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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze realizations of two speech acts, request and apology, of heritage learners of Korean in comparison with those of Korean native speakers. Twenty native speakers of Korean and twenty Korean-Americans who speak Korean as a second language participated in the study. They were undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a university in the Midwest. Data were collected using oral Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) that consisted of ten items for request and apology, respectively. In addition to performing on DCT, the participants responded to the interview questions regarding the thinking processes that they experienced while performing on the DCT. Participants' performances on DCT and interview were audiotaped and transcribed for analysis. The request and apology data were analyzed using a coding scheme adapted from the Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP) and Suh (1999a) by deleting some categories and adding new categories. Frequency of occurrence of the strategies in each situation were calculated. Additionally, the linguistic characteristics of the two groups' productions were described and compared for each situation. Interview data were analyzed in terms of recurring themes and patterns. The data analysis revealed differences between NS and NNS participants' request and apology realizations. The main findings were: (1) NS
subjects used a greater number and wider range of supportive moves than NNS subjects did, (2) NNS subjects made a request when NS subjects tended to avoid making a request, (3) NS participants' use of IFID and intensifying adverbials varied depending on the degree of offense/ mistake, age, and power relationship while NNS subjects' use of those features was more evenly spread out across the situations, (4) the participants considered many factors such as age, power relationship, social distance, situation, and setting in performing DCT, (5) the sources of difficulty in NNS participants' performance on DCT were grammar, vocabulary, speech style, and unfamiliarity with the setting, and (6) half of the NNS participants formulated their responses in English and translated them into Korean.

Based on the findings, implications for teaching Korean as a second/ foreign language are presented for teachers and program designers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Analyzing learners’ language was one of the earliest efforts of second language (L2) researchers. From the belief that the knowledge obtained through analysis of learner language would provide a basis for theory building and testing of second language acquisition, L2 researchers attempted to describe and explain learner language, either in contrast with target language patterns or on its own. The former efforts that compared learner language to the target language norms resulted in numerous error analysis studies in the 1970s and 1980s (Chamot, 1978, 1979; Corder, 1967, 1971a, 1974; Duyay & Burt, 1974b; Duyay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982; Duskova, 1969; Richards, 1971b; B. Taylor, 1975; G. Taylor, 1986; White, 1977). Error analysis researchers tried to describe how learner language patterns differ from the target language norms, analyze deviations, and explain the processes of second language learning based on error analysis.

Error analysis was not free from criticism, however (Bell, 1974; Long & Sato,
1984; Schacher & Celce-Murcia, 1977; Van Els et al., 1984). One of the frequently mentioned shortcomings of error analysis was that it focused only on errors, failing to identify what a learner did correctly (Bley-Vroman, 1983). Dissatisfaction with error analysis thus led some researchers to look into the learner language itself, not in comparison with the target language norms. The study of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972), which attempted to describe and explain learner language as a phenomenon of interest on its own, was launched as a way to compensate for the shortcomings of error analysis.

Whether learner language was compared to the target language conventions or was viewed on its own, the efforts to describe and explain learner language in the 1970s and 80s concentrated on the formal features of language, such as phonemes, morphemes, and syntactic structures. The theoretical underpinning of this emphasis was the blueprint for language competence suggested by Chomsky (1965), who defined language competence as the ability to produce an unlimited number of grammatically correct sentences that one has never heard. In the Chomskyan tradition, other abilities such as being able to produce an appropriate utterance in a given context were not considered to be a part of language competence.

Since Habermas (1970) and Hymes (1972), the notion of language ability has expanded. According to Hymes (1972), a language learner cannot survive in the L2 environment without learning what is "feasible," "appropriate," "possible," and "done" with the linguistic or grammatical forms (p. 286). Subsequent discussions about language ability focused on the importance of grammar, discourse, and sociolinguistic rules in
models of language competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Cohen, 1994).

As previously stated, the targets of interlanguage analysis were primarily the formal, grammatical aspects of learner language. However, since the 1980s, with the new perspective based on communicative competence, other aspects of an L2 learner's language competence, especially pragmatic competence, have attracted researchers' attention. Pragmatic competence is related to the ability that enables one to use language in an appropriate manner in a given context. The area of study of L2 learners' pragmatic competence is called interlanguage pragmatics. The main effort in interlanguage pragmatics has been to compare L2 learners' speech act realizations or behaviors with those of native speakers. Well-defined speech acts such as request (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Færch & Kasper, 1989; Olshtain, 1989), apology (Cohen & Olshtain, 1981; Mir, 1992; Olshtain, 1983), refusal (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990), compliment (Billmyer, 1990; Wolfson, 1989b), complaint (Olshtain & Weinbach, 1985) and expression of gratitude (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986) have been investigated mostly in ESL/EFL contexts. Findings of these studies have shown that even learners at an advanced level often make pragmatic errors "in that they fail to convey or comprehend illocutionary force or politeness value" (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, p. 10), although the utterances may be free from grammatical error. In relation to the theory of communicative language competence, this discrepancy between the development of a learner’s grammatical and pragmatic competences provides empirical evidence to support
the models of language competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Cohen, 1994) which suggest that grammatical, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic competences are distinguishable components, even though they are related to each other as parts of communicative language competence.

1.2 Problem Statement

It has been almost two decades since communicative language teaching based on the communicative language competence theory was introduced into second language classrooms. Apart from the growing concern that communicative language teaching may not be appropriate for all circumstances and regions of the world (Pennycook, 1994), it may be worthwhile to ask whether our L2 classroom practices promote the development of all aspects of communicative language competence. As far as Korean language classrooms at the college level in the U.S. are concerned, the answer is not positive. Even though there are no published studies which have analyzed the curricula of Korean language programs in U.S. colleges, the dissatisfaction that both teachers and students feel with the existing programs has often been mentioned in literature that discusses Korean language education (Kim-Richards, 1995). The major pitfall of the existing programs is overemphasis on grammar (Boylan & Kang, 1995; Wang, 1999). There may be several interrelated reasons for the emphasis on in Korean classes, but the main reason is that it is relatively easy to build a syllabus around grammar, as grammatical items tend
to be easily defined (Yalden, 1983), compared to sociolinguistic concepts such as naturalness or formality. The most widely used Korean textbooks\(^1\) (Boylan & Kang, 1995; Wang, 1999) were written from the framework of a grammar-structural syllabus.

Compared to other East Asian language programs such as Chinese and Japanese, the Korean programs in U.S. colleges are small both in enrollment and number of instructors, and the majority of learners are Korean-Americans (S. Sohn, 1995), who are considered heritage learners.\(^2\) Because the Korean programs mainly serve one specific student population, not a variety of groups, schools have refrained from allocating funds for research to improve Korean L2 programs. One piece of evidence that shows schools' unwillingness to invest in the Korean programs is that they tend to hire lecturers instead of professors. As the lecturer position is non-tenured and temporary, a lecturer holding a Ph.D. is likely to leave the school when a more permanent position becomes available. In this circumstance where Korean teaching is not highly valued, teachers often have low levels of motivation to absorb innovative knowledge in the area of second language acquisition or to conduct research, which could improve the institutional program in the long run.

Although the Korean language programs are not well established in the U.S., there has been a consistent demand throughout recent decades, and it is expected that the

---

\(^1\) Five Korean textbooks were examined: textbooks published by Yonsei University, Seoul National University, Korean University, Ehwa Women's University, and Myeongdo Press.

\(^2\) Heritage learners here are defined as "those who have acquired Korean naturally from their parents as well as the Korean community in which they reside" (S. Sohn, 1995, p.19).
demand will maintain the present level or increase because of Korea’s economic growth (S. Sohn, 1995). While the majority of Korean learners are still heritage learners who take Korean courses in order to communicate more effectively with their family members and relatives, it is likely that the percentage of non-heritage learners in Korean classes will increase as the Korean economy grows and the demand in the business world for those who know Korean increases accordingly (H. Sohn, 1995). Bearing in mind that the majority of Korean learners desire to learn Korean, not in order to obtain scholarly knowledge about the language, but in order to use it for communication in real life, the emphasis on grammar in Korean classes should be reconsidered. Korean language programs should try to develop all components of language competence -- grammatical, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic -- in order to produce effective language users, not grammar scholars. As the first step to achieve this goal, it is important to conduct empirical research and obtain concrete data that provide information about learners’ pragmatic and sociolinguistic knowledge for researchers, program designers, and teachers.

3. The tendency that Korean Americans are the majority in Korean classes is changing in the case of The Ohio State University. For Autumn Quarter of 2000, 7 out of 40 students enrolled in first year Korean, and 8 out of the 14 in second year Korean were heritage learners.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to describe and analyze realizations of two speech acts, request and apology, by learners of Korean in comparison with those of Korean native speakers. Among the numerous categories of speech acts, request and apology were chosen for two main reasons. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), both request and apology are face-threatening acts, but the two are also different in many ways. Request threatens the hearer’s “negative face,” which is one’s desire to be unimpeded by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 67). That is, request is an act of imposing that may impede the hearer’s or the addressee’s freedom. Apology, on the other hand, threatens the speaker’s “positive face,” that is, “the positive consistent self-image or personality claimed by interactants” (p. 66). By apologizing, the speaker admits that he/she is at least partially responsible for an event that offended the addressee. The request is a pre-event, while the apology is a post-event (Leech, 1983). That is, the request is the act of asking or requiring the hearer to perform a certain action that has not occurred yet. The apology is a gesture of the speaker to compensate for the consequences of an event which has already happened. Due to these contrastive characteristics, request and apology show different modification patterns: requests tend to be mitigated, as it is the speaker’s desire to reduce the degree of imposition on the hearer; apology tends to be aggravated as it is remedial work (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983). Request and apology have been studied more than any other speech acts in interlanguage
pragmatics research, which is one of the reasons why the researcher elected to explore these two speech acts specifically in Korean. This research may represent a starting point for interlanguage pragmatics research in Korean foreign language acquisition.

Another reason for the choice of research topic is that request and apology are frequently used speech acts in daily encounters. Language has two main functions: transmission of information and knowledge, and establishment and maintenance of human relationships (H. Sohn, 1999). Speech act realizations are related to the latter, the function of establishing and maintaining human relationships. For example, there are multiple potential ways to realize an apology in a given situation, but the speaker needs to consider how to establish or maintain the relationship with the addressee. There are many factors that affect a speaker's choice of forms in realizing speech acts: social, cultural, and situational. Social factors include age, gender, degree of intimacy with the addressee, social status, and occupational rank. Cultural factors are based on cultural norms. For instance, in some cultures, it may be appropriate for one to suggest another meeting to his boss when he has missed a meeting due to his own negligence, while in other cultures, it would be out of place for a person of inferior status to make such a suggestion because it should be the boss who decides what to do next (Cohen, 1996). Situational factors include degree of imposition in case of request and degree of offence or mistake in case of apology. As request and apology are frequently used speech acts and their appropriate realizations are significant to the establishment and maintenance of relationships in a speech community, it will be valuable to study these two speech acts
as examples of part of the acquisition of Korean as a foreign language.

In sum, Korean language learning has not been studied sufficiently, especially in terms of interlanguage pragmatics. For this study, which may be one of the first systematic efforts in interlanguage pragmatics conducted for Korean language learning, request and apology are appropriate starting points as they have been frequently studied in other languages and they are also frequently used speech acts in social interaction among members of a community. The fact that request and apology are frequently used in human communication may also have valuable pedagogical implications. Since they are often used, it is important that an L2 learner be able to perform requests and apologies appropriately in a given circumstance.

Speech act realization data for this study were collected using discourse completion tests (DCT) from twenty native speakers and twenty non-native speakers of Korean. There are many factors that influence the realizations of speech acts: social distance, power relationship, age, gender, degree of imposition, and degree of offence or mistake, among others. The DCT for this study were designed based on social distance, power relationship, and age. Previous speech act research has identified social distance and power relationship as variables affecting speech act realizations of both native speakers and non-native speakers (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Suh, 1999a). In addition to these two variables, age has been chosen because of its significance in
Korean culture and language. Koreans are age-sensitive. Bell (1998) and Kim (1995) found in their empirical research that Koreans differentiate their request realizations according to the ages of their interactants. Hwang (1990) asserted that an age difference as small as three years can initiate the use of different speech levels among Koreans. Due to the significance of the age factor in Korean culture and language, age has been included as one variable alongside social distance and power relationship. Request and apology data were analyzed using a coding scheme created for the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP: Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989) and revised for this study.

In addition to speech act language data, information about the processes employed in performing speech acts was collected via interviews. This examination illuminates whether interlanguage forms involve pragmalinguistic failure or sociopragmatic failure (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). Pragmalinguistic failure occurs when a learner chooses an incorrect form of utterance even though he/she has some understanding of the sociocultural norms of the target language and culture, whereas sociopragmatic failure occurs when a learner fails to understand the target sociocultural norms. Previous research has shown that learners' speech act realizations differ from those of native speakers. L2 learners' strategy use is limited (Kim, 1995; Suh, 1999a); they are often more verbose (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Edmonson & House, 1991;
Færch & Kasper, 1989), and they are more direct (Francis, 1997; Kim, 1995). Analysis of the processes L2 students use in producing speech acts should, therefore, assist teachers by increasing their understanding of the L2 learning process, and, as a consequence, they should be able to guide their students in the use of culturally correct expressions when communicating in the L2. In addition, textbook authors and curriculum program planners may also benefit from the findings of this study.

1.4 Research Questions

The primary research questions explored in this study were as follows:

1. How do L2 heritage learners of Korean make requests in Korean? Do they make requests differently from Korean native speakers? If so, to what extent and in what ways do their requests differ from those of Korean native speakers?

2. How do L2 heritage learners of Korean make apologies in Korean? Do they make apologies differently from Korean native speakers? If so, to what extent and in what ways do their apologies differ from those of Korean native speakers?

3. What are the learners' decision making processes with respect to choosing contextually appropriate Korean realizations of request and apology? What social, situational, or cultural factors do learners take into consideration in choosing a specific strategy?
4. What are the implications of the study’s findings for syllabus and curriculum design in Korean as a foreign language pedagogy at the college level?

1.5 Definition of Terms

The operational definitions of the key terms for this study are as follows:

**Apology:** a speaker’s expression of regret for what he/she has done to a hearer who the speaker feels has been offended or harmed by his/her intended or unintended behavior.

**Cultural factors:** factors uniquely manifested within a specific culture. For example, in Korean culture, age is a primary factor for a speaker to consider in order to establish the speech level or the degree of politeness in communication. Age does not carry the same significance in North American culture for native speakers of American English.

**Decision making processes:** the processes involved in learners’ choosing a form from among others to realize a request or an apology.
Korean native speakers: those who were born, grew up, and graduated at least from high school in Korea, where Korean is the language of education, commerce, and other official and unofficial communication.

Korean nonnative speakers (heritage learners of Korean): Koreans who were born in the U.S. or immigrated to the U.S. before they graduated from junior high school in Korea, and who assessed their proficiency in English to be higher than their proficiency in Korean.

Pragmatic competence: the component of communicative language ability which is related to the use of language and knowledge of its appropriateness to the context in which it is used.

Pragmalinguistic failure: errors that occur when a learner chooses an incorrect form of utterance even though he/she has some understanding of the sociocultural norms of the target language and culture.

Realizations of request and apology: produced linguistic forms or utterances to express request and apology.

Request: the speaker's linguistic behavior of asking the hearer to perform a certain action
such as giving information, giving permission, or lending something that belongs to the hearer.

**Situational factors:** factors specific to a situation in which a speech act occurs. For example, in request, borrowing an item is different from requesting a vacation or asking for permission to do something (e.g., asking for permission to submit a class assignment late).

**Social factors:** factors that are related to the relationships or that affect the relationships between the interlocutors. For instance, age, social status, power relationship, and intimacy between interlocutors are social factors.

**Sociopragmatic failure:** errors that occur when a learner fails to understand the target sociocultural norms.

**Speech act:** an utterance that performs a specific function in communication such as requesting, apologizing, complimenting, complaining, or refusing.

**Strategies:** linguistic forms or utterances chosen by a language user to express a request or an apology in a given situation.
1.6 Assumptions

This study was conducted based on several assumptions.

First, L2 heritage learner participants who volunteered for this study have proficiency in spoken Korean sufficient to perform DCT tasks. This was confirmed by giving sample tasks to the possible subjects and excluding those who could not perform the tasks. Second, all participants performed DCT tasks to the best of their ability. In giving instructions, the researcher requested that the participants do their best and speak as naturally as they would if they were in the real situations. Third, all participants were honest in providing background information and explaining the processes of producing a given speech act. Additionally, L2 participants were assumed to be honest in the self-assessment measure. Fourth, participants could explain the processes of generating specific speech act realizations. Even though they might not know the terminology or jargon of L2 research, they were able to explain their cognitive processes using their own terms. Last, qualitative, linguistic analysis of each participant’s speech act productions was more informative than quantitative, statistical analysis. Frequency was presented to show a general picture of the differences between L1 and L2 participants’ productions. However, more in-depth analysis regarding how a learner actually performed a speech act required analysis of individual speech act production.
1.7 Significance of the Study

As mentioned previously, Teaching Korean as a Second/Foreign Language (TKSL/TKFL) is a wilderness in terms of research. Studies should be launched and continued in order both to obtain knowledge of L2 acquisition in Korean and to meet Korean learners' needs. Research in interlanguage pragmatics is particularly significant in Korean because Korean programs still lag behind other language programs in developing communicative competence in L2 learners. Many Korean teachers focus their attention on grammar and grammatical errors of learners. However, little research has been conducted on pragmatic errors or errors in speech act realizations (Wang, 1999). L2 learners make errors in performing speech acts because speech acts are realized differently across languages and cultures under similar situations. It has been suggested that communication breakdowns often occur because of pragmatic failure rather than grammatical failure. Korean society is stratified based on age and social status, partly because of the influence of Confucianism, which is deeply rooted in Korean culture. To be able to function effectively as a language user in Korean society, it is crucial for learners to be able to speak the language in a socially and pragmatically appropriate manner (Wang, 1995). The type of research that describes and analyzes learners' speech act realizations is needed so that teachers can anticipate the kinds of pragmatic errors learners will make and then be able to deal with them. The efforts of teachers to improve their classroom practice by addressing not only grammar but also pragmatic features
should eventually lead to curriculum innovation.

The second area of significance of this study is more theoretical. There have been efforts to identify universal norms or strategies in speech act realizations across languages (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). To deepen understanding of whether the rules of speech acts are universal or language-specific, more research should be conducted with a variety of languages, especially languages like Korean which have received scant attention. Studying interlanguage pragmatic phenomena with Korean will contribute to the whole L2 research area, not just to interlanguage pragmatics, by contributing toward “solving one of the central problems of second language acquisition research, which aspects of nonnative language development are universal and which are language-specific” (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, p. 10).

1.8 Limitations of the Study

This study has the following limitations.

1. The L2 participants are all heritage learners. They have been exposed to Korean in natural environments, primarily through interaction with their family members. Non-heritage learners who have had contact with Korean only in formal settings may show different patterns in speech act realizations.

2. All participants are college students or graduate students in the U.S. ranging in
age from 18 to 35. Data collected from different groups in terms of age or education may produce different results.

3. Data were collected from only one university in the Midwest in the U.S. Findings cannot be generalized to learners in other universities, instructional levels, or regions of the world.

4. Oral discourse completion tests were used to collect data. Data gathered through different methods such as role plays or observation may produce different results.

5. Discourse completion tests were designed on the axes of three social variables: social distance, social power, and age. Other variables such as situational variables which are likely to affect speech act realizations have not been controlled in the study’s design. Separate research will be needed to investigate the effects of variables not included in this study.

1.9 Conclusion

The remaining sections of this dissertation will include: Chapter 2, Review of Literature; Chapter 3, Design and Methodology; Chapter 4, Results and Discussion; and Chapter 5, Summary, Implications, and Recommendations for Future Research. The dissertation also includes a bibliography and appendices.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since 1980, there has been increasing interest among L2 researchers in L2 learners’ speech act behaviors. Research in the interlanguage speech act has attempted to answer two major questions: how to speech act realizations of non-native speakers differ from those of native speakers, and what accounts for the speech act realizations of non-native speakers. The most frequently cited study in literature related to L2 speech acts is the Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP: Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). CCSARP investigated the realizations of request and apology of both native and non-native speakers across eight languages. Considering its significance in speech act research, it would be appropriate to start with a discussion of CCSARP and then move to other studies which focused on L2 request and apology. This chapter is organized as follows: 1) Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project; 2) Studies in L2 request; 3) Studies in L2 apology; 4) Studies in the processes of learners’ performing speech acts; and 5) Conclusion.
2.1 Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP)

In discussing research in L2 speech acts, the most often cited study may be the Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP: Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). In this research, native speakers’ speech act behaviors in request and apology were collected from eight language groups: Australian English, American English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, and Hebrew. Additionally, L2 English, L2 German, and L2 Hebrew data were collected. The goals of the project were to investigate request and apology realization patterns across languages, the effects of social and situational variables in realization of speech acts, and differences and similarities between native speakers’ and non-native speakers’ speech act behaviors for a given language (p. 12-13). Data were collected from 1,946 subjects using discourse completion tests (DCT). The DCT consisted of descriptions of sixteen hypothetical situations which varied according to social distance and social power. The test-takers were asked to fill in the gaps with a request or apology so that a short dialogue would be completed. In the following examples, (a) is designed to elicit request and (b) to elicit apology.

(a) At the University
Ann missed a lecture yesterday and would like to borrow Judith’s notes.
Ann: __________________________
Judith: Sure, but let me have them back before the lecture next week.
(b) At the college teacher’s office
A student has borrowed a book from her teacher, which she promised to return today.
When meeting her teacher, however, she realizes that she forgot to bring it along.

