics use (questions 13–24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYÖN-CH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S = inclusion of 꾸- 꾸, X = omission of 꾸-.
## L2 participant forms of address use (questions 1–12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYÖN-CH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = title, K = kinship term, N = personal name, P = pronoun, X = other.
L2 participant forms of address use (questions 13–24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRIK</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T = title, K = kinship term, N = personal name, P = pronoun, X = other.
Appendix 3. Role-play instructions

Spoken Korean language activity

This activity surveys your use of appropriate Korean language in role-play situations. Your partner will be a native speaker of Korean.

When performing the role-plays, try to behave as closely as possible to how you would if these were real situations happening to you in Korea. This includes:

1. what you choose to say and not to say
2. what language you use
3. what non-verbal behavior you employ

There is no “correct” way to perform these activities. The way that native speakers act in such situations also differs greatly from individual to individual. Just try to relax, imagine yourself in the situation and speak as naturally as possible.

The “professor” role-play

Roles:

You are an exchange student at XXX University.
Your partner is the professor of your “Korean History and Culture” class at XXX University, aged 45 years. You have been taking his/her classes for two semesters.

Situation:

You visit the professor in his/her office.
You are 20 minutes late for the appointment you had made with him/her via e-mail. The reason for this is because you were delayed talking to another professor after class. Last week, your professor lent you a book about Korean culture called “우리 나라, 우리 문화”. Unfortunately, you have lost the book – you left it on the subway. You went to lost-and-found but the book has not been handed in. You tried to buy a new copy of the book. However, it seems like the book is out of print.

Instructions:

Begin the role-play by greeting the professor as you enter his/her office.
Do your best to placate your angry professor for your lateness and for losing the book.
Decide with the professor what you are going to do about the lost book.
Use language that would be appropriate when interacting with a 45 year old professor.

You need to decide in advance …

Are you going to give the real reason for your lateness, or use a different excuse?
Are you going to give the real reason for losing the book or use a different excuse?
What are you going to propose to do about the lost book?
The “friend” role-play

Roles:

You are an exchange student at XXX University.
Your partner is your friend 이정민 (the same age as you). You have been classmates for a year and know him/her well.

Situation:

You meet 이정민 at the subway station.
You are 20 minutes late to meet your friend. The reason for this is because you were delayed talking to your professor.
Your friend is expecting you to return the digital camera he/she had lent you. Unfortunately, you have broken the digital camera – you dropped it and now it will not even turn on.
You know that the camera is more than one year old, so you are not sure if repairs will be covered by the warranty.

Instructions:

Begin the role-play by greeting 이정민 as you meet him/her at the subway station.
Do your best to placate your angry friend for your lateness and for breaking the digital camera.
Decide with your friend what you are going to do about the broken digital camera.
Use language that would be appropriate when interacting with a close friend.

You need to decide in advance …

Are you going to give the real reason for your lateness, or use a different excuse?
Are you going to give the real reason for breaking the camera or use a different excuse?
What are you going to propose to do about the broken camera?
Appendix 4. Instructions for making recordings (natural interactions)

Instructions for recording natural interactions

Which interactions should I record?

Try to record as wide a range of interactions as possible. Interactions with friends are okay, but I would also like to hear interactions with strangers, people who are unfamiliar to you and people who are older than you. As a bare minimum, please record at least one interaction with a friend or someone you are intimate with and one interaction with someone who is 5+ years older than you or who you are meeting for the first time.

Try to limit recordings to interactions with one (or maximum two) people at the same time.

Recordings of between 5–10 minutes are most ideal for my research. However, recordings of any length are acceptable. Always try to record an interaction in its entirety, even if it lasts much longer than 10 minutes.

Do I need to ask the other person for permission?

It is very important to gain the permission of people who are involved in the interactions you are recording. If possible, this should be done beforehand.

If it is not possible to ask in advance, asking after you have made the recording is also ok. If the person objects, you should erase the file in front of them.

Always let people listen to the recording if they want to.

When recording strangers in short interactions, it is not necessary to obtain permission as you do not know their identity and their privacy / confidentiality cannot therefore be violated.

Please remember ...

I will have to transcribe all of the dialogues onto my computer, so please make sure they are of sufficient quality. Before doing any recordings, practice a few times so that you know how the microphone works best.