Teacher: Miriam, I hope you brought the book I lent you.
Miriam: ________________________________
Teacher: OK, but please remember it next week. (p. 14)

The CCSARP project also produced a coding scheme that has been widely
adopted in other speech act studies. Because the current study has used the CCSARP
coding scheme for data analysis, it is not discussed here, but in Chapter 3, where data
analysis methods are described.

2.1.1 Findings of CCSARP

The researchers who participated in the project analyzed different segments of
the data with different foci (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Blum-Kulka & Levenston,
1987; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Færch & Kasper, 1989; Olshtain, 1989). Some
researchers focused more on methodological issues (Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989).

Færch and Kasper (1989) analyzed request productions of the Danish learners of
English and German, and the native speakers of Danish, British English, and German.
The data analyzed were requests realized in three situations: “Notes,” “Ride,” and
“Lecturer.” The researchers examined how the five groups modified their conventionally
indirect requests internally and externally in the three situations, and the relationship
between internal and external modifications. They found that learners used more
complex, explicit, and longer procedures of request modification in their use of politeness
markers, syntactic downgraders, and supportive moves.

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) analyzed the realizations of five DCT request items produced by Hebrew and English native and non-native speakers. They conducted a series of comparisons between natives and non-natives in terms of three aspects of request production: the request strategy types; amount and types of internal modifications; and amount and types of external modifications. In terms of the strategy types, the two groups were found to be significantly different in only one request situation out of five. Non-natives used internal modifications less frequently than native speakers, but the difference was not significant. The two groups were significantly different in the use of external modifications. Non-native speakers used more external modifications than native speakers. The average number of words per utterance was 10.1 for non-natives and 8.3 for natives.

Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1987) focused on Hebrew and English learners' use of pragmatic indicators, both lexical and syntactic. The lexical indicators studied were Hebrew "bevaqasa" (please), and mitigators of illocutionary force like "a bit" and "a little." Major findings were: Hebrew non-native speakers differed from native speakers quantitatively in their choice of perspective; qualitative analysis of the requests and apologies produced by the learners showed that their choices in perspective were linked to lexical simplification; quantitative analysis of the request internal modifier in Hebrew (bevaqasa/please) revealed significant differences between native and non-native usage; overgeneralization and misplacement of the internal modifier (bevaqasa/please) by
Hebrew learners produced a variety of pragmatic effects -- whining, excessive formality, inappropriate attention-getting; and internal modification of requests in English by non-native speakers differed from native usage in less use of downoners and in the blunt use of "I want."

Blum-Kulka and House (1989) compared request realizations of five groups of subjects: native speakers of Hebrew, Canadian French, Argentinean Spanish, Australian English, and German. The focus of the analysis was to examine the relationship between situational and cultural factors in determining variable patterns of requestive behavior. The researchers found that the use of impositives follows a similar trend across different situations in all languages, and the proportion of impositives used within each situation varies with language.

Olshtain (1989) investigated the strategies used to realize apologies by speakers of four different languages: Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French, and German. The four language groups showed striking similarities in two general strategies of apology, the IFiD (Ilocutionary Force Indicating Device), and expressions of the speaker's responsibility. Olshtain suggests that different languages may realize apology in very similar ways. As an alternative explanation, the similarity could have been caused by the data elicitation method. That is, expected speech act behaviors in each context described in the DCT could be similar across the four cultures.

Wolfson, Marmor, and Jones (1989) discussed the CCSARP data from a methodological perspective. In their analysis of the apology data collected for CCSARP,
they found that the two variables, social distance and social dominance, were too broad to capture the variations in apology strategies observed across the situations. They suggested that the sex of the participants, frequency of interaction, optionality, and intimacy should be taken into account in generalizing the findings and in designing future research.

In sum, CCSARP showed that speech acts are culturally-governed behaviors. Different strategy patterns in language users' speech act realizations, for both L1 and L2, were manifested across the eight cultures. Still, the project has limitations in that it investigated only eight languages, seven of which are Indo-European. In order to find out whether certain features are universal or language-specific and to refine the analysis framework developed for the project, more research with a variety of languages will be needed.

2.2 Studies in L2 Request

The studies that investigated L2 speech acts can be categorized as two types: those that examined L2 learners’ comprehension of speech acts and those that examined the production of speech acts. In this section and in the next section, where studies of L2 apology will be discussed, studies which examined the production of learners’ speech acts will be addressed.

Niki and Tajika’s study (1994) investigated communication norms in English and
Japanese in a situation in which the two related speech acts of "asking for permission" and "requesting" merge. The pair-verbs "borrow" and "lend" were examined. The participants were 26 native speakers of English and 64 ESL Japanese speakers. A discourse completion questionnaire consisting of scripted dialogues was used as the data collection method. Data were analyzed in terms of social distance (siblings, friends, teachers) and the degree of imposition (low, medium, high). The findings showed that English native speakers preferred asking for permission, whereas ESL learners used requests more frequently.

Mir's study (1995) explored the relationship between cultural factors and the speaker's perception of situational factors. Mir examined how native and non-native speakers perceive situational factors and how the perception affects their request behaviors. Three groups of subjects participated in the study: native Spanish speakers, native American English speakers, and Spanish ESL learners. Data were collected via two methods: discourse completion tasks (DCT) of 24 items which were differentiated based on social power and familiarity, and metapragmatic assessment questions. In the metapragmatic assessment questions, the subjects were asked to rate each situation on a scale of 1 to 3 in terms of three dimensions: familiarity, power, and imposition. The results showed that the subjects assessed the DCT situations from a cultural perspective. For example, no difference was found among the three groups in assessing power relationship, but the two native groups perceived the degree of familiarity differently. In addition, the study suggested that perceptions of different factors of the
context are interdependent. That is, the degree of power relationship assessed is related to the degree of familiarity or degree of imposition assessed. This interdependency becomes more complicated when cultural differences are taken into account. This study was new in that the participants' assessment of the situation and its influence on speech act behavior was investigated. In earlier research, situational factors were considered as both given and fixed.

Kim (1995) investigated how Korean ESL learners made requests in English, focusing on the deviations caused by negative transfer. Data were collected using oral discourse completion tests. Six request situations were given to the subjects. The situations varied in terms of the interlocutors' role relationships (dominance, social distance), interlocutors' rights and obligations, and degree of imposition. Each subject was asked to read the six situations typed on index cards silently and respond to the verbal cues given by the researcher. Three groups of subjects provided data. Native speakers of American English provided baseline English data, Korean native speakers baseline Korean data, and ESL learners L2 data. Kim found that request realizations were determined by social distance and dominance. Negative transfer was evidenced in the directness level of two situations -- getting off work early and baby-sitting. Both Korean and L2 English data were much more indirect in the situation of getting off work early, and more direct in asking a child to go to bed.

Pair (1996) investigated L2 Spanish request strategies. The subjects were 22 native Dutch speakers who had taken Spanish courses for three years (NNS), and 36
native Spanish speakers (NS). The data were collected by means of a discourse completion test (DCT) that consisted of 12 items. In contrast to other previous studies, Pair elicited oral data. That is, instead of writing, the subjects were asked to speak as they would in a given situation. Request production was audiotaped and transcribed. The focus of the analysis was on the head act, which is a minimal element for realizing a request. The head acts were coded using the CCSARP analysis framework, a scale with nine categories, which were grouped into three levels based on the degree of directness. The findings were: the conventional indirect strategies\(^5\) were the most frequently used strategies for both NS and NNS groups; NS subjects used direct strategies\(^6\) twice as frequently as NNS; NNS tended to use ability/possibility-strategies, whereas NS used more willingness-strategies; and NNS mainly used the verbs in unmodified form to mark possibility and willingness whereas NNS tended to use these verbs in the conditional mood.

Francis (1997) attempted to identify the development pattern of L.2 pragmatic competence in ESL learners. The subjects were 29 college students from a variety of backgrounds in terms of L.1, length of English study, duration of stay in the U.S., educational goals, and age. Data were collected at three settings: a university public

---

\(^5\) The conventional indirect strategies discussed here are asking the hearer's ability/possibility or willingness to carry out the request. Some examples are:

- Asking the hearer's ability/possibility: *Can you lend me your notebook?*
- Asking the hearer's willingness: *Will you tone down the music?*

\(^6\) Direct strategies here means using an imperative to make a request.
administration office, the private office of a university program officer, and an ESL classroom. Participant and non-participant observation, audio recording, and video recording were used as data collection methods. Francis’ findings were: a preponderance of directives over conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect requests in the data; and preference for want statements, preparatory interrogative, and hints over other strategies. The greatest differences between the groups were linked to setting, which seemed to demonstrate students’ sensitivity to context and role-relationships. Another finding is related to proficiency level and I.2 development. Elementary and intermediate level students showed similarity in the number of directives and non-conventionally indirect requests they produced. However, the percentage of conventionally indirect requests made by intermediate learners was twice that of elementary learners, which means that the more advanced learners produced more complex patterns both linguistically and pragmatically.

Bell (1998) examined three speech acts produced by ESL Korean students. The participants were eleven students at the high beginning level enrolled in a intensive university ESL program. The three speech acts were disagreements, requests, and suggestions. Data were collected through audio and video-taping of each class session, and were analyzed in terms of the politeness strategies described in Brown and Levinson (1987). Results showed that in general the participants used very few positive politeness strategies, even though disagreements comprised more than fifty percent of the corpus. In addition to the absence of positive strategies, a high occurrence of explicit
disagreement was observed, especially when the speaker was older than the hearer. The younger students were not so free to disagree with their elders. They chose to use redressive action or to remain off record in 71.44% of their disagreements with older students. This study suggests that learners transferred from their L1 not only politeness strategies, as shown in the use of more negative politeness strategies than positive ones, but also socio-cultural norms. In addition to being sensitive to age differences, learners showed sensitivity to social power by being more polite when they talked to the teacher than they were to each other.

Suh (1999a) investigated ESL Korean learners' request realizations in English. The research questions were: how ESL Korean learners differ from English native speakers in the use of supportive moves; and how ESL Korean learners differ from English native speakers in the expression of politeness in requests. Data were collected from three sources: ESL Korean learners' performance in English, American English native speakers' performance in English, and Korean native speakers' performance in Korean. The subjects in the first group were 30 Korean students, 15 males and 15 females, enrolled in an Intensive English Program (IEP) at a university in the U.S. A Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used as the data collection method to elicit the speech act of request. The DCT included twelve situations developed based on the combination of "social power" and "familiarity." The subjects were asked to write a request for each situation after carefully reading the descriptions of the situations. The major findings of this study were: the Korean ESL learners employed more supportive
moves, which resulted in verbosity; the ESL learners' use of supportive moves differed from those of both English native speakers and Korean native speakers; the ESL learners used fewer downgraders\(^7\) than the English native speakers, which indicated that they might sound less polite than English native speakers; the ESL learners' use of downgraders was limited in range. They used one downgrader within a given situation and rarely combined one with another.

In sum, the studies in the 1990s tried to observe the request behaviors of subjects of different L1 backgrounds from those studied in the 1980s. The L1s of the subjects investigated were Japanese (Niki & Tajika, 1994), Korean (Bell, 1998; Kim, 1995; Suh 1999a), and Spanish (Mir, 1995). The L2 was English, except in the study of Pair (1996), which investigated L2 Spanish request strategies. Summarizing the findings, research has shown that: learners' strategy choices are limited; they are more verbose than native speakers; they are more direct; and the factors influencing speech act realization are determined by culture, for example, age in Korean culture. More research should be conducted with learners of diverse L1s and L2s in order to see if these findings are universal or language-specific.

\(^7\) Downgraders are elements to tone down request as shown below (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989).

*Can I borrow your pen for a second?*
*Would you move your car a little bit?*
2.3 Studies in L2 Apology

Apology is another speech act category that has attracted interlanguage pragmatics researchers’ attention.

Cohen and Olshtain (1981) studied Hebrew learners of L2 English. They found situations where the learners did not seem to be familiar with the semantic formulas needed for the apology. For example, they were less likely to offer reparation when they had backed into someone’s car, and less likely to acknowledge responsibility when they had bumped into and shaken up an old lady than when they performed the same apologies in their L1. Lack of linguistic proficiency was in this case reflected in the use of general formulas and saying too little.

Olshtain (1983) examined L2 Hebrew apology behaviors of English and Russian speakers. Data were also collected from Hebrew native speakers. The instrument consisted of eight apology situations. After the participants read each situation description, the investigator played the role of the person who deserved an apology. No reply was given by the investigator to apologies. Four apology situations were designed to assess intensity\(^8\) in showing regret, and the remaining four situations to assess stylistic competence.\(^9\) Olshtain found that the overall frequency of semantic formulas

---

\(^8\) For example, “I’m terribly sorry” shows an apology of high intensity, whereas “I’m sorry” an apology of low intensity (Olshtain, 1983, p.238).

\(^9\) That is, the investigator intended to examine whether learners could use formal and informal expressions in appropriate contexts. For example, “I wish to apologize” is more formal and “I’m sorry” is less formal (Olshtain, 1983, p.238).
was higher in native English speakers than in native Hebrew speakers, with native Russian speakers intermediate. Whereas the English learners decreased the frequency of their use of semantic formulas to a level approximating that of native Hebrew speakers, the Russian learners maintained the same level as in their native Russian. Olshtain suggests that this reflects the different perceptions of the English and Russian learners. Whereas the former perceived Hebrew speakers as apologizing less than English speakers, Russians had a more universal perception of apology. That is, Russians believed that people should apologize according to the degree of their regret in offending someone or their feeling of responsibility regardless of the language they speak.

Mir (1992) examined EFL Spanish speakers' apology strategies. The subjects were 29 Spanish speakers enrolled in an intensive English course in Barcelona, Spain. They provided both L1 Spanish and L2 English responses. Twenty-nine English native speakers at a university in the U.S. provided English data. The instrument was a set of eight role-play exercises that varied in terms of the degree of severity of the offense, the degree of familiarity between interactants, and the age of the offended. In addition to the role play exercise, two questions were administered to Spanish speakers. The questions were asked in order to compare the apologies produced by the subjects and their impressions of the English apology system. The results showed that 65.2 % of the Spanish speakers believed that English native speakers apologize more than Spanish native speakers, and 65.2 % of them believed that English native speakers apologize differently from Spanish native speakers. The analysis of apology production data
showed that the three groups differed in the frequency of their use of apology semantic formulas and in their use of intensification of apologetic expressions. Native English speakers used apology strategies and intensified apologetic expressions more frequently than native Spanish speakers. The variable, familiarity, had a different effect on the frequency and type of semantic formulas used by different groups. Severity and age had similar effects for all groups.

Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper, and Ross (1996) examined L2 English apologies produced by Japanese speakers, focusing on L1 transfer. Four groups of subjects participated in the study: 30 Japanese learners of English (intermediate), 30 Japanese learners of English (advanced), 30 native speakers of English, and 30 native speakers of Japanese. The instrument was a 20-item Dialogue Construction Questionnaire. The items were varied in terms of gender, social distance, social status, and degree of severity of offense. The respondents were asked to play the roles of both the offender and the offended. Only the parts for which the respondents played the offender’s role were analyzed. In addition to the Dialogue Construction Questionnaire, an Assessment Questionnaire about the Dialogue Construction Questionnaire was prepared. In each situation, a five-point scale was given for five context-internal factors and two context-external factors. The native participants were asked to complete the scales. The researchers found that negative transfer\textsuperscript{10} was infrequently at work when learners

\textsuperscript{10} In this study, negative transfer was defined as "statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature between interlanguage-second language and first language-second language and lack of statistically significant difference between interlanguage and first language." Positive transfer was defined as "lack of statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature in the first language, second language, and interlanguage" (p.167).
performed apology. Differences were found between the advanced and the intermediate learners. The advanced learners transferred apology strategies from Japanese to English in two instances, while the intermediate learners did so in six instances when American and Japanese apology patterns differed. The intermediate learners showed limited apology strategies, compared to the English native participants and the advanced learners.

Studies in apology are not sufficiently extensive for a discussion of the patterns in the findings and their generalizations. As in the case of request, research should be expanded to diverse languages.

2.4 Studies on Processes of L2 Speech Act Production

Research on processes is significant in that it illuminates the processes of learners' decision making, and the findings can be used by teachers as they guide learners. Very few studies have been done on this topic.

Cohen and Olshtain (1992) examined how nonnative speakers assess, plan, and execute three speech acts: apology, complaint, and request. The subjects were 15 advanced EFIs. learners whose L1s were Hebrew, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Arabic. Two apology, two complaint, and two request situations were given, for which the subjects role-played with a native speaker of English. The situations were written on cards, and the English native speaker interlocutor read the instructions out loud before
the respondents were asked to role play with the interlocutor. The role play performance was videotaped. Immediately after the respondents performed the role play, the tape was played back, and questions were asked in Hebrew regarding the factors involved in the learners' responses. These verbal reports were analyzed in terms of how the learners assessed, planned, and executed speech acts. The results were: the subjects assessed the situations in a general way; they thought in two or three languages when they planned and executed the speech acts; and they used different strategies in searching for linguistic forms, and did not pay much attention to grammar and pronunciation.

Suh (1999b) examined ESL Korean learners' decision-making processes in making requests in English. This study was conducted simultaneously with another study by Suh to investigate ESL Korean learners' request realizations in English, which was described previously. The subjects were 30 Korean students, 15 males and 15 females, enrolled in an Intensive English Program (IEP) at a university in the U.S. Immediately after the respondents completed Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) that consisted of 12 situations, the researcher asked them to reflect on what they had been thinking when performing the requests, using questions like “What were you thinking when you made this request strategy?,” “On what basis did you use politeness in this situation?,” and “What was the most important factor influencing the performance of the request in this situation?” The retrospection was conducted in Korean, audiotaped, and transcribed. Through analysis of the retrospection, six categories of decision-making processes were
identified. They were “assessment of the situation,” “monitoring for appropriate
sociolinguistic expressions,” “use of request skills,” “connection to personal life,”
“cross-cultural comparison,” and “monitoring for language forms.”

In sum, research in interlanguage pragmatics has generated valuable findings, but
the languages and variables studied are limited. Future research should investigate diverse
L1s and L2s to answer questions concerning universals and the language specifics of
pragmatic norms. That is, if it is found that language users choose similar strategies in
making request and apology across the languages, the strategy choice may be interpreted
as universal. On the other hand, if they choose different request and apology strategies
depending on the language they use, the strategy choice may be considered language-
specific. In the next chapter, the design and methodology of this study is discussed.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Subjects

Two groups of subjects participated in this study. The first group consisted of 20 non-native speakers of Korean (NNS), all of whom were heritage students, and the second group was composed of 20 native speakers of Korean (NS). The number 20 was chosen based on the speculation that certain linguistic patterns would appear in the participants’ speech act production when the number of the participants approached 20. After the instruments were developed and revised through a pilot study,\textsuperscript{11} the researcher identified Korean and Korean-American students by their last names in the Student Directory of The Ohio State University, and sent each student an email to solicit participation in the study. In the email, the researcher described the purposes of the study, the number of subjects needed, data collection procedures, and incentives. The

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{11} The pilot study was conducted with 5 participants in each group, who did not participate in the actual study. They pointed out that knowing the addressee’s name would be useful. And it turned out that some performed the DCT assuming that the setting described was America, while others assumed that the setting was Korea. Based on this, names were added, and it was explained to the participants in the research study before they performed the DCT that the setting was Korea.
participants were chosen from among those who responded to the email message.

Because of the time line for the study, the researcher stopped accepting participants as soon as 40 subjects were obtained. The NS group consisted of 12 males and 8 females: four of them were undergraduate students and 16 were graduate students. Except for one female subject who came to the U.S. in the 11th grade, all NS participants finished secondary or higher education in Korea. The mean age of NS participants was 27.8, and their majors were in such diverse areas as engineering, MBA, TESOL, statistics, journalism, biochemistry, visual communication design, computer science, sociology, and family resource management. The NNS group was composed of 8 males and 12 females, 3 graduate students and 17 undergraduate students. The mean age of the NNS group was 21.3, and their majors included dentistry, history of art, pharmacy, elementary education, computer science, political science, English, and business. The NNS participants usually use Korean when they talk with their parents, relatives, and friends. They learned Korean primarily from their parents. Most of them took Korean classes at church-affiliated Sunday schools or weekend Korean schools when they were young. Five students took Korean language or Korean culture classes at the college level. Several participants listen to Korean songs or watch soap opera in order to improve their Korean.

Each participant was given a small cash incentive at the end of the data collection as an expression of gratitude by the researcher.

It was not the intention of the study to recruit heritage learners only, that is,
Korean-American students, as NNS subjects. The use of such students was unavoidable due to the current trend in Korean language students. The enrollment pattern in Korean language classes for the last five years (1994-1999) at The Ohio State University shows that very few of the non-heritage students continued to take Korean after one year of study (mean enrollment under 3). As at least an intermediate level of Korean language proficiency was required to perform the speech acts that were the foci of this study, heritage learners were primarily considered for recruitment. In interpreting data, the possibility that the patterns of the heritage learners' contact with the Korean language or Korean use environments might be different from those of non-heritage learners\textsuperscript{12} was considered. The language use environments of heritage learners could have formed their speech act behaviors in a unique way that distinguishes them from non-heritage learners.

3.2 Instruments

Four instruments were used in this study. They were the "Can do scale of speaking," which is a language proficiency self-evaluation scale for speaking, "Background Information Questions (BIQ)," "Discourse Completion Tests (DCT)," and "Questions on Processes (QOP)." Each instrument is described separately as follows:

\textsuperscript{12} That is, Korean Americans acquire Korean primarily through interaction with their parents and relatives. Non-heritage students are often deprived of this opportunity. Their contact with the target language is often limited to classroom environment.
Language proficiency self-appraisal scale of speaking ("Can do" scale): The Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed an instrument for student self-evaluation of language proficiency, the "Can do" scale, as an alternative to language tests (Barrows et al., 1981). "Can do" scales of reading, listening, and speaking, 4-category Likert-type scales, were developed for a nationwide foreign language survey, which was intended to collect language proficiency data from a large sample of students in the U.S. ETS lists the shortcomings of previously available language tests as follows. First, carefully developed standardized tests of language proficiency are limited to the most widely taught languages in the U.S., such as French, German, Spanish, or Italian. Second, the major available language skills tests are not considered to have a high level of face or content validity.13 Last, actual skills tests of listening and speaking are difficult to administer to a large number of examinees. Based on these types of limitations, student self-evaluations of their own level of language proficiency were used, and the scales were developed. One of the advantages of self-appraisals is that scales can be developed in such a way as to be uniformly applicable to any language (Barrows et al., 1981, p. 26). Another advantage is that they can be designed based on specific, criterion-related language-use situations by asking respondents to indicate whether and to what extent they believe they can perform the particular tasks in question.

---

13. ETS provides an example of a listening comprehension test, MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students battery (ETS, 1964), to show that items in available tests often are not representative of real-life language use. In MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students, an examiner listens to brief tape-recorded utterances, short dialogues, and a few longer utterances. However, there is no simulation of other listening comprehension situations such as television broadcasts, telephone conversation, airport announcements, or other listening tasks that examinees often encounter in the real world (Barrows et al., 1981, p. 26).
The correlation among "Can do" scales, FSI self-ratings, and MLA tests are as follows (Barrows et al., 1981, p. 33):

**Speaking proficiency (FSI interview score) related to...**

| 1. "Can do" reading scale | .640 |
| 2. "Can do" speaking scale | .632 |
| 3. FSI self-rating of speaking | .594 |
| 4. "Can do" listening scale | .578 |
| 5. FSI self-rating of reading | .543 |

**Listening comprehension (MLA-Cooperative listening test) related to...**

| 1. FSI self-rating of speaking | .599 |
| 2. "Can do" listening scale | .594 |
| 3. "Can do" speaking scale | .586 |
| 4. "Can do" reading scale | .548 |
| 5. FSI self-rating of reading | .462 |

**Reading ability (MLA-Cooperative reading test) related to ...**

| 1. "Can do" reading scale | .601 |
| 2. FSI self-rating of speaking | .565 |
| 3. "Can do" speaking scale | .559 |
| 4. "Can do" listening scale | .532 |
| 5. FSI self-rating of reading | .509 |
The correlations between the "Can do" scale of speaking and other measures range from .559 to 632.\textsuperscript{14}

In this study, the "Can-do" scale of speaking was used to gather some types of background information about the participants. It was expected that language proficiency would have an impact on the speech act realizations of NNS subjects. For "Can do" scales, there are no established cut-off scores that distinguish different levels of proficiency. Therefore, rather than using the "Can do" scale of speaking to categorize the participants as low or high proficiency learners at the beginning, it was considered more appropriate to use the information on the "Can do" scale in interpreting data. In other words, when certain patterns were revealed in the speech act realizations of the non-native participants, and if those patterns were assumed to be related to Korean proficiency, the information on the "Can do" scale was referred to and used to explain the patterns in relation to proficiency. The "Can do" scale of speaking as it was used in this study was revised. There were four categories in the original scale: "not at all," “with great difficulty,” “with some difficulty,” and “quite easily.” It was observed that there was a large gap between “with some difficulty” and “quite easily.” In order to mitigate the gap, the category “fairly easily” was added between the two categories. The "Can-do" scale was given only to NNS subjects (Appendix A).

\textsuperscript{14} The correlations are not very high. According to ETS, extremely high correlations were not anticipated because the two measures tap different aspects of language behavior. Nevertheless, the correlations are considered sufficiently high to indicate that self-rating scales are positively correlated with external measures in the same skill areas.
Background information questions: Each participant was interviewed about his/her age, area of study, and foreign language learning experiences. In addition to these topics, each group was asked different sets of questions. For example, questions about when they immigrated to the U.S., when and with whom they normally use Korean, or if they had received any formal education in the Korean language were asked only of NNS subjects. The subjects in the NS group were asked about their length of stay in the U.S. and English use environments (Appendices B & C).

Discourse Completion Tests (DCT): Each discourse completion test contains 10 items. Items were developed based on three variables: social distance (SD), power relationship, and age. Social distance means the degree to which the interlocutors know each other. Social distance has two levels: + and -. “+SD” means that the interlocutors do not know each other well, whereas “-SD” means that the interlocutors know each other well. Power relationship has two levels: the speaker has more power or is of higher status than the listener (x>y), and the opposite case (x<y). Each DCT consists of two parts.

The six items in Part I were written based on the combination of social distance and age. Age has three levels in Part I: the speaker is older than the hearer (a>b), younger than the hearer (a<b), and the speaker and the hearer are the same age (a=b). The combination of social distance and age generated six items. The four items in Part II were based on a combination of power relationship and age. Age in Part II has two levels (a>b, a<b). Each item and the variable combinations are tabulated as follows:
Social Distance, Age (a: speaker, b: listener)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Situations</th>
<th>Apology Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+SD, a&gt;b</td>
<td>S1: noise by children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+SD, a=b</td>
<td>S2: borrowing notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+SD, a&lt;b</td>
<td>S3: kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SD, a&gt;b</td>
<td>S4: notebook computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SD, a=b</td>
<td>S5: loud music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SD, a&lt;b</td>
<td>S6: cleaning the apt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Items in Part I on DCT: Variables: Social Distance, Age

Power relationship (x: speaker, y: listener)  
Age (a: speaker, b: listener)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Situations</th>
<th>Apology Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x&gt;y, a&gt;b</td>
<td>S7: Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x&lt;y, a&gt;b</td>
<td>S8: one-week vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x&lt;y, a&lt;b</td>
<td>S9: paper extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x&gt;y, a&lt;b</td>
<td>S10: secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Items in Part II on DCT: Variables: Power Relationship, Age

The DCT developed for CCSARP (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989) and the DCT for this study differ in two ways. First, the participants were asked to speak instead of writing in this study. They were instructed to speak in Korean what they would say in each situation after reading the descriptions of the situations. Their performances were audiotaped and transcribed for subsequent
analysis. The reason the researcher chose to have the subjects speak instead of writing requests and apologies was that some non-native Korean speakers did not know how to write Korean even though they could speak it. Another difference between the DCT for CCSARP and this study is that no hearer’s responses were given in this study. The researcher made the DCT open-ended since the responses given would affect the request or apology realizations of the participants (Pair, 1996). Copies of the DCT are included in Appendices E and F.

*Questions on processes:* Immediately after the DCT, the subjects were asked about the processes they went through in producing each form. To assist their recall, the tapes containing their answers were played back while they were asked questions about the processes. The purpose of these questions was to investigate what factors a speaker took into consideration in choosing a specific form in realization of a given speech act. Other related questions were asked as well. They included whether a non-native subject produced requests or apologies automatically or with careful planning, how confident he/she was in performing a given speech act, how he/she evaluated his/her own production in terms of politeness, whether he/she formed a request or apology in his/her L1 (English) first and translated it into Korean, if he/she paid attention to grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, and pronunciation, and how he/she felt about the tasks (Appendix D).
3.3 Procedures

All participants had one individual session with the researcher. The NNS participants provided data on self-assessment, background information, DCT, and processes. The NS participants provided data on background information and DCT only. For processes, the NS participants were asked only the questions concerning what factors they took into consideration in responding and how they felt about the tasks. At the beginning of the session, each NNS participant filled out the “Can do” scale of speaking. All participants took the DCT. Before they worked on the DCT, they had a chance to practice with two sample DCT items. During this practice, the researcher explained what the participant was expected to do with the DCT and checked to see if they understood the tasks. These practice items were not part of the original 20 items. The process questions were asked immediately after the participants finished the DCT. All DCT and interviews on processes were audiotaped and transcribed for subsequent analysis. Each session lasted 30-50 minutes. A sample data gathering session for NNS participants is described below.

The researcher met the participant in a study room at a library on campus. First, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the participant. The participant rated his/her proficiency in Korean on the “Can do scale” of speaking. Then, he/she was given instructions on how to take DCT. Sample items were given to him/her as an exercise. After discussing the exercise performance with the participant by providing
feedback about the performance, the researcher gave the participant the request DCT and audiotaped the performance. To reduce participant stress that might come from performing two DCT in a row, background information was gathered after request DCT data were collected. After being interviewed on background information, the participant performed on the apology DCT items, and this was also audiotaped. As the last activity of the session, the researcher interviewed the participant about his/her thinking processes in performing the DCT. This interview was also audiotaped.

3.4 Data Analysis

Data were coded using a coding scheme. The coding scheme was developed based on the analysis framework of CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989). This analysis framework was revised by adding new categories developed by Suh (1999a) and the researcher. Cohen & Olshtain (1994) asserted that the CCSARP coding scheme is appropriate for examining language learners' speech act knowledge. CCSARP has been extensively used in interlanguage pragmatics research. The unit of analysis for this study was any response in Korean that an individual subject produced to make a request or an apology. The researcher and her assistant coded the data from each subject, and codings were compared. For utterances that the researcher and the assistant coded differently, there was discussion over the problem coding until agreement on coding was reached. After coding each response, the total number (frequency) of request and apology
realizations for each category in the coding scheme were calculated. The frequency constituted the quantitative part of the analysis. More focus was placed on qualitative analysis, which was comprised of the analysis of linguistic content of request and apology realizations made by the participants. The patterns of speech act realizations were examined. That is, general patterns to be found in native speakers’ productions were identified, and non-native speakers’ productions were examined to determine how their productions differed from those of native speakers. For the interview data, participant responses to each interview question were examined, and patterns or reoccurring topics were sought. The coding scheme used for this study is described in the next section.

The coding scheme

A) Request

The first step in analyzing a request is to identify head acts and supportive moves. There are other elements besides head acts and supportive moves, such as alerts\(^{15}\) within one speech act realization, but this study will focus on head acts and supportive moves only.

\[^{15}\text{Alerters are opening elements preceding the actual request, such as a term of address or an attention getter. The underlined parts are alerts in the following examples.}\]

*Mr. Kim, would you clean up the kitchen?*

*Excuse me, could you give me a lift to town?*

Other examples of alerts include title/role ("professor"), names ("Sally"), or endearment terms ("honey").
**Head act:** A head act is the minimal and core unit needed to realize a given speech act. For example, in the piece of utterance,

*John, would you open the window? It's so hot in here.*

the head act, the core unit, is "would you open the window?", which is a request. The other parts, "John" and "it's so hot in here," are not essential in making the request. One frequently used element which is not essential to realizing a request is the supportive move. A supportive move is an element additional to the head act which either aggravates or mitigates the force of the head act. In the above example, "it's hot in here" is a supportive move in that it provides an explanation for why the speaker makes the request that John open the window and therefore mitigates the impositive force of the request. Multiple categories were developed to code head act strategies and supportive moves for this study. The categories were developed based on CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989), and Suh (1999a), with the addition of new categories. The added new categories are "introducing oneself/greeting" and "asking the hearer's opinion" for supportive moves. These categories were added as data that CCSARP and Suh's categories were not be able to code were found. The coding categories for head act strategies and supportive moves are described below. In the first column, each head act and supportive move strategy is listed. Definitions of each strategy are given in the second column. In case of categories borrowed from CCSARP and Suh, the original definitions are given. Examples of each strategy are provided in the third column. As in definitions, for the categories borrowed from CCSARP and Suh, the examples given in
those studies were borrowed. Korean examples provided were from the data of the current study. Table 3 below shows head act strategies and Table 4 indicates supportive move categories, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mood Derivable   | The grammatical mood of the location conventionally determines its illocutionary force as a request. The prototypical form is the imperative. Infinitive forms and elliptical sentence structure express the same directness level. | Go away.  
No smoking.  
Mr. Kim, please.  
컴퓨터 좀 빌려 줄까요.  
computer com pil-lye cwe-yo  
Please lend me your computer. |
| Location derivable | The illocutionary intent is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the location. | You must/ought to call now.  
한주 동안 휴가를 좀 신청해봐요.  
han cwo dong-an hyu-ka-lul com sin-cheng-hay-yatoy-keyss-e-yo |
| Want statement   | The utterance expresses the speaker’s desire.                                | I’d like to borrow your computer tonight.  
화이날 레이퍼를 기간을 좀 연장시키기 주셨으면 좋겠습니다.  
final paper-lat ki-kan-ul com yen-cang si-khve cwo-syess-a-myen coh-keyss-sum-ni-ta |
| Suggestory formula | The illocutionary intent is phrased as a suggestion by means of a framing routine formula. | How about meeting tomorrow?  
음악 좀 안 티시면 어떨까요?  
um-ak com an thu-si-myen e-tel-kka-yo.  
How about not playing the music? |

Table 3. Head Act Categories  
continued
Table 3 continued

| Preparatory | The utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition establishing the feasibility of the request, typically, one of ability, willingness, or possibility as conventionalized in the given language. | Can I borrow your notes? I was wondering if you would give me a ride.  
맥은 그곳 좀 천위 줄래요?  
mek-un ku-lut com chi-we cwwul-lay-yo?  
Would you wash the dishes?  
Would you wash the dishes? |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strong hint | The illocutionary intent is not immediately derivable from the location. Such elements often relate to preconditions for the feasibility of the request. Unlike preparatory strategies, hints are not conventionalized and require more inferencing activity of the hearer. | Will you be going home now? (Intent: getting a ride home)  
부엌 좀 씻도 돼요?  
pwe-ek com sse-to hway-yo?  
Can I use the kitchen? (Intent: reminding the hearer that the kitchen should be cleaned.) |

**Supportive moves:** Supportive moves are utterances to mitigate or aggravate the impositive force of a request. Supportive moves either precede or follow the head act.

The following categories were found in the current data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparator</td>
<td>The speaker prepares the hearer for the ensuing request by announcing that s/he will make a request by asking about the potential availability of the hearer or by asking for the hearer’s permission to make the request.</td>
<td>I’d like to ask you something. Do you live on the same street as me? (preceding a request for a ride)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Getting a precommitment | In checking on a potential refusal before making a request, a speaker tries to commit his/her hearer before telling him/her what he is letting him/herself in for.                                   | Could you do me a favor?  
방학동안에 터어키 가능해 부탁해도 됩니까?  
pang-hak dong-an-ey Turkey ka-nun-ney pwu-thak-hay-to tway?  
I am going to Turkey during the break, can I ask a favor of you? |
| Grounder         | The speaker gives reasons, explanations, or justifications for his/her request.                                                                                                                                                                   | I missed the class yesterday. Could I borrow your notes?                                                                                                                                          |
|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 차를 빌려도 주세요.  
ca-ya toy-nun-ney, co-jong-hi com hay cwu-se-ye.  
I have to sleep. Please be quiet.                                                                                                                                                                |
| Disarmer         | The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise.                                                                                                                                                                         | I know you don’t like lending out your notes, but could you make an exception this time?                                                                                                            |
|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 이거 내 차를 빌려도 되는데, 오늘 날짜 충 충히 충 충히 줄 수 있나요?  
i-ke nay cho-lyeun-ke-o-nun-ney o-nul ni-ka com chi-we cwul swu iss-nya.  
I know that it’s my turn, but can you clean the apartment today? |

Table 4. Supportive Move Categories

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise of reward/repair</th>
<th>A reward due on fulfillment of the request is announced.</th>
<th>Could you lend me your notes? I’ll treat you to lunch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The speaker promises to make reparation for the loss to be caused by the request.</td>
<td>오늘 좀 남아 가지구 이것 좀 마쳐 해 수구 가 주셨으면 하는데요. 다음에 내가 저녁 삼개요. o-nul com nam-a ka-ci-kwu i-kes com ma-ce hay cuw-kwu ka cuw-syes-u-myen ha-nun-ley-yo. ta-am-ey hay-ka ce-nyek sal-kkey-yo I want you to stay and finish this work. I’ll buy dinner next time. 다음과 내가 해 줄께. 오늘은 나가 방 청소 좀 해 주라. ta-am-ey hay-ka hay cuw-lkey; o-nul-un ni-ka pang cheng-so com hay cuw-la. I’ll do it next time, so please clean the apartment today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposition minimizer</td>
<td>The speaker tries to reduce the imposition placed on the hearer by his request.</td>
<td>Would you give me a lift? But only if you’re going my way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>컴퓨터 좀 열려 주면 안 되겠냐? 오늘 하루만 쓰고 들려 줄게. computer com pil-lye cuw-myen an toy-kess-nya? o-nul ha-la-man ssa-ko tol-lye cuw-lkey Will it be a problem if you lend me your computer? I’ll use it only today and return it to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralizing</td>
<td>In order to lend additional credence to his/her request, a speaker invokes general moral maxims.</td>
<td>If one shares a flat, one should be prepared to null one’s weight in cleaning it, so get on with the washing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>조용히 해라. 범놓게 따름만 다른 사람한테 방해가 되지 않니? co-yong-hi hay-la. pam-mui-key itu-tul-myen ta-lun sa-lam-han-they pang-han-ka toy-ci anh-mi? Be quiet. If you make noise late at night, it will disturb others, right?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgement of imposition</th>
<th>The speaker acknowledges the imposition created by the request.</th>
<th>I was wondering if you might have a copy of this book that I could borrow. Sorry about the inconvenience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>바쁜데 이런 부탁해서 미안한데, 일주일 정도 휴가를 내 주셨으면 하는데요.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pa-ppun-tey i-len pwu-thak-hay-se mi-an-han-tey. il-cwu-il ceng-ta hyu-ka-lul nay cwu-syess-u-myen ha-nun-tey-yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm sorry to ask you this favor when the store is busy, but I want you to give me a one-week vacation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>The speaker shows concern about the hearer’s ability, willingness, or availability to carry out the request.</td>
<td>If you don’t mind, can I use your computer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>펜할다면, 노트북 좀 빌려서 다음주까지 좀 쓰겠으면 하는데.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kwyn-chan-ta-myen, notebook kom pil-lye-se ta-um cwu-kka-ci kom ssess-u-myen ha-nun-tey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If it’s OK with you, I would like to borrow your notebook computer and use it until next week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>The speaker expresses his/her appreciation for the hearer’s compliance with the request before it is performed.</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an-nay chayk-ca iss-u-myen kom po-nay cwu-myen ko-map-kess-nun-tey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would appreciate it if you would send me a brochure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise of return</td>
<td>The speaker promises the hearer to return what he/she has borrowed from the hearer.</td>
<td>I will return your notebook tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni notebook kom pil-lil swu iss-keyss-nya? cal sse-se tol-lye cwuul-kkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can I borrow your notebook computer? I’ll use it with care and return it to you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Promise of non-recurrence</strong></th>
<th>The speaker promises the hearer that he/she will not make the same request again.</th>
<th>I will not ask it again.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seriousness/urgency</strong></td>
<td>The speaker expresses the seriousness or urgency of the act requested.</td>
<td>It’s urgent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introducing oneself/greeting</strong></td>
<td>The speaker introduces him/herself to the hearer or greets the hearer before he/she makes a request.</td>
<td>Hi! I’m your classmate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asking the hearer’s opinion</strong></td>
<td>The speaker asks the hearer’s opinion about the possibility of the request’s being fulfilled.</td>
<td>What do you think?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B) **Apology**

In this study, apology strategies and intensifiers were coded. The coding scheme developed for CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, p. 289-294) was used by two raters, the researcher and the assistant, to code apology realizations.

Apologies were coded in six categories: “Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices” (IFID), “taking on responsibility,” “expression of embarrassment,” “explanation or account,” “offer of repair,” and “promise of forbearance.” “Expression of embarrassment” is a subcategory of “taking on responsibility” in CCSARP, but for this study, it was coded separately, not as “taking on responsibility,” because of its high frequency of occurrence in the current data.

*Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFID):* IFID are formulaic, routinized expressions to convey the speaker’s apology explicitly. Some examples are:

- Sorry.
- Excuse me.
- I apologize for ~
- Forgive me.
- Pardon me for ~
- I regret that ~

미안합니다.
*mi-an-hap-ni-ta*
I'm sorry.

Intensifiers such as “terribly,” “very,” “really,” “Oh, no,” “please” can be inserted in IFID as in:

- I’m *terribly* sorry
- *Please* forgive me.
Taking on responsibility: the speaker can choose to express responsibility for the offense. There are two subcategories, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explicit self-blame               | The speaker explicitly acknowledges the fact that s/he has been at fault. | My mistake.  
ce-ka ceng-mal sil-swulul hayss-ney-yo  
I really made a mistake. |
| Admission of facts but not of responsibility | The speaker does not deny his/her involvement in the offense act but abstains from openly accepting responsibility. | I forgot about it.  
ce-ka ta-lum il-i pa-ppa-se kkamppak i-ess-ney-yo  
I forgot because of other things. |

Table 5. Apology strategies: Taking on Responsibility

Expression of embarrassment: The speaker expresses embarrassment about the consequences of the mistake he/she made. Here are some examples.

I feel awful about it.

어쁘지요?
e-tek-ha-ci-yo?
What should I do?
**Explanation or account:** The speaker may explain why an offence occurred.

However, when the first person is used, the expression is to be coded as “taking on responsibility.”

The traffic was terrible. (Explanation or account)

I missed the bus. (Taking on responsibility)

**Offer of repair:** If the damage caused by the speaker can be repaired or compensated for, the speaker can choose to offer reparation.

I’ll pay for the new glasses.
제가 보상해 드리겠습니다.
ce-ka po-sang-hye tu-li-keyss-sup-ni-ta
I’ll pay for it.

**Promise of forbearance:** The speaker can promise that the same offense will never occur again.

This won’t happen again.
다음엔 빨리 갖다 드릴게요.
ta-sm-eyn ppal-li kat-ta tu-lii-kkey-yo
I’ll return it quickly next time.