Either before or after the recording, record the names of participants (saying who spoke first), the date and the activity on the form provided [see next page].
Korean language recordings log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>MP3 track number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who and where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who and where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who and where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who and where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5. Interview questions

Korean language learning interview

1. From your experience, would you say that honorifics are one of the most difficult aspects of the Korean language?
2. In general, do you feel more comfortable using panmal or contaymal?
3. In your regular interactions with Koreans, do you use more panmal or contaymal?
4. Do you use referent honorifics in cases where the referent is also the hearer?
5. Do you use subject honorifics when talking about people who are not present?
6. How often have you used the following Korean terms of address when talking to another person? [followed by list of different forms of address]
7. What do Koreans usually call you? [followed by discussion of specific interlocutors]
8. In your regular interactions with Koreans, is there anyone who you speak to in contaymal but who speaks panmal to you?
9. In your regular interactions with Koreans, is there anyone who you speak to in panmal but who uses contaymal to you?
10. Do you think Koreans use the same honorifics to you (as a second language learner of Korean) as they do to other Koreans? How would you summarize that difference? And in what part of the honorific system is that difference expressed?
11. Most Koreans will become annoyed when they are addressed using a level of honorifics they believe to be too low. Do you also get annoyed when this happens?
12. Where / how did you learn to use contaymal?
13. Where / how did you learn to use panmal?
14. Where did you first learn or realize that Korean has different verb endings depending on who you are talking to (and talking about)?
15. Have Korean teachers ever corrected you on your use of honorifics? Have other Koreans (outside of class) corrected you on your honorifics use?
16. Do you aim to and try to use honorifics the same as Koreans do?
17. What do you think influences your honorific use most?
18. Finally, I would like you to think of any incidents that happened when you experience "discomfort" due to either your own or another person's (mis)use of honorifics. "Discomfort" includes emotions such as being offended, angry, irritated and embarrassed or just feeling that either your own or another's behavior was incongruous, inappropriate, shocking and strange. The incidents might be times when you experienced difficulty using honorifics, times when people reacted to your honorifics use or times when you were surprised by the honorifics use of others.
Appendix 6. Summary of individual usage of participants

Summary of speech style use of individual participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ref</th>
<th>Speech style use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; negotiated non-hon use with superiors/non-intimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>used non-hon styles above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT; used {Y} for modulation politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>used non-hon styles above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; comfortable with both modes of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; low control over styles; used {Y} for modulation politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CHÔL</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; comfortable with both modes of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT; avoided non-hon except to be purposefully rude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT; used {Y} for modulation politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; some hesitancy in using non-hon styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT; struggled to use {P} style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; hesitancy in using non-hon styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT, but elsewhere comfortable with both modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT, but comfortable with both modes of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>used hon styles above native rate on DCT; used {Y} for modulation politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>used non-hon styles above native rate on DCT; struggled to use {P} style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT; struggled to use {P} style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of referent honorifics use of individual participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ref</th>
<th>Referent honorifics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>totally avoided on DCT, but sometimes used elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>totally avoided on DCT, but sometimes used elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>totally avoided on DCT, no evidence whether used elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYÖN-CHÔL</td>
<td>used above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>used above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>used below native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>used above native rate on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT, but tended to omit elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>totally avoided on DCT, but sometimes used elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>used close to native rate on DCT, but tended to omit elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ref</td>
<td>Forms of address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>no salient patterns reported; enjoyed using fictive kinship terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>used ce at high frequency on role-play; enjoyed using fictive kinship terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>some use of tangsin on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>no salient patterns reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>overused personal names and avoided kinship terms on DCT; some use of tangsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>no salient patterns reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>no salient patterns reported; enjoyed using fictive kinship terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT; used ce at high frequency on role-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYON-CHOL</td>
<td>no salient patterns reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>avoided kinship terms on DCT; some use of tangsin in learner stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT; avoided kinship terms on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>overused personal names and avoided kinship terms on DCT; used ce at high freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT; avoided kinship terms on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>overused personal names and avoided kinship terms on DCT; used ce at high freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>overused personal names on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>some use of tangsin on DCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>used ce at high frequency on role-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>used ce at high frequency on role-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ref</td>
<td>Salient attitudes towards honorifics use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>believed in negotiating reciprocal <em>panmal</em> use; attached low importance to referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNY</td>
<td>preferred using “friendly” <em>panmal</em> forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIROKI</td>
<td>attached low importance to using referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUN-CHAE</td>
<td>lacked confidence to use <em>panmal</em> – cautious user; low awareness of referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEKO</td>
<td>attached low importance to using referent honorifics; cautious and not fluent in <em>panmal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRIY</td>
<td>attached low importance to using referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>happy to use both honorific and non-honorific language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIO</td>
<td>attached low importance to using referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>happy to use both honorific and non-honorific language; some low awareness of referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYÓN-CHÓL</td>
<td>happy to use both honorific and non-honorific language; some low awareness of referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLY</td>
<td>avoided <em>panmal</em> due to belief of impoliteness; attached low importance to referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>cautious and not fluent in <em>panmal</em>; some low awareness of referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>happy to use both honorific and non-honorific language; some caution in using <em>panmal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE</td>
<td>preferred safety and egalitarianism of the {Y} style; low awareness of referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>lacked confidence to use <em>panmal</em> – cautious user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>happy to use both honorific and non-honorific language; some low awareness of referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA</td>
<td>happy to use both hon and non-hon lang; some attempts to negotiate reciprocal <em>panmal</em> use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN-U</td>
<td>cautious and not fluent in <em>panmal</em>; some low awareness of referent hons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>low awareness of referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE</td>
<td>low awareness of referent honorifics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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