**Distracting from the offense:** This category covers moves that the speaker uses to divert the hearer’s attention from the speaker’s responsibility. This category has several subcategories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act innocent/pretend not to notice the offence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Am I late?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>이가 어머니 컵이었어요? i-ke-e-me-ni cup-i-yesso-yo? Was that your cup, mother?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>If you think that’s a mistake, you ought to see our fried chicken. (Waiter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>어머니 컵인 줄 알고 일부러 마셨죠. e-me-ni cup-in-cwal al-ko il-pwa-le ma-syess-ryo I drank your water on purpose, knowing that it was your water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeaser</td>
<td>Compensatory offers are not directly connected with the offense.</td>
<td>I’ll buy you lunch (after the speaker has kept his/her friends waiting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>제가 술 한잔 살게요. cey-ka swul hun-can sal-kkey-yo I’ll buy you a drink. (apologizing for having forgotten to return the tools)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Apology strategies: Distracting from the offense

The data were coded with the scheme described above. NS and NNS groups' data were coded and tabulated separately, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of analysis of the data collected from DCT and interviews on thinking processes. DCT data were analyzed in terms of frequency and linguistic content. The difference between NS and NNS groups' performances was compared in terms of the frequency of each strategy used in the ten situations and linguistic content of request and apology realizations. The comparison was made situation by situation. Analysis of the data collected from the interviews on thinking processes was reported in terms of the interview questions that were asked.

4.1 Request

The number of words that NS (Native Speaker) and NNS (Non-Native Speaker) subjects produced in order to realize requests in the ten situations are as follows:
Table 7. Number of words produced by the participants in the request situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>3433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS subjects produced longer requests than NNS subjects did except in S1 and S3, in which NS and NNS subjects produced request realizations of similar length. The fact that NS subjects’ utterances were longer than those of NNS subjects is in contrast with the results of previous research that showed learners to be more verbose in their speech act realizations (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Færch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1987; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Suh, 1999a). One likely explanation for this contrast is that this study used oral DCT (Discourse Completion Tests), whereas previous research used written DCT. It has been suggested that the data collection method could affect speech act behaviors (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989; Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Wolfson, Marmor, & Jones, 1989).

Tables 8 and 9 below indicate how the head act strategies differed for each group across the ten situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 8. Head act strategies used by NS subjects (n=20) across the situations (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 9. Head act strategies used by NNS subjects (n=20) across the situations (frequency)

Examination of Tables 7, 8, and 9 reveals that there was no significant difference between NS and NNS subjects in the frequency of their head act strategy use. NS subjects used a total of 202 head act strategies, and NNS used 197 strategies. The difference is in the total length of utterance, including head act strategies, supportive moves, and other elements such as exclamations or address terms. That is, even though NS and NNS participants used a similar number of head act strategies, NS participants used supportive moves and other elements more frequently than NNS subjects did, resulting in longer utterances.
Tables 8 and 9 show that there are differences in the NS participants’ use of head act strategies across the situations, but NNS subjects’ strategy choice is relatively consistent from situation to situation. For example, NS subjects used 8 mood derivable, 11 preparatory, and 1 strong hint in Situation 1. They chose 8 locution derivable, 8 want statement, and 7 preparatory in Situation 8. NNS subjects mainly chose mood derivable and preparatory for all situations, which may show that learners are not adept at differentiating appropriate head act strategies in response to different social and situational variables. The strategies most frequently chosen by the NS group throughout all situations are mood derivable, want statement, and preparatory, whereas those chosen by NNS groups are mood derivable and preparatory.

The following tables display the two groups’ use of supportive moves across the situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>Ret</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disamer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Ret: Promise of return; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Ask: Asking the hearer's opinion; Int: Introducing oneself/greeting; Com: Getting a precommitment

Table 10. NS subjects’ use of supportive moves across the situations (frequency)

65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>Ret</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Ret: Promise of return; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Ask: Asking the hearer's opinion; Int: Introducing oneself/greeting; Com: Getting a precommitment

Table 11. NNS subjects’ use of supportive moves across the situations (frequency)

Tables 10 and 11 show that there are differences in the participants’ use of supportive moves across the situations. In the case of Situation 1, for example, the NS group used grounder and moralizing as supportive moves. They used a wider range of supportive moves in Situation 4, choosing preparator, grounder, imposition minimizer, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, promise of return, seriousness/urgency, and getting a precommitment. The NNS group’s strategy use is less varied, compared to the
NS group. The NNS group chose the grounder for most situations except for Situation 6, where promise of reward/repair was chosen 12 times. Still, there are situational variations found in the NNS subjects' use of supportive moves. In Situation 1, NNS subjects used the grounder for their supportive moves. In Situation 6, they chose different moves. They used grounder, promise of reward/repair, and acknowledgment of imposition. The result supports the findings of previous research, which suggested that social and situational variables affect the patterns of speech act realizations (Bell, 1998; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Francis, 1997; Kim, 1995; Mir, 1992; Olshtain, 1989; Suh, 1999a).

In the following sections, NS and NNS groups' request realizations will be compared for each situation.

4.1.1 Situation 1

You are in bed trying to get some sleep, but you can't sleep because of the noise made by two children outside your window. They are the kids of your new neighbor, so you don't know them well yet. You approach the window. What would you say to them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 12. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 1 (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency

Table 13. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 1 (frequency)

The most frequently used head act strategy by both NS and NNS subjects is preparatory. The next most frequently chosen strategy is mood derivable, that is, imperative sentences. The reason mood derivable, which could sound impolite in certain request situations because of its directness, was often used may be that the addressees were children. The majority of the participants pointed out that age was one of the most significant factors that they considered when they performed the task. Mood derivable could sound impolite if it were addressed to an adult in the same situation. Three NNS subjects used a strong hint, "시 [juzli] 위" (si-ku-le-we), which means "You're making noise." This expression is usually followed by a command, "조용히 하й" (co-yong-hi hay), which means "Be quiet." Because these subjects said "시 [juzli] 위" only, "시 [juzli] 위" was coded as a head act strategy, not as a supportive move. Two NS subjects used moralizing as supportive moves. They explained to the children that making noise bothers others, instead of providing a personal reason for why the children should be
quiet, that is, the noise they are making is interrupting the speaker's nap. Persuading or scolding the hearer based on a general moral maxim is often used in Korea when the speaker is an adult and the hearer is a child or an adolescent even if the child is not the speaker's own. The underlying mindset is that adults are responsible for teaching children manners or good behavior; teaching manners or good behavior is the responsibility of the community, and is not limited within the boundary of family. For example, in Korea it is not unusual to observe an adult scolding a child on the street or in other public places about inappropriate behaviors such as making loud noise or running around even though the child is not his/her own. It seems that this cultural aspect of education of children by the community was reflected in the NS group’s performance when they used moralizing as a supportive move. NNS subjects did not use moralizing as a supportive move. They used only the grounder as supportive move. Neither NS nor NNS subjects used supportive moves extensively in this situation. This may also be related to the fact that the addressees are children. Supportive moves often mitigate the impositive force of a request. The effect of using supportive moves is therefore to make a request more polite. The participants may have felt that they did not need to be polite to the children.

4.1.2 Situation 2

You are taking a course. Last week you missed classes since you had a bad cold. You know that one of your classmates takes good notes. You don’t know him well, but you need to borrow his notes. What would you say to him? He looks about your age (name - 한승우).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu.: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 14. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 2 (frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Ret</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Int: Introducing oneself/greeting

Table 15. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 2 (frequency)

The head act strategy most often used by the two groups was preparatory.

Except for one participant who chose a want statement, the NS subjects typically chose preparatory. Four NNS subjects chose mood derivable. Because this situation is borrowing a notebook from a classmate whom the speaker does not know well, using mood derivable could be considered impolite. As a consequence, the NS subject who chose want statement used a conditional clause to tone down the request and make it more polite. That is, instead of "노트를 볼리고 싶은데요" (note-lul pil-li-ko sip-un-
“I want to borrow your notes,” he used “노트 좀 빌려주면 좋겠는데” (note comp pil-lye-cwu-myen coh-keyss-nun-tey), “I would be so happy if you might lend me your notes.” According to the CCSARP coding scheme manual (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989, p. 283), a conditional clause is one of the syntactic devices that mitigate the impositive force of a request. That is, by using a conditional structure, this subject tried to make the request sound less compelling.

For supportive moves, NS subjects used preparatory, grounder, imposition minimizer, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, promise of returning, and introducing oneself/greeting. NNS subjects used grounder, promise of returning, and introducing oneself/greeting. Grounder was the strategy most frequently used by both group members. NS subjects used a wider range of strategies than NNS subjects did. Not only did NS subjects use a wider range of strategies, they also tended to use more than one supportive move and, therefore, produced longer utterances. Examples of the NS subjects’ use of more than one supportive move are shown below.

(NS #2) 안녕하세요, 제 이름은 __ 입니다. 지난 주에 제가 아파서 강의를 빼 먹었습니다, 노트 좀 빌려도 될까요?
an-nyeng-ha-sey-yo, cey i-lum-un __ ip-ni-ta. ci-nan-cwu-ey cey-ka a-pha-se kang-uy-lul
ppay-mek-ess-nun-tey, note-lul com pwa-to toyi-kka-yo?
Hi, my name is ___ (introducing oneself/greeting) Last week I was ill, so I missed the class (grounder). Can I see your notes? (request)

(NS #4) 저기, 나 너무 같은 클라스를 듣는 __이라구 하는데, 내가 지난 주에 감기 가 걸려서 클라스를 다 빼겠거든요. 그러니가 내가 남 노트 좀 빌릴 수 있을까요?
내가 카피하고 줄게.
ce-ki, na ne-lang kat-un class-lul tut-nun __ i-la-kwu ha-nun-tey, nay-ka ci-nan-cwu-ey
Hi, I am ______, and I’m taking the class with you (introducing oneself/greeting). I had a cold last week, so I missed the classes (grounder). Then, can I borrow your notebook? (request) I’ll return it to you after I photocopy it (promise of return).

NS #2 used two supportive moves and NS #4 three supportive moves. On the other hand, the majority of NNS participants used one supportive move or none, as shown below.

(NNS #3) 감기 치러서 수업에 안 갔는데요, 좀 크라스 노트 있으면 좀 빌려 주세요.

kam-ki-ka kel-lye-se swu-ep-ey an kass-nun-ney-yo, com class note iss-u-myen com pil-lye cwul-sey-yo.

I got a cold, so I didn’t come to class (grounder). Please lend me your class notes if you have any (request).

(NNS #20) 제가 그저께 감기 치렀는데, 수업을 못 와서, 노트 빌려 줄 수 있어요?

cey-ka ku-ce-kkey kam-ki kel-lyess-nun-ney, swu-ep-ul mos wa-se, note pil-lye cwul swu iss-e-yo?

I caught a cold the day before yesterday, so I couldn’t attend the class (grounder). Could you lend me your notebook? (request)

(NNS #6) 저기요, 노트 좀 빌릴 수 있을까요?

ce-ki-yo, note com pil-nil swu iss-ul-kka-yo?

Excuse me. Can I borrow your notes? (request)

NNS subjects #3 and #20 used one supportive move, and NNS #6 did not use a supportive move at all. Because the speaker does not know the classmate well, using one supportive move or not using any may sound rather abrupt, that is, it can give the
hearer the impression that the speaker is not explaining enough. This impression can weaken the effect of the request. NS participants often used an acknowledgement of imposition such as ＂미안합니다” (mi-an-hap-ni-ta), “I’m sorry,” before they made a request, along with other supportive moves such as grounder. Acknowledgement of imposition was rarely used by NNS subjects.

4.1.3 Situation 3

You have a new roommate (name - 박성훈/ 김미라). You have lived with him/her for two weeks, so you don’t know him/her well yet. Yesterday, your roommate cooked, but did not clean the kitchen. You have invited some of your friends, and they are coming over for dinner today. What would you say to your roommate? He/she is older than you by 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 16. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 3 (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency

Table 17. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 3 (frequency)

As a head act strategy, NS subjects chose mood derivable, locution derivable, want statement, preparatory, and strong hint, while NNS subjects used mood derivable, preparatory, and strong hint. Preparatory was the most frequently used strategy by both groups of subjects. Six NS subjects commented that they would clean the kitchen themselves rather than ask the roommate to clean it. According to these subjects, the reason they would avoid making such a request is that the roommate is older and they have known the roommate for only two weeks. One participant said, “한두달 짧아서 친해지게 되면 그 때 말할 수 있겠죠,” “After one or two months, when I get to know him well, then I can ask” (NS #1). Another reason some NS subjects chose not to make a request may be that the situation can be resolved by the speaker himself/herself easily. Unlike borrowing a notebook or asking someone to lower the music, cleaning the kitchen is something the speaker can do himself/herself without risking any trouble if the request is rejected by the listener. One factor that could make this request situation embarrassing is that the request might imply criticism. Requesting that the hearer clean
the kitchen that he/she messed up could imply that he/she failed to do what he/she was obligated to do, which was to clean the kitchen after using it. For these reasons, NS subjects commented that they would rather not make a request. Those who made a request tended to use unfinished sentences, strong hint, or to request with a laugh, which could make the embarrassing moment less intense. Here are some examples.

(NS #16) 저, 미라씨, 최송한데, 오늘 친구가 와서 그리는데, 무렵 좀....
ce, mira-sssi, coy-song-han-ney, o-nul chin-kwu-ka wa-se ku-le-nun-ney, pwu-ek com....
Mira, I’m sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), my friends are coming (grounder),
then, the kitchen (request · unfinished sentence)....

(NS #17) 제가 오늘 친구를 초대했는데 부엌을 좀 씁야 되거든요. 근데 좀 약해 꽤한 것 같아요.
I’ve invited friends. I have to use the kitchen (grounder), but it is not clean so... (request
· strong hint)

NS #16 used an unfinished sentence, and NS #17 a strong hint.

Instead of making such a request, one NS participant asked her roommate to help her clean the kitchen. She said:

(NS #11) 오늘 제 친구들이 집에 놀러 오는데 제가 저녁을 준비해야 되거든요?
그러니까 부엌을 좀 청소했으면 좋겠는데 같이 치울래요?
My friends are coming today. I have to prepare dinner, so I would like to clean the kitchen. Would you do it with me?
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When NS #11 was asked what factors she took into consideration when she performed the task, she said that she tried not to offend or hurt the hearer. Therefore, instead of making a request which might embarrass the hearer, she chose to ask for help, a strategic option in this situation.

Among NNS subjects, none chose an avoiding strategy except one (NNS #1) who has many Korean native speaking friends and interacts with them on a regular basis. She (NNS #1) said:

I won’t ask because I feel bad. I don’t want her to feel bad about me. And she is older, so I don’t want to tell her what to do. Maybe later. If it’s too much? Then, if we become better friends, I would make fun of her.

She explained that she chose an avoidance strategy for personal reasons, that is, she did not want her roommate to feel bad because of her as well as for social reasons such as age and intimacy. It seems that the regular interaction of this participant with Korean native speakers enabled her to consider avoidance in this situation when the roommate was older and the speaker did not know the roommate very well.

Six NNS subjects chose mood derivable, which forms a contrast with the NS subjects’ avoidance strategy. Examples of NNS subjects’ use of mood derivable are shown below.

(NNS #3) 오늘 친구들 오는데요, 기친 식것이 좀 해 주세요.
*o-nul chin-kwu-tul o-nun-tey-yo, kitchen sel-kec-i com hay cuw-se-yo*
My friends are coming today. Wash the dishes in the kitchen, please.
Two NS participants also used mood derivable. One participant who used mood derivable tried to reduce the impositive force of the request by making the request with a laugh. The other participant used mood derivable from personal belief. He had had an unpleasant experience when he was living with roommates who were his seniors in Korea. At that time, he had to wash cups or dishes that he had not used because he was younger than the others. This experience made him an advocate of observing the rules of communal living, that is, those who use cups and dishes are responsible for washing them. Thus, in this situation, he used mood derivable with supportive move, moralizing, as follows:

*(NS #18) 동춘의 형, 설것이 좀 잘 해 봤. 그래야 다음 사람 편하지.*

*dong-hwan-i-nyeng, sel-kec-i com cal hay-cwe. ku-lay-ya ta-um sa-lam pyen-ha-ci.*

Dong-Hoon, please always wash your dishes. That will make others’ lives easier.

For supportive moves, NS and NNS subjects show very similar patterns. Both chose grounder most frequently, and three of each group chose acknowledgement of imposition.
4.1.4 Situation 4

You are writing a term paper on your computer. Suddenly, the computer stops working. The paper should be submitted by tomorrow. It is the end of the quarter, and the computer lab is very crowded.

You know that your close friend (name - 채인./ 우희정) bought a notebook computer a year ago. You call your friend. What would you say? Your friend is the same age as you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 18. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 4 (frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Ret</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Com: Getting a precommitment

Table 19. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 4 (frequency)

NS participants used mood derivable, want statement, and preparatory, whereas NNS participants used mood derivable and preparatory as head act strategies. The most
frequently used strategy for the two groups was preparatory. Compared to other situations, more NS participants chose the want statement. This may be because the situation is urgent and the hearer is the speaker’s close friend. These reasons could have made the speaker bolder in addressing his/her needs.

The differences between NS subjects’ and NNS subjects’ request realizations are manifested in supportive moves as well. NS subjects chose a wide range of supportive moves. They used preparator, grounder, imposition minimizer, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, promise of return, seriousness/urgency, and getting a precommitment. NNS subjects used preparator, grounder, and promise of reward. The most frequently selected strategy was grounder for both NS and NNS groups. Many NS subjects used more than one supportive move for this situation. This is because borrowing an expensive piece of equipment like a laptop computer imposes high imposition on the addressee even though the addressee is a close friend of the speaker. This perception of high imposition led NS speakers to elaborate their requests more and, consequently, to produce longer utterances. NNS subjects did not produce longer utterances in this situation. This may be because they did not have the linguistic resources in Korean to express what they wanted to express. The following examples show that NS subjects tended to use multiple supportive moves, while NS subjects tended to use either a single supportive move or none.

(NS #10) 인표야. 자기 내가 컴퓨터가 갑자기 고장 나가지구, 지금 페이퍼를 거의 다 써 가는데 여기 학교도 복잡하다 그래 가지구. 한 한시간 정도만 벌리면 내가
سو채 다 할 것 같겠데? 지금 바쁘니는 이는데, 내가 너 안 쓰 동안만 잠시 쓸면....
내가 말려도 됐까?

In-pyo-ya, ce-ki, nay-ka computer-ka kap-ca-ki ko-cang-na-ka-ci-kwu, ci-kum paper-hul ke-
uy ta see ka-nun-tey ye-ki lap-sil-to pok-cap-hu-ko ku-lay ka-ci-kwu, han han-si-kan ceng-
to-man pil-li-myen nay-ka swuk-cey te hal-kes kat-ke-tun? ci-kum pa-ppun-ci-nun a-nun-
tey, nay-ka ne an ssul dong-an-man cam-si ssu-myen...nay-ka pil-lye-to toyi-ka?

In-Pyo, my computer suddenly went down (grounder). I had almost finished my
paper...the lab is crowded. I think I can finish my paper if I can borrow your computer
for an hour (imposition minimizer). I know that you are busy (acknowledgement of
imposition). If I use the computer while you are not using it.....(imposition minimizer),
may I borrow it? (request)

(NS # 5) 아, 큰일 났다. 저 컴퓨터 좀 빌려 주면 안 되겠나, 오늘? 내 팀 레이더가 인쇄 내야 있는데 컴퓨터가 날라 가지구. 오늘 하루만 쓰고 줄리 줄게.

ya, khun-il nass-ya. ce computer com pil-lye cwu-myen an toy-kess-nya, o-nil? nay term
paper-ka in-cey nay-ya toy-nun-tey computer-ka nai-la ka ka-ci-kwu. o-nil ha-lwu-man
ssu-ko tol-lye cwu-kyey.

Look, it's an emergency (seriousness/urgency). Would it be a problem if you lent me
your computer today? (request) I have to turn in a term paper, but my computer is down
(grounder). I'll just use it today and return it to you (imposition minimizer/promise of
return).

(NNS #15) 회장야, 내가 너 컴퓨터 쓸며는 안 돼요?

huy-ceng-a, nay-ka ne computer ssu-myen-mun an tway-ya?

Hee-jung, would it be a problem if I used your computer? (request)

(NNS #11) 연표, 재일 좋은 친구야, 나 이것 좀 빌려 줄지도 띄? 내 뭐 좋은 거 사 수
계, 빌려 주면.

in-pyo, cey-il coh-un chin-kwu-ya, na i-kes com pil-lye cwe-to tway? nay mwe coh-un ke
sa cwu-kkyey. pil-lye cwu-myen.

In-Pyo, my best friend, can you lend me this? (request) I'll buy you something good if
you lend me this (promise of reward).

Even though the hearer is the speaker’s close friend, asking him/her to loan an expensive
piece of equipment like a notebook computer imposes a burden on the hearer. NS
speakers attempted to mitigate this impositive force by using multiple supportive 
moves, in particular, acknowledgement of imposition such as “I’m sorry.” NNS 
speakers failed to use acknowledgement of imposition. They tended to use one 
supportive move or none.

4.1.5 Situation 5

You are studying at home for a midterm exam tomorrow. However, you cannot concentrate on studying 
because your neighbor is playing music loudly. You have known her for two years, and you know her 
well. You go to her apartment. What would you say? She (name - omnia) is older than you by 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: 
Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 20. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 5 (frequency)
Table 21. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 5 (frequency)

NS subjects used mood derivable, preparatory, strong hint, and suggestory formula as head act strategies, whereas NNS subjects used mood derivable and preparatory. Preparatory was the most frequently used strategy for both groups. One NS subject (NS #15) said that he would not make a request in this situation because the neighbor was older and she was playing the piano in her private residence. Two NS subjects used strong hints instead of making a request directly. One said, "내가 원래 피아노 소리 별로 안 좋아하기든" (nay-ka wen-lay piano so-li pyel-lo an coh-a-ha-ke-tun), "I don’t like the sound of piano that much." The other one said, "음악이 좀...(um-ak-i com...) "the music is a bit ...."

For supportive moves, grounder was the most frequently used strategy for both groups. Subjects explained why the addressee needed to tone down the music, that is, the speaker had a midterm the next day. In addition to grounder, NS subjects used disarmer, imposition minimizer, moralizing, and acknowledgement of imposition. NNS subjects used appreciation in addition to grounder. Besides NS #15, who chose not to
make a request, another NS (NS #1) said that if this were a real situation, he would go to
the library to study instead of asking his neighbor to reduce the volume of the music. He
said:

피아노. 그거는 말을 안 하는 쪽이니가요. 자기 집에서 자기가 피아노 치는
거니까. 계속 같이 살아야 되고.
piano. ku-ke-nun mal-ul an ha-nun cok-i-ni-kka-yo. ca-ki cip-ey-se ca-ki-ka piano chii-
nun ke-ni-kka. kye-sok kat-chi sal-a-ya toy-ko.
Piano. I would rather not complain about it because she is playing the piano in her
home. And we should continue to see each other.

In other words, because the woman has a right to do whatever she wants to do in her
own home, this NS subject feels that it is not appropriate to ask her to stop playing the
piano. This perception explains why several NS subjects used acknowledgement of
imposition as supportive move, while it was not used by NNS subjects. The following
examples show the NS subjects’ use of acknowledgement of imposition.

(NS #4) 영옥씨, 정말 죄송한데요. 제가 내일 시험이라서 그러는데 음악이 너무 시
그리워서 공부에 집중할 수 없는데 조금만 낮춰 주시겠어요? 죄송합니다.
yeng-ok-sii, ceng-nal coy-song-han-ney-yo, ce-kanay-il si-hem-i-la-se ku-le-nun-ney um-
ak-i ne-mu si-kku-le-we-se kong-pwu-ey cip-cwang-bal swu ep-nun-ney co-kum-man nat-
Young-Ok, I’m really sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), but I have an exam
tomorrow (grounder). I can’t study because the music is too loud (grounder). Would
you lower the volume of the music a bit? (request) I’m sorry (acknowledgement of
imposition).

(NS #19) 영옥이 언니, 미안한데, 나 시험이거든. 근데 음악이 조금 크다. 음악 조
금만 줄여 주면 안 될까요?
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yeng-ok-i en-ni. mi-an-han-ten. na si-hem-i-ke-tun. kun-tem um-ak-i co-kum kku-ta. um-ak co-kum-man cwul-ye cwu-myen an toyl-kka?

Young-Ok, I’m sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), but I have an exam (grounder). The music is a bit loud (grounder). Would it be a problem if you lower the volume of the music? (request)

Even though music bothers the speaker, NS speakers tended to think that the hearer could do whatever she wanted to do at home, and therefore asking her to stop playing the music was challenging the hearer’s right. This belief led some NS subjects to use acknowledgement of imposition as a supportive move. NNS subjects did not use acknowledgement of imposition. They used a single supportive move, mostly grounder.

4.1.6 Situation 6

You are living with a roommate (name - 선동원/ 응선희). You have lived with him/her for two years, so you are close. You and your roommate alternately clean the apartment. Today it is your turn, but you have many things to do. The apartment is such a mess that you want your roommate to clean the apartment today on your behalf. What would you say to your roommate? Your roommate is younger than you by 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Location derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 22. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 6 (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency

Table 23. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 6 (frequency)

The most frequently used head act strategy by the NS group was mood derivable. The reason that the most direct strategy, mood derivable, was often used may be because the addressee is younger than the speaker and they know each other well. In addition to mood derivable, preparatory and want statement were used by the NS group. The NNS group chose preparatory and mood derivable. Preparatory was the most frequently used strategy for the NNS group. The fact that the NNS group used preparatory most frequently when the NS group tended to choose mood derivable may suggest that the NNS subjects were not effective in differentiating their request realization strategies according to social and situational variables. In other words, NS subjects chose the most direct strategy, mood derivable, because the addressee was a junior and close to the speaker. NNS subjects chose preparatory which they chose most frequently in other situations as well.

More than half of the NS subjects chose promise of repair and grounder as supportive moves. Disarmer, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, and promise of
non-recurrence were also chosen by NS subjects. NNS subjects used grounder with the
greatest frequency. They also used promise of repair and acknowledgement of
imposition. As the situation is asking the roommate to clean the apartment when it is
not the roommate’s turn, promise of reward/repair in which the speaker offers future
cleaning was often used. More NS subjects chose acknowledgement of imposition
compared to NNS subjects.

4.1.7 Situation 7

You are a 40-year-old professor at a college. You are planning to visit Turkey during the summer. You
know that one of your former students works at a local travel agency. You want to obtain travel brochures
from her. You have known her for years. You call her (name - 권나영). What would you say? She is
25 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug:
Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 24. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 7 (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Com</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS  (n=20)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Impression minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Com: Getting a precommitment; Int: Introducing oneself/greeting

Table 25. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 7 (frequency)

The NS and NNS groups show similar patterns in using head act strategies. Both groups chose preparatory the most frequently and mood derivable next. Other strategies were not chosen.

For supportive moves, both NS and NNS subjects chose grounder most frequently. More than half of the NS subjects chose introducing oneself/greeting. They also used preparator, acknowledgement of imposition, and appreciation. NNS subjects used introducing oneself/greeting and getting a precommitment. The major difference between NS subjects’ and NNS subjects’ use of supportive moves is the use of greeting. NS subjects tend to start their request by identifying themselves or using a greeting. Few NNS subjects started the request with a greeting. The examples below show this contrast.

(NS #3) onclick, ी고속입니다. 다른이 아니라 이번 여행에 터키로 가게 됐는데, 여행 관련 부분을 좀 알려줄 수 있을까요 해서 전화 드린거였어요.

kwen-na-yeng-ssi, ीko-swup-ni-ta. ta-tum-i a-ni-la i-pen ye-lum-ey Turkey-ey ka-key
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Ms. Na-Young Kwon, this is Prof. ____ (introducing oneself/greeting). I am going to Turkey this summer (grounder). I called you to ask if I could get travel brochures from you (request).

(NS #6) 나영이나? 잘 있느냐? 내가 터키에 가야 되는데 책자 좀 구해 줄 수 있나?
nay-ka Turkey-eye ka-ya hoy-mun-te chayk-ca com kwu-hay cweul swu iss-nya?
Na-Young, how have you been? (introducing oneself/greeting). I'm visiting Turkey (grounder). Can you get me some brochures? (request)

(NNS #11) 나영아, 제가 터키를 갔 거니까, 부.setRequest 줄 수 있겠어?
nay-yeng-a, cey-ka Turkey-lul kal-ke-ni-kka, brochure com cweul-swu iss-keyss-e?
Na-Young, I'm going to Turkey (grounder). Can you give me a brochure? (request)

(NNS #4) 나영, travel brochure 좀 찾아 주며는 안 되어요?
nay-yeng, travel brochure-lul com kai-te cwu-mye-mun an tway-yo?
Na-Young, would it be a problem for you to bring me a travel brochure? (request)

Even though NNS subjects did not use introducing oneself/greeting as often as NS subjects, it is hard to say that this is because of their lack of understanding of sociocultural rules in Korean. It may be that they were preoccupied with the thought of making a request, so they overlooked the fact that they should make the utterance sound as natural as possible by including an opening and an ending. The use of a single supportive move by NNS subjects is observed again in this situation.
4.1.8 Situation 8

You are a 45-year-old cashier at a very busy grocery store. Because of an urgent family matter, you need to request a one-week vacation. What would you say to the manager? The manager (name - 한상호) is 27 years old, and you have known him for years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu.: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 26. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 8 (frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Ask: Asking the hearer’s opinion

Table 27. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 8 (frequency)

The NS group’s use of head act strategy is evenly distributed among locution derivable, want statement, and preparatory. On the other hand, the majority of NNS subjects chose preparatory. Locution derivable and want statement were rarely or never
chosen by NNS participants. The situation is that an older employee is requesting a vacation of his younger boss whom he knows well. It seems that more frequent use of locution derivable and want statement in this situation than in other situations is related to the fact that the situation is urgent, the employee is older, and he has known his young boss for years. The urgency of the situation and the closeness between the speaker and his boss made it possible for the speaker to be bold and direct in addressing his needs. Samples of NS speakers’ use of locution derivable and want statement are shown below.

(NS #1) 여. 상호씨. 내가 집에 좀 일이 있어 가지고, 한 일주일 정도 휴가를 좀 신청해야 되겠는데, 괜찮겠어요?

*e, sang-ho-ssi, nav-ka cip-e com il-i iss-e ka-ci-ko, han il-cwu-il ceng-to hyu-ka-lul com sin-cheng-hay-yatoey-keys-nun-tye, kwayn-chan-kess-e-yo?*

Sang-Ho, because of family matters (grounder), I want to request a one-week vacation (request). Will it be okay? (concern)

(NS #7) 상호씨, 제가 다음 주에 개인적으로 집안에 일이 있어 가지고 휴가를 내고 싶은데 어떻게 하면 될까요?


Sang-Ho, because of family matters next week (grounder), I want to request a one-week vacation (request). What shall I do? (asking the hearer’s opinion)

NNS participants used preparatory dominantly. That NNS subjects used preparatory most often when NS participants used three other strategies shows again that NNS subjects are not effective in differentiating request realizations according to social and situational variables. They used preparatory the most frequently regardless of
the situation.

For supportive moves, both NS and NNS groups used grounder with the greatest frequency. NS participants also used disarmer, acknowledgement of imposition, asking the hearer’s opinion, seriousness/urgency, concern, and appreciation. Disarmer, acknowledgement of imposition, and asking the hearer’s opinion were each chosen by one NNS subject. The major difference between the two groups was the NS subjects’ use of disarmer, acknowledgement of imposition, and asking the hearer’s opinion. The reason NS participants used supportive moves more in this situation than in other situations was that the situation is urgent, taking a vacation can cause a great degree of inconvenience because the store is busy, and it is still difficult to make a request of the boss even though the boss is younger. Therefore, the speaker had to use mitigating devices, that is, supportive moves, more than once to make it more likely that the boss will comply with the request. Some examples of the NS participants’ use of multiple supportive moves were as follows:

(NS #4) 집안에 급한 사정이 생겨서 다음 주 한 주 동안 휴가를 쳐 냈으면 하는데 최종하지만 조금 헤라 해 주실 수 있겠습니까? 너무 급한 일이라서 지금 바쁜 기간 안 줄 알지만 어렵게 부탁드리니 기다려.

I have an urgent family matter ( grounder), so I want to request a one-week break next week (request). I’m sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), but would you allow me to have it? (preparatory). I ask you even though I know that the store is busy (disarmer) because it’s urgent (seriousness/urgency).
(NS #16) 한상호씨, 저 외출하긴 한데, 되게 바쁜 일이 있어서 그러는데, 일주일 정도 휴가를 좀 연을 수 없을까요?

han-sang-ho-ssi, ce coy-song-ha-kin han-tey, toy-key pa-ppun il-i iss-e-se ka-le-nun-tey, il-cwu-il ceng-to hyu-ka-lul com et-ul-swu eps-ul-kka-yo?

Mr. Sang-Ho Han, I’m sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), but I have an urgent matter (grounder). Then can I get a one-week vacation? (request)

NS #14 used grounder, acknowledgement of imposition, disarmer, and seriousness/urgency, and NS #16 used acknowledgement of imposition and grounder.

NNS participants tend to use a single supportive move. As a result, their requests were shorter than those of NS participants. As stated in previous sections, this is another characteristic of NNS participants’ speech act realizations. That is, they tend to use a single supportive move or none regardless of the situation. Here are some examples:

(NNS #16) 매니저님, 갑자기 어머니께서 돌아가셨기(()=>)요. 일주일 동안 휴가 별 수 있을까요?

manager-nim, kap-ca-ki e-me-ni-kkey-se tol-a-ka-syess-ke-tun-oyo. il-cwu-il dong-an hyu-ka nayl-swu iss-ul-kka-yo?

Manager, my mother suddenly passed away (grounder). Can I have a one-week vacation? (request)

(NNS #19) 상호씨, 가족 문제가 있는데 일주일 휴가 좀 보내 줘.


Sang-Ho, I have family matters (grounder). Give me a one-week vacation (request).

Both NNS subjects #16 and #19 used only grounder as supportive moves. The reason that NNS subjects tend to use a single supportive move could be due to their limited
linguistic resources and lack of confidence in performing requests in Korean. This will be discussed again in a later section of this chapter.

4.1.9 Situation 9

You are a 26-year-old graduate student. Tomorrow is the due date of the final paper for a course you are taking. However, you are not able to turn it in on time. You want to talk to the professor (45 years old) about an extension on the paper. You go to his office. You have known him (name - 정광한) for a year.

What would you say to him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 28. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 9 (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Ask: Asking the hearer’s opinion

Table 29. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 9 (frequency)

Both NS and NNS subjects chose preparatory and mood derivable as head act strategies. Preparatory was the strategy most frequently used by the two groups. Four NS subjects used want statement.

The differences between NS participants and NNS participants were revealed in the use of supportive moves. NS subjects used more diverse strategies. They used preparator, grounder, disarmer, promise of reward/repair, imposition minimizer, moralizing, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, seriousness/urgency, and asking the hearer’s opinion. NNS subjects used grounder, promise of reward/repair, and asking the hearer’s opinion. The NS speakers’ use of extensive supportive moves is attributed to the fact that the addressee is a professor who has power and is rather unapproachable in Korean society based on Confucianism. In Confucian tradition, education is highly valued, and those who teach, especially in colleges, are greatly respected. Students often feel a distance between themselves and their professors, and therefore asking a professor for an extension often requires courage. This could make NS participants request
realizations more wordy. Some examples of NS and NNS subjects’ productions are as follows:

(NS #10) 안녕하세요, 교수님, 내일 저 내야 되는 그 시험 있어요? 제가 이번에 좀 여러 가지 일이 겹쳐서 아직 마치지 못했습니다. 할 일수만도 좀 연기 를 하면 안 될까요?

har-il-cwu-il-i-la-to com yen-ki-lul ha-myen an toyl-kka-yo?

Hi, Professor. The exam that I should hand in tomorrow? I couldn’t finish it because of several other things (grounder). Will it be a problem if I hand it in in a week? (request)

(NS #13) 교수님, 이 페이지 두 데이지 내일인데 제가 사정이 생겨서 이걸 다 못 썼거든요. 그래서 기간을 조금만 연장해 주시면 제가 더 노력해서 잘 서서 제출 하겠습니다. 특별히 문제가 되지 않는다면 시간을 좀 더 주실시오.


Professor, the due date for this paper is tomorrow, but I couldn’t finish it because of other matters (grounder). So, if you give me an extension, I’ll try to do a better job and hand in the paper (moralizing). If it is not a problem (imposition minimizer), give me more time, please (request).

(NNS #10) 자기야, 교수님, 제 페이지가 아직 다 안 끝나 가저고 혹시 내일 내도 되는지 알고 설어서 잠깐 왔겨요.


Professor, I couldn’t finish the paper. I came to ask you if it is okay for me to hand in the paper tomorrow (request).

(NNS #20) 남선생님, 제가 이 페이지를 아직 다 못 썼어요. 그 익스텔션을 받을 수 있어요?

nam-sen-sayng-nim, ce-ka i paper-lul a-cik ta mos ssess-e-yo. ku extension-ul pat-ul-swu
Professor Nam, I couldn’t finish the paper. Can I get an extension? (request)

The above examples show that NS subjects used multiple supportive moves, whereas NNS subjects only made a request.

4.1.10 Situation 10

You are the 34-year-old manager (과장) of a company. You have a secretary (name - 이경현 / married) who has worked for you for two years. There is an urgent report that you should take to your boss (부당) tomorrow, so you want the secretary to stay after office hours and finish typing the report today. What would you say to her? The secretary is 50 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Locu</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Sug</th>
<th>Prep</th>
<th>Stro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mood: Mood derivable; Locu: Locution derivable; Want: Want statement; Sug: Suggestory formula; Prep: Preparatory; Stro: Strong hint

Table 30. Head act strategies used by the participants for Situation 10 (frequency)
Table 31. Supportive moves used by the participants for Situation 10 (frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Gro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Rew</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Ack</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre: Preparator; Gro: Grounder; Dis: Disarmer; Rew: Promise of reward/repair; Imp: Imposition minimizer; Mor: Moralizing; Ack: Acknowledgement of imposition; Con: Concern; App: Appreciation; Non: Promise of non-recurrence; Ser: Seriousness/urgency; Ask: Asking the hearer’s opinion

NS subjects used want statement most frequently, followed by preparatory, mood derivable, and explicit performative. NNS subjects used preparatory most frequently. They also used mood derivable and want statement. In this situation, the boss is asking his/her secretary to type an urgent report. As in Situations 4 and 8, NS subjects used want statement since the situation is urgent. The participants commented that it is not easy to make a request of an older person. In this case, even though the hearer is older than the speaker, the fact that the speaker is the hearer’s boss and the urgency of the situation made NS subjects bolder, that is, more of them used want statement more frequently than preparatory.

For supportive moves, NS subjects used grounder, preparator, disarmer, promise of reward, imposition minimizer, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, seriousness/urgency, and asking the hearer’s condition. The NNS group used grounder, promise of repair/reward, acknowledgement of imposition, concern, and seriousness/urgency. Because the situation involves asking a secretary to stay after working hours, many NS
participants used acknowledgement of imposition, such as “죄송하지만” (coy-song-ha-ci-man), “I’m sorry, but,” concern as in “괜찮으시겠어요?” (kweyn-chanh-u-si-keyss-e-yo), “will it be okay with you?,” or asking the hearer’s opinion as in “어떻겠어요?” (e-tteh-keyss-e-yo), “what do you think?” These moves were not often used by NNS subjects. As shown by the total number of supportive moves, NS subjects used more supportive moves, which resulted in longer utterances. Examples of NS and NNS participants’ productions are shown below.

(NS #10) 갑작스럽게 오늘 저녁에 이걸 다 끝내쳐야 되겠어? 오늘 러근시간 후에도 남어서 가지고 타이핑 해 주시면 제가 내일 부상당께 보고 드릴 수 있는데, 죄송하지만 오늘 어거 다 끝내치구 러근해 주시기 바람니다.

We have to finish this report tonight, okay? If you stay after your working hours and type this, I can take it to the boss tomorrow (grounder). I’m sorry (acknowledgement of imposition), but I want you to leave after you finish it (request).

(NNS #17) 내일까지 부상당께 내야 될 리포트가 너무 급한데, 오늘 임직 러근하 지 않고 좀 남어서 나하고 같이 일을 좀 할 수 있겠어요? 시간이 편찮아요?
There is an urgent report that I have to submit to the boss by tomorrow (grounder). Can you stay after work today and work with me? (Request) Do you have time? (concern)

(NNS #8) 내일 부상당께 그 리포트를 드려야 되니까, 오늘 저녁에 그 리포트를 다 끝낼 수 있겠어요?
nay-il pwu-cang-nim-han-they kureport-lul tu-lye-yatoy-ni-kka, o-nul ce-nyek-ey ku
report-hul i a kkum-nayl swu iss-kess-e-yo?
I have to submit this report to the boss tomorrow (grounder). Could you finish typing the report tonight? (request)

(NNS #4) 미스 리, 내가 이 리포트를 내일까지 붙었을 갖다 줘야 돼요. 그러나가 오늘 좀 다 하세요.
Miss Lee, nay-ka i report-hul nay-il-kka-ci pwu-cang-ul kat-to cwe-ya tway-yo. ku-le-nikka o-nul com ta ha-sey-yo.
Ms. Lee, I have to hand in this report to the boss tomorrow (grounder). Then, finish it today, please (request).

Compared to NS participants, who used a combination of supportive moves, the above examples show that NNS subjects used one supportive move, the grounder.

4.1.11 Summary

The data analysis showed that there were differences between NS participants’ and NNS participants’ speech act behaviors. The main findings of the analysis of the request data for this study can be summarized as follows.

a) The head act strategy most frequently used by the two groups was preparatory, which asks about the hearer’s capability or willingness to comply with the request. The NS group used 111 preparatory out of 202 head act strategies in a total of ten situations, and the NNS group used 142 preparatory out of 197 head act strategies.

b) The most frequently chosen supportive move was the grounder, which provides explanations, justifications, or reasons for the request. NS subjects used 149 grounders out of 315 supportive moves in a total of ten situations. NNS subject used
148 grounders out of the 193 supportive moves that they used for the ten situations.

c) NS subjects produced longer utterances by using more supportive moves than NNS subjects did. NS subjects also used a wider range of supportive moves than NNS subjects did. The use of supportive move by NNS subjects was often limited to grounder.

d) NNS participants tended to use a single supportive move or none. They did not speak more when their NS counterparts increased the length of their utterances. The structure of the NNS subjects’ requests is minimal. A typical request consisted of either head act only or head act plus one supportive move.

e) NNS subjects chose preparatory and grounder most frequently for all ten situations, while the most frequently used strategies varied depending on the situation for NS subjects. This may show that NNS subjects were not adept at differentiating strategies in response to social and situational variables.

f) The requests made by NNS subjects were more direct than those by NS subjects (Situation 2). The use of direct request, mood derivable, could sound impolite when the hearer is a stranger and result in pragmatic failure.

g) NNS subjects made a request when NS subjects tended to avoid making a request because the hearer was older than the speaker and they did not know each other well (Situation 3). This may show a gap in sociocultural knowledge in Korean among NNS subjects.

In the next section, the analysis of the apology data will be presented.
4.2 Apology

The number of words that NS and NNS subjects produced to realize an apology in ten situations are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>3288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Number of words produced for apology situations

For all situations, NS subjects produced longer utterances than NNS subjects did. Table 32 also shows that there are differences in the length of utterances for each situation. For instance, NS subjects spoke more in Situation 9 than in Situation 6. NNS participants produced longer utterances in Situation 4 than in Situation 1.

Tables 33 and 34 below show the use of apology strategies by NS and NNS groups across the ten situations.
The tables show that the three most often chosen strategies are IFID, taking on responsibility, and offer of repair. The tables also show that the participants used different strategies in different situations. For example, NS subjects used IFID the most.
in Situation 1 and explanation/account the most in Situation 4. NNS participants used IFID the most in Situation 2 and offer of repair in Situation 7.

The following tables show the use of intensifying adverbials by the two groups. Intensifying adverbials are words such as “정말” (ceng-mal), “really,” or “너무” (ne-mwu), “too,” that modify an IFID such as “미안합니다” (mi-an-hap-ni-la), “I’m sorry,” and intensify the degree of apology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensifying adverbials</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35. Intensifying adverbials used by NS group (n=20) (frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensifying adverbials</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Intensifying adverbials used by NNS group (n=20) (frequency)

NS participants used more intensifying adverbials than NNS participants did for all situations except Situations 6 and 7. In Situations 1, 2, 3, and 5, the differences in frequency in the use of intensifying adverbials between the two groups are fairly large. NS subjects used 19, 17, 14, and 14 intensifying adverbials for these situations, whereas NNS participants used 2, 1, 5, and 5 intensifying adverbials. The differences in frequency in the use of intensifying adverbials between the two groups are relatively
small in Situations 4, 8, 9, and 10. NS participants used 5, 5, 6, and 4 adverbials when NNS subjects used 2, 1, 4, and 1 adverbials. In Situations 6 and 7, no difference was found in frequency in the use of intensifying adverbials between the two groups. Both groups used 2 intensifying adverbials in Situation 6 and none of them in Situation 7.

In the next section, apology realizations of NS and NNS groups will be compared for each individual situation.

4.2.1 Situation 1

S1. You were walking on the street in a city, with a cup of coke in your hand. While you were looking around and not paying attention to the front, you bumped into (부딪치다) a 10-year-old girl, shaking her up a bit and spilling coke over her clothes. What would you say to her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 37. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 1 (frequency)

Both groups used Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFID) such as “미안해,” (mi-an-hay), “I’m sorry,” heavily. They also used taking on responsibility, expression of embarrassment, and offer of repair. One NNS subject used distracting from the
offense. This subject offered to buy something for the girl. Compared to NNS subjects, NS subjects used expression of embarrassment “어떡하나?” (e-itek-ha-nya), “what should I/you do?,” more frequently. This expression can be used to show compassion in a situation like this, but except for one subject NNS subjects did not demonstrate the right usage of this expression. Another noticeable difference between NS and NNS subjects’ apology realizations is that NS subjects used a greater number of intensifying adverbials. NNS subjects rarely used the intensifying adverbials. And, because there was some physical harm to a little child, it would be natural to ask the hearer if she is okay by using “괜찮니?” (kwen-chan-ni), “are you okay?,” or “웃 많이 찔었니?” (os manh-i cec-ess-ni), “did your clothing get very wet?” NS subjects used this type of question often, while NNS participants rarely used this question. Some examples of NS and NNS participants’ apology realizations are as follows.

(NS #5) 아이구, 예 진짜 미안하다. 아저씨가 없을 못 봤네. 어떡하지 이가? 진짜 미안한다.

(a-i-ikhwu, yay, ein-cce mi-an-ha-ta. a-esse-ka ap-ul mos pwass-ney. e-itek-ha-ci, i-ke?
ein-cce mi-an-ha-ta)

Ouch, kid, I’m really sorry (IFID). I wasn’t paying attention to the front (explanation/account). What should I do? I’m really sorry (IFID).

(NS #14) 어, 고마야, 괜찮니? 오빠가 콜라를 다 씹어 버렸네. 괜찮아? 미안하다.

(e, kko-ma-yaa, kwayn-chanh-ni? o-ppe-ka cola-hul ta ssot-a be-lyess-ney. kwayn-chanh-e?
mi-an-ha-ta)

Oh, kid, are you okay? I spilled cola over you. Are you all right? I’m sorry (IFID).

(NNS #6) 어, 미안하다. 내가 안 보고 가는 바람에. 미안하다.

(mi-an-ha-ta. ney-ka an po-ko ko-nun pa-lam-ey. mi-an-ha-ta.)
I’m sorry (IFID). I wasn’t looking to the front (explanation/account). I’m sorry (IFID).

(NNS n=20) 아이구, 미안하다.
a-i-kwu, mi-an-ha-ta.
Ouch, I’m sorry (IFID).

Like NS #5 and #14, NS participants used plenty of “what should I do?,” “are you okay?,” and “did your clothing get very wet?” questions which show compassion to the addressee and check on the addressee’s well-being. Only two NNS subjects used “are you okay?” The typical structure of NNS participants’ apology is IFID only as in NNS #20’s production above or IFID plus explanation/account as in NNS #6’s production, which resulted in shorter utterances than those of NS subjects.

4.2.2 Situation 2

You were moving your car in a parking lot. While you were backing up, you hit someone else’s car which was parked. It was a pretty new car. The collision left some scratches on the bumper of this car. The driver of the car saw the incident and approaches you. What would you say to him? He looks about your age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 38. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 2 (frequency)
Both NS and NNS participants chose IFID heavily. Some participants used IFID more than once. More than half of the subjects from both groups chose taking on responsibility in statements such as “제 실수였어요” (ce sil-swu-kwu-yo), “It’s my fault,” and “제 책임이구요” (ce chak-im-l-kwu-yo), “I’m responsible for it.” Offer of repair was also used. More NS participants used offer of repair than did NNS subjects. NNS subjects tended to ask the hearer’s opinion by saying “어떻게 하실까요?” (e-teh-key ha-sil-kka-yo), “what shall we do?,” instead of offering repair. This seems to be because some of the NNS participants have insufficient linguistic knowledge to express offer of repair. Few of them were able to use car accident related expressions like “insurance” or “reparation” in Korean. Therefore, using a question like “어떻게 하실까요?” (e-teh-key ha-sil-kka-yo), “what shall we do?” seems to be a strategy to compensate for their lack of knowledge of expressions related to car accidents. Another way to compensate was to say “이름하고 전화번호 줘요.” (i-lum-ha-ko cen-hwa-pen-ho cwul-kkey-yo), “I’ll give you my name and phone number,” instead of mentioning “insurance” or “reparation for damage” because NNS subjects have the vocabulary for name and phone number, but do not have the vocabulary for “insurance” or “reparation for damage.” Three NS subjects showed compassion to the hearer by saying, “새차 같은데” (say-cha kath-un-tey), “your car looks new.” The implication of this remark was that “because it’s a new car, I feel even more sorry,” which, therefore, emphasized the apology. As in Situation 1, most of the NS participants used intensifying adverbials that reflected their evaluation of the situation, that is, it is a serious offense to hit someone’s new car. Only one NNS
participant used an intensifying adverbial. The following are examples of NS and NNS subjects’ apology realizations.

(NS #3) 죄송합니다. 제가 후진하다가 못 보구 부담치게 됐는데, 산 지 얼마 안 된 차 같네요. 정말 죄송합니다. 연락처를 주시면 자세한 얘기하는 절차상 하도록 하겠습니다.


I’m sorry (IFID). I hit your car while I was backing up. It looks like a new car. I’m really sorry (IFID). If you give me your contact number, we’ll talk about the details on the phone (offer of repair).

(NS #9) 아우, 죄송합니다. 제가 깜짝 실수를 했네요. 나중에 이거는 어떻게 제가 변상하도록 하겠습니다.


Oh, I’m sorry (IFID). I made a mistake (taking on responsibility). I’ll take care of the repairs later on (offer of repair).

(NNS #3) 미안해요. 차에서 스크래치 조금 났는데 이거 어떻게 하실래요?

미안해요.

mi-an-hay-yo. cha-ey-se scratch co-lum nass-nun-tey i-ke e-tteh-key ha-sil-lay-yo? mi-an-
hay-yo.

I’m sorry (IFID). I scratched your car (taking on responsibility). What shall we do? I’m sorry (IFID).

(NNS #20) 죄송합니다. 제가 이름하고 전화번호 다 주세요.


I’m sorry (IFID). I’ll give you my name and phone number (offer of repair).

There are two IFID in Korean that are translated as “I’m sorry.” They are “미안 합니다” (mi-an-hap-ni-ta) and “죄송합니다” (coy-song-hap-ni-ta). The speaker uses
the latter when the hearer is older or in a higher position than the speaker, or when the hearer is a stranger to the speaker. On the other hand, the speaker uses “미안합니다” when the hearer is younger or in a lower position than the speaker, and when the speaker knows the hearer well. Some NNS participants failed to distinguish between these two forms. In this situation, the speaker is addressing a stranger. Therefore, “죄송합니다” should be used, but some NNS subjects, including NNS #3 in the examples above, used “미안합니다.” The use of “미안합니다” instead of “죄송합니다” resulted in an impolite and pragmatically inappropriate apology.

4.2.3 Situation 3

S3. Two weeks ago, you borrowed tools from your new neighbor and forgot to return them. This morning, your new neighbor comes by and tells you that he needs the tools back. What would you say to him? He is a 50-year-old man.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 39. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 3 (frequency)
Both NS and NNS participants used mostly IFID. Some participants used taking on responsibility such as “감짝 잊어버렸어요” (kkam-ppak ic-e-pe-lyess-e-yo), “I forgot.” Both groups also used offer of repair such as “지금 당장 갖다 드리겠습니다” (ci-kum tang-cang kac-ta tu-li-keyss-sup-nta), “I'll bring them to you right now.” The difference between NS and NNS subjects' strategies is that NS subjects used self-blame, “진작 돌려 드렸어야 되는건데” (cin-cak dol-lye du-lyess-e-ya toy-nun-ken-tey), “I should have returned them to you earlier,” which is a type of taking on responsibility, while no NNS participants used self-blame. Examples of NS participants' use of self-blame are shown below.

(NS #4) 정말 죄송합니다. 진작 돌려 드렸어야 하는 건데 제가 정신이 없어서, 정말 죄송합니다. 다음부터는 이런 일이 없도록 하겠습니다.
I'm really sorry (IFID). I should have returned them earlier (self-blame), but I was really busy so I forgot (explanation/account). I'm sorry (IFID). This won't happen again (promise of forbearance).

(NS #17) 어, 정말 안찍 했네요. 제가 돌려 드렸어야 되는건데 이렇게 오시게 해서 너무 죄송해요.
e. ceng-mal kkam-ppak hayss-ney-yo. cey-ka tol-lye du-lyess-e-ya toy-nun-ken-tey i-leh-key o-si-key hay-se ne-mwu coy-song-hay-yo.
Oh, I really forgot about them (explanation/account). I should have returned them earlier (self-blame). I am really sorry to make you come over (IFID).

NS participants used more intensifying adverbials than NS subjects. This may be because the hearer is much older than the speaker so that the speaker wanted to be more
polite by intensifying the degree of apology. Five NNS subjects used “미안해요” (mi-an-hay-yo) instead of “죄송해요” (coy-song-hay-yo), which resulted in an impolite apology.

4.2.4 Situation 4

A week ago, you promised your nephew and niece to take them to a movie on Saturday. It is Saturday today, and your advisor called in the morning, saying that he needs to see you today. You have to cancel the movie date. What would you say to your nephew and niece? They are middle school students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 40. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 4 (frequency)

NNS participants used more IFID than NS participants. This may be because IFID is formulaic and simple in form so that NNS subjects with limited linguistic ability can resort to it immediately in any apology situation. NS participants used fewer IFID in this situation than in other situations such as Situations 1 or 2. They may have thought that using IFID was not necessary because the addressee is a nephew/niece and the offense is not very serious. In addition to offer of repair, several participants used
distraction by saying “맛있는 것도 사 줄게” (mas-iss-nun ket-to sa cwul-kkey), “I’ll buy you some tasty food, too.” The expression of embarrassment “어떻지 하지?” (e-tek-ha-ci), “what should I do?,” was also used to express apology by several NS and NNS participants. NS subjects used fewer intensifying adverbials in this situation than in other situations. This may be because the addressee is the speaker’s nephew/niece and the offense is not very serious.

NS subjects’ use of IFID and intensifying adverbials in this situation is in contrast to the usage in Situation 1. In both Situation 1 and this situation, the addressees are much younger than the speaker. In Situation 1, the addressee was a 10-year-old girl, and in this situation the addressees are middle school students. The NS participants’ use of 29 IFID and 19 intensifying adverbials in Situation 1, but 16 IFID and 5 intensifying adverbials in this situation can be attributed to the fact that the offense of spilling cola over the child in Situation 1 was somewhat serious and the child was a stranger, but in this situation the offense was not very serious and the addressees were the speaker’s relatives. On the other hand, NNS used 24 IFID and 2 intensifying adverbials in Situation 1 and 21 IFID and 2 intensifying adverbials in this situation. This lack of variation in using IFID and intensifying variables across the different situations may suggest that, as in request situations, the NNS subjects were not adept at selecting apology strategies according to social and situational variables.
4.2.5 Situation 5

You borrowed a camera from your close friend (name - 이현철/ 황미연) for a class project. Yesterday, you dropped the camera and the lenses got broken. Now, you see your friend. What would you say to him/her? He/she is the same age as you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 41. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 5 (frequency)

NNS participants used more IFID than NS participants did. NS participants tended to use an expression of embarrassment such as “어떻나?” (e-ttek-ha-nya). “what should I do?,” which was chosen by a few NNS subjects as well. NS participants also used more intensifying adverbials such as “정말” (ceng-mal) and “진짜” (cin-cca). “really,” than NNS participants. NS participants used 16 intensifying adverbials while NNS subjects used 5. The use of intensifying adverbials by NS participants seems to be related to the degree of offense they perceive, as shown in previous situations. Breaking a camera may have been considered serious, and therefore have led NS subjects to use a greater number of intensifying adverbials. NNS subjects used 5 intensifying variables.
NNS participants’ use of intensifying adverbials varied less from situation to situation.

This reveals that NNS participants failed to reflect the situational variety in their apology realizations. Several NS participants performed the apology with light laughter.

When asked why they laughed, one participant said:

(NS #1) 친구 기름 캐트戮을 때는 미안하고 그런 것보다는 웃기도 환영하죠. 그런 기대가 있는 것 같아요. 왜렇한 친구한테는 “미안해” 그린 말 잘 안 하지도요? 제가 그런 생각을 갖는 이유라는 걸 제가 아니까 내가 막 미안해 하면 계도 되게 어색한거구.

When you break something that belongs to a friend, it’s funny and embarrassing rather than something I should feel sorry about. Seemingly, there is an expectation that to a close friend, we rarely say “I’m sorry” because I know that my friend knows it; if I say “sorry” or “really sorry,” it’ll make him feel embarrassed. (Translation)

That is, he laughed to reduce that embarrassment. This participant’s comment may shed light on why NS subjects used IFID less in this situation than in other situations even though the mistake of breaking an expensive camera could be serious. NS subjects tended to express apology by other means such as taking on responsibility, expression of embarrassment, and offer of repair, rather than heavily relying on IFID.

Only one NNS laughed when she apologized. She explained that she laughed because it made an apology to a close friend easier. She learned to laugh in this kind of situation from Korean native speaking friends. Considering that no other NNS participants laughed, laughing in this situation seems to be a sociocultural phenomenon that many NNS subjects are not familiar with.
4.2.6 Situation 6

You are having dinner with your close friend (name - 최우성/ 현진주) and his/her parents. You have
known his/her parents for two years. By mistake, you take his/her mother’s cup and drink the water in it.
His/her mother tells you that it is her cup. What would you say to her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS  (n=20)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 42. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 6 (frequency)

Table 32 showing the number of words used to produce the apology indicates that
neither group spoke as much in this situation as they did in other situations. This may
be because many of them perceived the situation as not being serious. This belief led
them to speak less and to use no intensifying adverbials for IFID. Some participants
used IFID only among apology strategies, as shown below.

(NS #17) 이, 너무 죄송해요.
*ne-mwu coy-song-hay-yo.
Oh, I’m so sorry.

(NNS #10) 죄송합니다.
coy-song-hap-nil-ta.
I’m sorry.
This may be because the repair can be taken care of by a waiter only, not by the speaker; therefore, the speaker has little to say other than IFID or taking on responsibility as in "몰랐어요" (mol-lass-e-yo), "I didn’t know that." One NS participant used humor to reduce the feeling of embarrassment, as shown below.

(NS #13) 어, 여기 어머니 컵이었어요? 에이, 제가 어머니 컵인 줄 알고 먹었죠.
(laugh)

e, i-ke e-me-ni, cup-i-yess-e-yo? ey-i, ce-ka e-me-ni cup-in cwul al-ko ma-syes-cyo.

Oh, was this your cup, mother? Well, I used your cup because I knew that it was yours.

NNS participants used IFID more than NS subjects did, which shows again that the NNS subjects’ main apology strategy is IFID regardless of different social and situational variables. The NNS subjects’ problem of distinguishing “미안합니다” (mi-an-hap-ni-ta), “I’m sorry.” and “죄송합니다” (coy-song-hap-ni-ta), “I’m sorry.” appeared again in this situation. Several NNS subjects used “미안합니다” instead of “죄송합니다,” which resulted in an impolite apology.

4.2.7 Situation 7

You are a 40-year-old professor. Today in class, you returned some graded mid-term papers to your students. After class, one of the students (name - 한수연; 20 year old) approaches you and tells you that there is no grade on her paper. It seems that you missed her paper while you were grading. What would you say to her? You have known this student for a year.
Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 7 (frequency)

Both NS and NNS participants used IFID, taking on responsibility, and offer of repair. IFID was used with less frequency in this situation than in other situations. This may be because the speaker, the professor, has power over the hearer and the mistake of missing a paper was considered to be easily reparable. The greatest difference between NS and NNS participants’ production is in the use of taking on responsibility. More NS subjects chose taking on responsibility than did NNS participants. Some examples are shown below.

(NS #14) 아, 그랬어? 나이가 드니가 감책감책하는구만. 내가 다시 해 줄게. 써 바.
Oh, did I? I’m getting old and becoming forgetful (taking on responsibility). I’ll redo it (offer of repair). Give it to me.

(NS #20) 아, 미안해요, 수현양. 내가 너무 많은 시험이 제쳐다 보니까 이거 갚어 нару 보네. 내 다시 해 드릴께요.
Oh, I’m sorry (IFID), Soo Hyun. I may have forgotten your paper because I have too many papers to grade (taking on responsibility). I’ll redo it (offer of repair).

(SNS #2) 수형씨, 죄송합니다. 내가 당장 그레이딩할게요.
Soo-Hyun-ssi, coy-song-hap-ni-ta. nay-ka tang-cang grading-hal-kkey-yo
I’m sorry (IFID), Soo Hyun. I’ll grade it right away (offer of repair).

(SNS #18) 어, 미안해요. 그럼 오늘 밤에서 내일 갈다 줘요.
e, mi-an-hay-yo. ku-lem o-md ill-e-se nay-il kat-ta cwal-kkey-yo.
Oh, I’m sorry (IFID). I’ll read it and return it tomorrow (offer of repair).

While NS participants #14 and #20 chose taking on responsibility in addition to IFID and offer of repair, the apologies of NNS subjects #2 and #18 consist of IFID and offer of repair only, which is the typical structure of NNS subjects’ apology in this situation.

In previous sections, it was pointed out that some NNS subjects misused “미안합니다” (mi-an-hap-ni-ta) and “죄송합니다” (coy-song-hap-ni-ta), which mean “I’m sorry.” The former is used when the hearer is younger, has less power than the speaker, and when the speaker knows the hearer well. The latter is used in the opposite case, that is, when the hearer is older, has more power than the speaker, and when the speaker does not know the hearer well. In previous sections, it was observed that some NNS subjects used “미안합니다” when “죄송합니다” was appropriate, resulting in an impolite apology. NNS #2 in the examples above shows the error of the reverse case. She used “죄송합니다” in apologizing to a student, which is not appropriate in that she was “overpolite” to her student. Both using “죄송합니다” when “미안합니다” is
appropriate and using “미안합니다” when “죄송합니다” is appropriate are considered as pragmatic failure.

4.2.8 Situation 8

You are a 35-year-old waiter at an expensive Korean restaurant. Today, a customer came in and ordered Bi-bim-bap (비빔밥), but you brought her Bul-go-gi (불고기). The customer tells you that she ordered Bi-bim-bap. What would you say to her? She (name - 신윤주) is 25 years old, and you have known her as a customer for a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak.: Taking on responsibility; Emb.: Expression of embarrassment; Exp. Explanation/account; Off.: Offer of repair; Pro.: Promise of forbearance; Dis.: Distracting from the offense

Table 44. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 8 (frequency)

Both NS and NNS participants used IFID and offer of repair with similar frequency. The difference between NS and NNS subjects’ productions is that more NS participants used taking on responsibility such as in "내가 착각을 했네요" (nay-ka chak-kak-ul hayss-ney-yo), “I got confused,” than NNS participants. Although the frequency was low, expression of embarrassment, explanation/account, and distracting from the offense were also used. Intensifying adverbials were not used often. NS participants used 5 intensifying adverbials, and NNS participants chose 1. This may be
because the mistake is easily reparable, the hearer is younger than the speaker, and the speaker and the hearer know each other well. However, this speculation holds only for NS participants. NNS participants used fewer than 5 intensifying adverbials in all situations. Therefore, using few intensifying adverbials may simply be their pattern of apology behavior rather than an indication that they tried to reflect social and situational variables in their apology realizations. The following are examples of NS and NNS participants’ apologies.

(NS #10) 죄송합니다. 손님, 제가 주문을 착각했습니다. 조금만 기다리시면 제가 비빔밥 다시 해 드리도록 하겠습니다.


I’m sorry (IFID). I got confused with the order (taking on responsibility). I’ll bring Bi-bim-bap in a few minutes (offer of repair).

(NS #16) 죄송합니다. 제가 정신이 없어서 실수를 한 모양인데, 다시 갖다 드릴게요, 죄송합니다.


I’m sorry (IFID). I was so busy that I made a mistake (taking on responsibility). I’ll bring the food that you ordered soon (offer of repair). I’m sorry (IFID).

(NNS #11) 너무 미안해요. 잘못 드러졌으면 비빔밥 다 굽쳐 먹으세요.


I’m so sorry (IFID). Because I made a mistake (taking on responsibility), the Bi-bim-bap is free of charge (distracting from the offense).

(NNS #19) 은주쌤, 죄송합니다. 제가 비빔밥을 갖다 드릴께요.


EunJoo, I’m sorry (IFID). I’ll bring you Bi-bim-bap (offer of repair).
4.2.9 Situation 9

You are a 30-year-old owner of a big grocery store. You promised to give one of the cashiers a one-week vacation next month. However, due to a serious shortage of cashiers, you have to rescind your promise. What would you say to him? The cashier is a 50-year-old man (name - 김병수), and he has worked at the store for a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS (n=20)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS (n=20)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 45. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 9 (frequency)

IFID was less used by both groups compared to the other situations. Expression of embarrassment, explanation/account, offer of repair, and distracting from the offense were also used. Several participants made a request/suggestion or asked a favor of the hearer after they explained about the store situation. Ten NS participants used making a request/suggestion/asking a favor. Examples are shown below.

(NS #12) 저기 미안한데요, 계산대에 사람들이 많이 줄어 가지구요. 그게 약속한 거 그게 다음으로 미루면 안 될까요?


I’m sorry. We have fewer cashiers now (explanation/account). Will it be a problem if we postpone the vacation that I promised you? (making a request/suggestion/asking a favor)
(NS #20) 병수써, 이번에 휴가 나가기로 한 거 말이에요. 지금 좀 사정이 안 좋아서 그러는데, 좀 다음으로 미룰 수 없겠어요? 다음에 일주일 내 보내 드릴게요.


Mr. Kim, the vacation that you’re planning to take at this time? The store is in a difficult situation (explanation/ account). Then, can we postpone it? (making a request/suggestion/asking a favor) I’ll give you a one-week vacation next time (offer of repair).

While most of the NS participants used either offer of repair or making a request/suggestion/asking a favor, as shown in the examples above, NNS participants tended to say “I don’t think I can give you a vacation” without making an offer of repair or making a request/suggestion/asking a favor. Some examples are given below.

(NNS #7) 김병수써, 최송하지만 다음 달 일주일 vacation 못 받을 거 같아요.


Mr. Kim, I’m sorry (IFID), but I don’t think I can give you the one-week vacation next month.

(NNS #14) 병수써, 너무 미안하지만 다음 주에는 일주일동안 휴가 못 출 거 같아요. 다음 주 좀 바쁜 것 같거든요. 너무 미안해요.


Mr. ByungSoo Kim, I’m so sorry (IFID) but I don’t think I can give you a one-week vacation next week. The store is gonna be busy (explanation/ account). I’m really sorry (IFID).

Talking about canceling a vacation without providing offer of repair or making a request/suggestion/asking a favor may not be appropriate behavior in this kind of
situation, especially when the hearer is older than the speaker even though the speaker has power over the hearer. As stated previously, age is one of the significant factors in Korean that influence language behaviors. Even though many NNS participants recognized the importance of age, their linguistic behaviors did not reflect their perception in this situation.

4.2.10 Situation 10

You are a 24-year-old graduate student. Last week, one of your professors (40 years old; name - 송현 옥) asked you to buy her a book, giving you money. She said that she was too busy to go to a bookstore.

You have also been busy with papers, so you forgot to get the book. Today, the professor asks you about the book. What would you say to her? You have known the professor for a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IFID</th>
<th>Tak</th>
<th>Emb</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tak: Taking on responsibility; Emb: Expression of embarrassment; Exp: Explanation/account; Off: Offer of repair; Pro: Promise of forbearance; Dis: Distracting from the offense

Table 46. Apology strategies used by the participants for Situation 10 (frequency)

Both groups of participants used IFID less than in other situations. They used taking on responsibility most frequently as apology strategy. They also used an expression of embarrassment, "어떻게 하죠?" (e-ttek-ha-cyo), "what should I do?;" and
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offer of repair. Few intensifying adverbials were used in this situation. This was because of the relatively low frequency of IFID, as intensifying adverbials modify the IFID, and the offense of not getting a book may have been considered easily reparable.

Some examples of NS and NNS subjects’ productions are as follows.

(NS #3) 교수님, 지난 주에 제가 너무 바빠서 서점에 갈다고 오는 걸 감谢했습니 다.
내일이라도 사다 드리겠습니다.

k yo-sw u-nim, ci-nan c wu-e c ey-ka ne-mwu pa-ppa-se se-cem-cy kat-ta o-nun kel kkam-
ppak-hayss-sup-ni-ta. nay-il-i-la-to sa-ta tu-li-keyss-sup-ni-ta.

Professor, I was so busy last week that I forgot to go to the bookstore (taking on responsibility). I’ll buy the book tomorrow (offer of repair).

(NS #9) 교수님, 죄송합니다. 제가 그간 너무 바빠 정신이 없었는데요. 제가 지금 가서 사오도록 하겠습니다.

k yo-sw u-nim, c oy-song-hap-ni-ta. c ey-ka ku-kan ne-mwu pa-ppa ceng-sin-i eps-ess-nun-
tey-yo, c ey-ka ci-tum ka-se sa-o-to-lok ha-keyss-sup-ni-ta

Professor, I’m sorry (IFID). I have been so busy for the last few days (taking on responsibility). I’ll go to the bookstore and buy the book now (offer of repair).

(NNS #3) 죄송합니다. 너무 바빠서 정신이 좀 없어서 나 잊어 버렸어요. 죄송합 냥다.

c oy-song-hap-ni-ta. ne-mwu pa-ppa-se cong-sin-i com eps-e-se na ic-e-pe-lyess-e-yo. c oy-
song-hap-ni-ta.

I’m sorry (IFID). I was so busy that I forgot (taking on responsibility). I’m sorry (IFID).

(NNS #20) 송신생님, 제가 너무 바빠서요, 책 못 샀어요. 내일 가서 올케요.

Song-sen-sang-nim, c ey-ka ne-mwu pa-ppa-se-yo, chayk mos sass-e-yo. n ay-il ka-cye ol-
kkey-yo.

Professor Song, I was so busy that I couldn’t buy the book (taking on responsibility). I’ll bring the book tomorrow (offer of repair).
NS and NNS participants’ productions show a similar structure. That is, the apology consisted of IFID, taking on responsibility, and/or offer of repair.

4.2.11 Summary

The results of the analysis of the participants’ apology realizations are summarized as follows.

a) NS participants produced longer utterances than NNS subjects as shown by the total number of words produced by each group. NS participants produced 3,288 words in total, while NNS subjects produced 2,123 words.

b) Their production of longer utterances reflects the fact that NS participants used combinations of strategies to make an apology more acceptable and to be more polite, whereas NNS subjects tended to use a single strategy or fewer strategies.

c) In general, NS and NNS participants used apology strategies in similar ways. The three strategies most frequently used by both groups across the situations were IFID, taking on responsibility, and offer of repair.

d) IFID were used for all situations. The number of IFID used varied depending on the situation. In the case of NS participants’ production, IFID were used more when the offense/mistake was serious (S1, S2), when the offense/mistake involved one who was older than the speaker (S3), and when the offense/mistake involved one in a higher position than the speaker (S8). This pattern was not observed in NNS participants’ production. Their use of IFID was more evenly spread across the situations.
e) In several situations (Situations 4, 5, 6, 10), NNS participants used IFID more than NS subjects did. This may be because IFID is formulaic, simple in form, and easier for NNS subjects who have limited proficiency in Korean.

f) NNS participants showed difficulty in distinguishing “미안해요” (mi-an-hay-yo) and “죄송해요” (coy-song-hay-yo). Both mean “I’m sorry,” but they are used in different circumstances. “미안해요” is used when the speaker is older than the hearer or has more power than the hearer, and when speaker knows the hearer well. “죄송해요” is used in the opposite circumstance. That is, it is used when the speaker is younger than the hearer or has less power than the hearer, and when the speaker does not know the hearer well. The use of one form when the other form is appropriate can be considered pragmatic failure.

g) In Situations 1, 2, 3, and 5, NS participants used more intensifying adverbials than NNS participants did. The use of intensifying adverbials was related to the perceived degree of offense/mistake and social variables such as age and power. NS subjects increased their use of intensifying adverbials when the degree of offense/mistake was considered serious and when the offense/mistake involved someone who was older or in a higher position than the speaker. NNS participants used intensifying adverbials less than NS participants did throughout the situations. This may show that NNS subjects were not able to reflect the social and situational variables in realizing apology.
4.3 Thinking Processes

The questions that were posed to the participants immediately after they finished the DCT probed the thinking processes that they went through while they were taking the DCT. The focus was on NNS participants’ thought processes. It was stated earlier that the examination of NNS participants’ thinking processes would illuminate whether interlanguage forms reflect pragmalinguistic failure or sociopragmatic failure (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). Pragmalinguistic failure occurs when a learner chooses an incorrect form of utterance even though he/she has some understanding of the sociocultural norms of the target language and culture, whereas sociopragmatic failure occurs when a learner fails to understand the target sociocultural norms.

Even though the purpose of the analysis was to examine NNS subjects’ thinking processes, NS participants’ thinking processes will also be included in the discussion when comparison between NS and NNS subjects’ thinking processes is necessary.

4.3.1 What factors did the participants take into consideration when they performed request and apology?

The participants considered various factors when they produced both requests and apologies. They considered social factors such as age, power relationship, and social distance, and situational factors such as the degree of offense or setting. By setting is meant where the speech act takes place, that is, whether it is a formal setting like the
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work place or a more informal setting like a fast food restaurant. As pointed out in other literature (Bell, 1998; Kim, 1995; Hwang, 1990), age is an important factor in interpersonal interaction in Korean society, and many of the NNS subjects were aware of the significance of age in realizing request and apology. To the question on what factors they took into consideration, NNS subjects responded:

(NNS #1) Age and other situations. The most difficult situation for me was when I had power and I was younger and I had to address someone older. Because I have been conditioned to older people to be very sincere... because I know the situation. In Korean videos, even people in higher position, they still treat older people with respect, but not that much especially to secretaries, to girls. I tried to consider age and to be polite, but when it came to being a manager, I took that more into consideration, maybe equally.

(NNS #9) Mostly the age difference. I think Korean culture is really strict compared to American in how you address each other. And I know that even with Korean friends, if they are older than me, they are really strict about what I call them.

(NNS #10) I think, age. Usually, even if I know the person pretty well, if he or she is a lot older than me, I still tend to use more 존대말 (com-tay-mal), "honorific."

(NNS #11) Probably two of the primary things I considered were if I knew them well or didn’t know them at all. And the other one was if they were older than me, like the grocery example. If I’m trying to sleep and the kids are too loud and I don’t know the kids, I don’t know anyone in neighborhood, I wouldn’t yell at them.

NNS #1 tried to balance age and power relationship, while NNS #10 and #11 considered age and social distance. NS #9 placed more emphasis on age. Not only NNS participants but also NS participants considered more than one factor when they produced request and apology. They said:
These NS participants considered age, social distance (intimacy), power relationship, and situation. Because these variables often interact, it is sometimes difficult to choose appropriate forms. Several NNS participants said that they had difficulty in performing request Situation 10 and apology Situation 9, in which the speaker was younger than the hearer, but was in a higher position than the hearer. Some
NS participants also pointed out this discrepancy between power relationship and age as a source of difficulty in performing the tasks. They said:

(NS #5) 어랫 사람이 나이가 많은 경우에 되게 불편하죠, 나이 때문에. 제가 군대에 있을 때, 제가 그때 스물 한 살인데 제 앞에 총병이 스물 일곱 살 중학교 신생님 하다가 오신 분이 있었어요. 엄청 불편하더라구요. 그래서 간섭을 면로 안 하게 되더라구요.

When the person in a lower position is older than me, it makes me feel really uncomfortable because of age. When I was in the army, I was 21 and I had a subordinate who was 27, a former middle school teacher. I felt really uncomfortable. So, I just let him go his own way.... I didn’t talk to him that much. (Translation)

(NS #18) 제가 과장이고 연장자인 비서한테 얘기할 때 힘들죠. 일단은 지보다 연장자이기 때문에. 또, 이건 부탁이지만 좀 어려운 부탁이잖아요? 하는 일은 어렵지 않아도 연장자한테 일 부탁한다는 건 항상 어려운 일이니까.

It was difficult to talk to my secretary, who is older than me. First, she is older, and second, the request is a difficult one. Regardless of the request, it is always difficult to ask something of an older person. (Translation)

They feel that even though the addressee is in a lower position, if he/she is older than they are, they should think more about what to say as well as how to say it and the answer is often not straightforward.

In sum, the participants considered many factors in performing the tasks. The main factors were age, power relationship, social distance, situation, and setting. NNS subjects seemed to be aware of the importance of age in interpersonal interaction in Korean society. Not only NNS participants but also NS participants had difficulty in realizing speech acts in certain situations because of the interaction of these factors.
4.3.2 What was the major source of difficulty when the participants performed the tasks?

Most of the NNS participants listed grammar and vocabulary as a source of difficulty in performing the tasks. It seems that they still had difficulty at the level of grammar and vocabulary. On the other hand, two of these subjects pointed out their partial knowledge of speech style and unfamiliarity with the setting as the source of their difficulty. They said:

(NNS #9) One I wasn’t quite sure about what to say was I wasn’t sure what to say to the little girl...because it was somebody who I didn’t know, but in my experience around Korean people,...even though some people are older, they still use a little honorific style when they talk to younger people, on videos. I watch videos. That’s why I wasn’t sure...I’m older...should I talk more politely or what?

(NNS #14) The last one. Not just because I’m not very familiar with the vocabulary that you would use,...like...in a business setting, an office setting. Also, I’m not very aware of what office dynamics are in Korea. I’m sure they’re very different from what they are here in America, so I’m just not very familiar with it, so it was the most difficult.

NNS #9 was not sure whether he should use honorific forms in speaking to the little girl or not. His knowledge of honorifics in Korean was only partial, so he ended up using honorific forms to the 10-year-old girl, which was not observed in NS subjects’ speech act productions. For NNS #14, the unfamiliarity with office settings and office language in Korea made her feel less confident in performing the request. For NS subjects, difficulty in realizing a speech act was mostly caused by a lack of experience in the
situations. They said:

(NS #1) 피아노. 그거는 말을 안하는 쪽이니까요. 저 같은 경우에는, 그런 경험이 별로 없었던 것 같아요.
The piano situation, because I would rather keep silent in this case. I don’t have much experience in that kind of situation. (Translation)

(NS #18) 프로페셔가 터키 가는 거. 저는 이런 부분에 안 하기 때문요. 요기에 대답에 대해서는 자신은 못 하겠어요. 제가 경험한 바가 아닌 상황이 나오면 그 대답에 대해서 크레딧을 줄 수는 없어요.
Professor going to Turkey. I rarely ask this kind of favor. I am not confident about my request in this situation. For situations that I have not experienced, I can’t give credit to my responses. (Translation)

(NS #19) 항상 남자 교수님 하는 거만 봐서 여자 교수님은 어떻게 하는지 모르겠어요.
I haven’t seen many female professors, so I am not sure what a female professor would say in that situation. (Translation)

That is, even though they were native speakers of Korean, their confidence level was not high when they were forced to make a request in a situation in which they would rather stay silent or when they had little experience of the situation in question. While grammar and vocabulary were not problems for NS participants, they still had difficulty in certain situations that made them think more about what to say before they spoke.
4.3.3 Was the production automatic or did they have to formulate utterances in a response before they spoke?

Most of the NNS participants said that they had to formulate their responses before they spoke. One participant said that her production was automatic when she was talking with those who were close to her such as friends or relatives, but she had to think about what to say when the addressee was older but in a lower position than she was. Three participants reported that they refined their language before they spoke because it was not a real situation, but a testing situation. Another participant said she had more difficulty when she tried to think before she spoke. She said:

(NNS #13) I like to think about it before I say it. But I noticed if I think first I mess up more. If I just talk naturally, with no pressure, it just goes. But sometimes, if I feel awkward or nervous, then I think before I speak, and that causes problems. For these situations, I tried to think everything through and read it from my mind, but that didn’t work, either.

Thinking or formulating responses before speaking did not produce more satisfactory responses for her. For other participants, thinking was done at two levels: discourse and grammar. They had to think about what to say in each situation and how to put this thought into words. They reported:

(NNS #15) I had to think about it a little bit more. I think it’s more...because...like...where to say that you are sorry...like I think I apologized
immediately and then gave him alternative suggestions like what can be done. But I had to think about how I wanted to say it, what I wanted to say after I apologized, so it took a lot of thinking. If I wanted to say it as a statement or a question, the subject, where to put the subject, the grammar is different, so I had to think about it a little bit more.

(NNS #18) I had to think about the situation and what I should say. I know pretty much what to say, but need to put it into words because a lot of times when I think, I think American first, and then translate to Korean. That’s why sometimes it takes a little longer for me to have Korean conversation rather than English conversation.

NNS #18 thought his responses in English and translated them into Korean. Not just NNS #18, but half of the NNS participants translated their responses from English into Korean in most of the cases. One of them said that it was two-step thinking for her because she had to translate from English to Korean, but it didn’t sound right so she had to change the Korean until it sounded right. Another participant called his translation process “automatic translation” as he thought of what to say in English, then put the idea into Korean immediately. The process was so quick and unconsciously done that he felt the translation was automatic. The rest of the NNS participants reported that they did not translate.

4.3.4 How confident were they when they performed request and apology?

Except for one, NNS participants were not very confident about their responses. When they were asked to rate their confidence level from 1 to 10 (1 - the least confident, 10 - the most confident), their ratings ranged from 2 to 7. One participant said that he
was confident in the situations when he was talking to friends or equals, but not confident when the hearer was a older person. He said:

(NNS #18) I knew in what situation I should use which term, but I don’t use a lot of formal terms because I’m not around older people that much. I’m usually around my friends when I speak Korean. It’s (formal style) a different language for me. If I go to Korea, I have no choice. I’m not used to using formal style. I do know what the formal style is, but I don’t use it that much..., like honorific forms, addressing people using appropriate terms....

Because he knows that the language he should use to address older people is different from the language he uses to speak to his friends or equals, his confidence level varied depending on the situations. When the participants were asked how confident they were in terms of politeness, most of them said that they were not very confident. One participant commented:

(NNS #2) I know that there are more polite expressions, but I used what I know, so I don’t think I was polite.

Like NNS #2, those who felt that they were not polite enough considered their limited language proficiency as the source of their low confidence. Some of them said that their intention was to be polite even though they were not sure whether the politeness levels of their responses were appropriate.

Three participants reported that they were confident in terms of politeness. One subject said that being polite is her nature, and as she feels that Koreans have more
power, she tries to be polite to them. She commented:

(NNS #1) I think I’m a very polite person, so I always try to be polite no matter what. For some reason, I think Korean people, they have more, not power, but more... since they are Korean and they can speak Korean, I feel less, I feel inferior. That’s why I am always polite even if they are younger.

As she feels inferior to Koreans because of her limited Korean proficiency, she tries to be polite to all Koreans she talks to.

Another participant believed that he used an appropriate politeness level for each addressee. He reported:

(NNS #9) I think being polite is also according to the situation... For older people, I think I did use to honorify them and for people of my age or my friends, I think, the way I said it was appropriate for the people that I was talking to....

Another subject commented that politeness was not a problem for him, not because he was confident about his Korean, but because he expected that his Korean interlocutors would recognize him as a non-native speaker. Therefore, according to him, even though he made some errors by using impolite language, Koreans would not be offended as long as they identified him as a non-native speaker.

The confidence level of the participants is related to the length of their responses. The majority of participants reported that they stopped speaking even though they wanted to speak more. Some of them produced short responses because of their limited
language ability, especially in grammar and vocabulary. One subject stopped speaking in certain situations. She said:

(NNS #12) Probably to older people. When they are of my age or younger, I can expand more, but because they are older, I feel like I shouldn’t ask a lot of questions. In English, it’s not like that.

She produced shorter responses based on her evaluation of the situation and the hearer.

Another participant spoke less than he would in real situations because it was a test. He commented:

(NNS #10) I’m pretty sure that I would say more if it was a real situation, but because it’s a just tape recorder and a piece of paper, I’m not gonna say as much as I would in real life. If it’s in real life, to ask someone or tell them that I was gonna cancel their vacation, and if he was really old and it’s an urgent thing, I would probably think about it for a while before I went to him about what I said. Probably I would have said...a lot more things than I did on task.

Not because of language proficiency, but because there were no interlocutors with whom he could interact when he performed the tasks and the tasks were hypothetical situations, he did not speak as much as he would have in real situations.

In sum, except for a few participants, the confidence level of most of the NNS participants was not very high when they produced the speech acts. The source of low confidence level varies: they include grammar, vocabulary, and honorific styiles.
The NNS participants’ low confidence may be an explanation for the fact that they produced shorter responses than their NS counterparts.

4.3.5 Did NNS participants learn the language they produced in a formal setting?

All NNS participants had taken Korean classes either at weekend Korean language schools or at churches in childhood. Eight of the participants took Korean classes at the college level. When they were asked if they had learned what they produced for the DCT in a classroom setting, none of them said they had did. They learned the Korean they produced in a natural setting: by interacting with or observing family members, relatives, and Korean speaking friends, or by watching Korean videos, particularly soap operas.

Another relevant question asked of both NS and NNS subjects was about how they tried to perform the role of a professor or a manager, under the assumption that they had never been a professor or a manager. They commented that they performed those roles based on their past experiences of observing them, similar experiences such as being a teaching assistant for a professor, watching Korean videos, or by using their imaginations.
4.4. Discussion

4.4.1 The length of NS and NNS participants’ request and apology realizations

Several previous studies that investigated L2 learners’ speech act production in comparison with that of native speakers of the target language suggested that learners produced longer utterances than native speakers. Three sample studies are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) analyzed request data collected for CCSARP, which included seven languages and dialects: American English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, and Hebrew. The data were collected from both native and non-native speakers of those languages. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain focused on L1 and L2 Hebrew and English data. They found that non-native speakers with higher linguistic ability produced longer requests than native speakers. They used more words, and did more elaboration of the background, preconditions, reasons, and justifications related to the given situations. On the other hand, non-native speakers with lower linguistic ability did not produce longer utterances. They were closer to the native speakers’ norms in terms of utterance length.

Færench and Kasper (1989) analyzed the requests of native Danish, native German, native British, interlanguage Danish-German, and interlanguage Danish-English within CCSARP. They found that second language learners used more supportive moves and
produced longer requests than the German and English native speakers.

In a more recent study, Suh (1999a) examined the requestive behaviors in native English, native Korean, and interlanguage Korean-English. The verbosity of ESL learners was observed in this study. The learners employed more supportive moves than the two native speaker groups across all situations.

In contrast to these studies, the data collected for the current study did not indicate that learners produced longer utterances than native speakers. In the current study, request and apology realizations produced by NS subjects were longer than those by NNS participants. There are three possible explanations for this discrepancy between the results of the current study and those of previous studies.

First, the data elicitation methods were different. In CCSARP and Suh (1999a), written DCT were used, while oral DCT were used for the current study. Rintell and Mitchell (1989) compared oral and written request and apology data of ESL learners and native English speakers. They found that ESL learners’ oral responses were longer than their written responses as oral responses contained more and longer supportive moves, hesitations, repetitions, and other elements like “hello” or “excuse me.” If written responses had been elicited for the current study instead of oral responses, NS participants might have produced responses that were shorter than the oral responses they produced.

Second, it may not be that NNS subjects produced longer requests and apologies when written DCT were used, but that NS participants produced shorter responses than
they would in oral situations. This is the view of Edmondson and House (1991) in their interpretation of the observed learners' verbosity. They said:

It is in principle possible that it is the native speakers who are producing 'deviant' behaviors in saying too little, while the learner, for whom such a questionnaire may be judged to be more of a challenge, does not adopt such a reduction strategy. (p.282)

That is, it is not a straightforward conclusion as to whether learners produced longer responses than the native norms as it is possible that native speakers produced little when the task was a written one. Writing is more physically challenging than speaking and also requires more time as moving the hand is slower than projecting the voice. Therefore, NS participants may have tried to shorten their responses when they were required to write.

Finally, the NNS participants' language proficiency was not high in the current study. The learners in the studies previously mentioned were at intermediate and advanced levels. Several of the NNS participants in the current study were struggling at the level of grammar and vocabulary acquisition. Further, the interviews about their thinking processes revealed that many of them did not have a high level of confidence when they performed the tasks. Their feeling of being insecure about their Korean may have affected their request and apology behaviors so that they chose "minimal" positions, that is, they produced the minimum amount of request and apology that would permit their meanings to get through.

It is hard to say that one explanation among the three provided above is solely
correct. It should be pointed out here, however, that not all L2 speech act studies reported learners’ verbosity. In a study by Kim’s study (1995) which investigated Korean ESL learners’ requestive behaviors it was observed that learners did not overuse supportive moves and did not produce longer utterances as claimed in other studies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Færch & Kasper, 1989; Suh, 1999a). As the study of speech acts studies in second language acquisition research is still in its infancy, the phenomenon of learners’ verbosity should not be accepted as typical or a norm of non-native speech act behaviors.

4.4.2 The characteristics of NNS subjects’ request and apology

The interviews about thinking processes indicate that NS and NNS participants considered many factors when they performed request and apology. Many NNS participants were aware of the significance of age in interacting with Koreans, and tried to reflect their understanding in their request and apology behaviors.

However, NNS participants showed gaps in evaluating certain situations. Because they have used Korean mainly with their family members, relatives, and friends, they felt relatively comfortable in the DCT situations when they were expected to talk with relatives or friends. However, the NNS participants felt much less confident when the setting was formal, as in an office or work place, or when the addressee was a stranger. For example, one participant used the honorific style in speaking to a 10-year-old girl
who was a stranger to him. No NS participants used honorific style in this situation. And none of the NNS participants chose avoidance in the situation in which the speaker was supposed to ask his/her new roommate to clean the kitchen. Several NS subjects chose avoidance in this situation because the hearer was older than the speaker and the speaker and the hearer did not know each other well. These instances show the gaps in NNS participants’ understanding of social cultural norms in Korean society. Even though they have some understanding of the importance of age, their knowledge of sociocultural norms in Korean society is still partial. It was pointed out above that the NNS subjects’ production was minimal. In the case of request, they used a head act only or a head act plus a single supportive move, while NS participants used a combination of supportive moves in addition to the head act. For apology, NNS participants used IFID only or IFID plus one additional strategy, while NS participants used IFID and other multiple strategies. Using multiple strategies can make a request easier to comply with and an apology more acceptable. Minimal production in requesting and apologizing can be considered pragmatic failure in that the speaker’s intention and politeness level would not be communicated to the hearer in the way the speaker desired them to be.

Related to the minimal structure of NNS participants’ production, NNS participants did not use routines that were often used by NS participants. Examples of such routines are “세요하지만” (sil-lye-ha-ci-man), “excuse me, but.” “괜찮으시겠어요?” (kwen-chanh-u-si-keyss-e-yo), “will it be okay?,” “괜찮으시다면” (kwen-chanh-u-si-ta-myen), “if it’s not a problem for you,” “시간이 되시면” (si-kan-i toy-si-myen).
“if you have time,” and “전작 했어야 되는건데” (cin-cak bayss-e-ya toy-nan-ken-tey). “I should have done it earlier.” These routines function as tone-downers. They make a request less impositive and reinforce apology, which would result in a request that is easier to comply with and a more acceptable apology. These routines were not often used by NNS participants, and that is another reason that their responses were shorter than NS participants’ utterances. NNS participants also used repetition and intensifying adverbials much less frequently than NS subjects did and produced shorter responses as a consequence. The NNS participant’s limited use of routines and repetition seems to be related to their Korean proficiency.

In sum, both pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983) of NNS participants were observed in this study. Some deviations from native norms were related to NNS participants’ limited knowledge of the Korean language and others to their lack of understanding of sociocultural norms in Korean society.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This chapter presents a summary of the study that includes the purpose, the research design, and the results. Discussions on pedagogical implications of the study and recommendations for future research will follow the summary.

5.1. Summary of the Study

5.1.1 Purpose and Research Design

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze realizations of two speech acts, request and apology, of learners of Korean in comparison with those of Korean native speakers. Four research questions were asked in this study. They were:

1. How do L2 heritage learners of Korean make requests in Korean? Do they make requests differently from Korean native speakers? If so, to what extent and in what
ways do their requests differ from those of Korean native speakers?

2. How do L2 heritage learners of Korean make apologies in Korean? Do they make apologies differently from Korean native speakers? If so, to what extent and in what ways do their apologies differ from those of Korean native speakers?

3. What are the learners’ decision making processes with respect to choosing contextually appropriate realizations of request and apology? What social, situational, or cultural factors do learners take into consideration in choosing a specific strategy?

4. What are the implications of the study’s findings for syllabus and curriculum design in Korean as a foreign language pedagogy and programs at the college level?

Twenty native speakers of Korean and twenty Korean-Americans who speak Korean as a second language participated in the study. They were undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a university in the Midwest at the moment of data collection. Data were collected using oral Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) that consisted of ten items for request and apology, respectively. In the DCT, hypothetical situations were given. The participants were instructed to read the situation descriptions and speak what they would say for each situation. DCT items were developed based on three variables: social distance, power relationship, and age. Social distance means the degree to which the interlocutors know each other. Social distance has two levels: the interlocutors know each other well and the interlocutors do not know each other well. Power relationship has two levels: the speaker has more power or is of higher status than
the listener, and the opposite case. Each DCT consists of two parts.

Six items in Part I were written based on a combination of social distance and age. Age has three levels in Part I: the speaker is older than the hearer, the speaker is younger than the hearer, and the speaker and the hearer are of the same age. Four items in Part II were written based on the combination of power relationship and age. Age in Part II has two levels: the speaker is older than the hearer and the reverse case.

Each participant met the researcher individually. In addition to performing on the DCT, both NS and NNS participants answered interview questions regarding background information such as age, major, length of stay in the target language culture, and the environment in which NNS participants use Korean. They were also asked questions on thinking processes that they experienced while they were performing on the DCT. NNS participants filled out a self-assessment scale to rate their Korean speaking skills.

The request and apology data were analyzed using a coding scheme adapted from the analysis frameworks of the Cross Cultural Speech Act Research Project (CCSARP: Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989) and Suh (1999a) by deleting some categories and adding new categories. Frequency of occurrence of the strategies in each situation were calculated, and the linguistic characteristics of the two groups' productions were described and compared for each situation.
5.1.2 Results

The results of the data analysis are summarized as follows.

A) Request

a) The most frequently used head act strategy for the two groups was preparatory, which asks the hearer’s capability or willingness to comply with the request. The NS group used 111 preparatory out of 202 head act strategies in a total of ten situations, and the NNS group used 142 preparatory out of 197 head act strategies.

b) The most frequently chosen supportive move was the grounder, which provides explanations, justifications, or reasons for the request. NS subjects used 149 grounders out of 315 supportive moves in a total of ten situations. NNS subjects used 148 grounders out of the 193 supportive moves that they used for the ten situations.

c) NS subjects produced longer utterances by using more supportive moves than NNS subjects did. NS subjects also used a wider range of supportive moves than NNS subjects did. The use of supportive move by NNS subjects was often limited to grounder.

d) NNS participants tended to use a single supportive move or none. They did not speak more when their NS counterparts increased the length of their utterances. The structure of NNS subjects’ requests was minimal. A typical request consisted of either head act only or head act plus one supportive move.
e) NNS subjects chose preparatory and grounder most frequently for all ten situations, while the most frequently used strategies varied depending on the situation for NS subjects. This may show that the NNS subjects were not adept at differentiating strategies in response to social and situational variables.

f) The requests made by NNS subjects were more direct than those by NS subjects (Situation 2). The use of direct request, mood derivable, could sound impolite when the hearer is a stranger and result in pragmatic failure.

g) NNS subjects made a request when NS subjects tended to avoid making a request as the hearer was older than the speaker and they did not know well each other well (Situation 3). This may show a gap in sociocultural knowledge of Korean among NNS subjects.

B) Apology

a) NS participants produced longer utterances than NNS subjects, as shown by the total number of words produced by each group. NS participants produced 3,288 words in total, while NNS subjects produced 2,123 words.

b) The production of longer utterances means that NS participants used combinations of strategies to make an apology more acceptable and to be more polite, whereas NNS subjects tended to use a single strategy or smaller number of strategies.

c) In general, NS and NNS participants used apology strategies in similar ways. The three most frequently used strategies for both groups across the situations were IFID, taking on responsibility, and offer of repair.
d) IFID were used for all situations. The number of IFID used varied depending on the situation. In the case of NS participants’ production, IFID were used more frequently when the offense/mistake was serious (S1, S2), when the offense/mistake was made in relation to one who was older than the speaker (S3), and when the offense/mistake was made in relation to one in a higher position than the speaker (S8). This pattern was not observed in NNS participants’ production. Their use of IFID was more evenly spread across the situations.

e) In several situations (S4, 5, 6, 10), NNS participants used IFID more frequently than NS subjects did. This may be because IFID are formulaic, simple in form, and easier for NNS subjects who have limited proficiency in Korean.

f) NNS participants showed difficulty in distinguishing between “미안해요” (mi-an-hay-yo) and “죄송해요” (coy-song-hay-yo). Both mean “I’m sorry,” but they are used in different circumstances. “미안해요” is used when the speaker is older than the hearer, when the speaker has more power than the hearer, and when the speaker knows the hearer well. “죄송해요” is used in the opposite circumstances. That is, it is used when the speaker is younger than the hearer or has less power than the hearer, and when the speaker does not know the hearer well. The use of one form when the other form is appropriate can be considered as pragmatic failure.

g) In Situations 1, 2, 3, and 5, NS participants used more intensifying adverbials than NNS participants did. The use of intensifying adverbials was related to the degree of offense/mistake and social variables such as age and power. NS subjects increased the
use of intensifying adverbials when the degree of offense/mistake was serious and when the offense/mistake was made in relation to someone who was older or in a higher position than the speaker. NNS participants used intensifying adverbials less frequently than NS participants did throughout the situations. This may show that NNS subjects were not able to reflect the social and situational variables in realizing apology.

C) Thinking Processes

1) The participants considered a number of factors in performing the tasks. The factors are age, power relationship, social distance, situation, and setting. NNS subjects were aware of the importance of age in Korean culture. Not only NNS participants but also several NS participants had difficulty in realizing speech acts in certain situations because of the interaction of the factors.

2) The sources of difficulty in NNS participants’ performance on the DCT were grammar, vocabulary, speech style, and unfamiliarity with the setting. Some NS participants pointed out their lack of experience in the situations as a source of difficulty.

3) Half of the NNS participants formulated their responses in English and translated them into Korean.

4) The confidence level of most of the NNS participants was not very high when they produced the speech acts. The reasons for the source of low confidence level vary: they include grammar, vocabulary, and honorific styles. The NNS participants’ low
confidence may provide an explanation for the fact that they produced shorter responses than their NS counterparts.

5) The NNS participants learned the Korean they produced in natural environments, not in a formal setting, by interacting with or observing family members, relatives, and Korean speaking friends, or by watching Korean videos, particularly soap opera. NS and NNS subjects’ performance of the roles of professor and manager was based on their past experiences of observing them, similar experiences like being a teaching assistant, Korean videos they had seen, or by using their imaginations.

5.2 Implications

The main implication of this study is that not only grammar but also the pragmatic aspects of L2 Korean should be taught to learners. The study showed that NNS participants’ request and apology behaviors are different from those of NS participants. Those who have acquired an L2 in natural settings like the NNS participants in this study may have been exposed to limited language use environments. Their L2 use environment is often informal, and the interlocutors are usually family members, relatives, or friends. In this acquisition environment, pragmatic competence, which enables a language user to choose appropriate forms in a given context, cannot be fully developed. As several NNS participants commented, they have little knowledge of language used in formal settings such as the work place or school.
As the natural setting provides limited language use opportunities, instruction should be designed to help learners experience and practice target language used in a variety of settings. Use of audio/video materials that contain language used in diverse settings will provide a rich source of samples of the target language. TV programs such as soap operas can serve the purpose of teaching diverse speech styles. A sample teaching session might go as follows. Students watch a scene from an episode of a soap opera. At first, they watch and listen to the scene without interruption. When they watch it once again, the teacher stops the video tape after each sentence is articulated, and students write down what they heard. Then, students play out the script that they wrote down in pairs or in groups, depending on the number of roles required. After playing out the script, the whole class discusses the characteristics of the speech observed in the scene. For example, if it is conversation between friends, informal language such as shortened forms or non-honorific forms will be observed. If it is conversation between a professor and a student, it would be observed that the two people use different speech styles. That is, the student would use honorific forms, while the professor may use non-honorific forms. As follow-up exercise, the students could rewrite the script under the assumption that they are in a different setting. They are instructed to rewrite the script focusing on the change in speech styles, while maintaining the content. Then, the whole class discusses how a change in setting affected the speech styles. The purpose of the exercise is to enhance learners’ awareness of speech styles, and the relationship between the speech styles, setting, and roles of those involved in
In addition to the exercise described above, use of native speakers' speech act performance such as the NS participants' responses obtained for this study will allow learners to compare their own productions with those of native speakers. In class, learners could listen to or read native speakers' responses and discuss the characteristics of the native speakers' performance, compared to their own performance.

L2 learners also have partial knowledge of sociocultural norms in the target culture, that is, knowledge about what is appropriate behavior in certain contexts. For example, avoidance of request may be more appropriate than requesting in certain situations. In this study, request Situation 3 was a case for which several NS participants chose avoidance. They chose avoidance because the roommate was older and they did not know him/her well yet. Asking the roommate to clean the kitchen to in that situation was not considered polite behavior in Korea, according to those NS participants. The explanation and discussion of sociocultural norms of the target language and culture should be incorporated into L2 instruction. It may be desirable to set aside one class session per week to lecture about sociocultural aspects of the target language.

In the Introduction, it was pointed out that Korean classes have emphasized grammar. This research has shown that the learner language differs from native norms not only in terms of grammar but also in pragmatic features. Learners used fewer strategies to realize request and apology in terms of both number and range, were sometimes more direct, and failed to use routines that were often used by native speakers.
to enhance the effect of the speech act. Considering that the speech act is purposeful and influential behavior, that is, the speech act is used by a speaker in order to achieve a certain goal or to make the hearer behave in a certain way, making a request easier to comply with and an apology more acceptable may be important. Sufficient explanations and discussions about pragmatic features and strategies to realize speech acts in Korean should be a part of the core curriculum in Korean language teaching.

The following syllabus is proposed as a sample for a Korean class of intermediate level at a university in the United States.

**Syllabus for Korean 104**

1. Objectives: Enhancing learners’ knowledge in Korean in grammar, vocabulary, speech acts, and speech styles; helping learners understand sociocultural aspects of Korea reflected in language use

2. Areas to be covered: grammar, vocabulary, speech acts (requesting, apologizing, complimenting, refusing, expressing gratitude, complaint), speech styles (honorific, non-honorific, formal, informal)

3. Materials: 1) Textbook: *Korean 3*, Yonsei University Press; 2) video clips from several Korean soap operas; 3) audio clips/transcribed text from Korean native speakers’ request and apology realizations

4. Class hours: MTWRF, 1 hour daily
5. Weekly Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Vocabulary</td>
<td>Grammar/Vocabulary</td>
<td>Practice: Speech act/speech style</td>
<td>Lecture/discussion on Korean culture, speech style, and speech act</td>
<td>Communicative practice; weekly evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grammar:* The teacher goes over grammatical points introduced in each chapter. Structured practice such as transformation drill or substitution drill is done using exercise handouts.

*Vocabulary:* The teacher explains the meanings of new vocabulary terms. Students practice using each vocabulary item in sentences and paragraphs with exercise handouts.

*Practice - Speech act:* Students watch a scene from an episode of a soap opera. They watch and listen to the scene without interruption. When they watch it again, the teacher stops the videotape after each sentence is articulated, and students write down what they heard. Students play out the script that they transcribed in pairs or in groups. The whole class discusses the features of the speech observed in the scene. Students rewrite the script, assuming that they are in a different setting, without changing the content.

*Lecture/discussion:* The teacher explains sociocultural norms in Korean society and how these are reflected in speech acts and speech styles of Korean, and leads a discussion on relevant issues. The class listens to native speakers’ speech act productions with the aid of a transcribed text, and discusses the characteristics of native
speakers' productions.

*Communicative practice:* Students practice grammar, speech acts, and speech styles they have learned in tasks that require them to use language in hypothetical contexts.

*Weekly evaluation:* The teacher gives students quizzes in grammar, vocabulary, speech acts, and speech styles. The teacher can evaluate speech acts/styles using the communicative activity described above. Students can perform the tasks for the whole class, and the class discuss and evaluate their peers' performance in terms of grammar, vocabulary, speech acts, and speech styles.

This is a sample syllabus for intermediate Korean. It reflects an attempt to incorporate speech acts and related speech styles in the syllabus design, which areas of study have been relatively ignored in traditional Korean classrooms. The syllabus was also designed in such a way as to enhance students' metalinguistic and metapragmatic knowledge by incorporating discussions on language use and cultural aspects of Korea.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Research

The recommendations for future research are:

1. In the current study, data were elicited through use of a controlled method. Research conducted with data collected in natural settings can provide new insights about L2 speech act patterns.
2. Forty subjects participated in the study. Research with a larger sample size would be desirable.

3. Studies with quantitative design that investigate the relationship between various social and situational variables and speech act realizations will be necessary.

4. NNS participants in this study came from a homogeneous group in terms of their L1. Research with non-native speakers from different L1 groups should be conducted for cross-cultural comparison of speech act patterns.

5. NNS participants in this study acquired Korean primarily in natural settings. Research that compares Korean learners who have studied Korean mainly in a classroom setting with those who learned Korean in natural settings will provide a picture of the effect of learning environment on the development of pragmatic competence.

6. Research on native speakers’ reactions to and evaluation of NNS participants’ utterances can provide insight into how to define pragmatic failure.

7. A study of the views of instructors of Korean as a foreign language about how to teach honorifics to non-native speakers should be conducted through qualitative research projects.
REFERENCES


159


Page 165 is missing.
Appendices

Appendix A: “Can do” Scale of Speaking

Appendix B: Background information for NNS (Pre-instrument interview)

Appendix C: Background information for NS (Pre-instrument interview)

Appendix D: Post-instrument Interview Questions

Appendix E: Discourse Completion Test – Speech Act/Request

Appendix F: Discourse Completion Test – Speech Act/Apology
### Appendix A: “Can do” Scale of Speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>with some difficulty</th>
<th>with great difficulty</th>
<th><em>fairly easily</em></th>
<th>quite easily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I can say the days of the week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I can count to 10 in the language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I can give the current date (month, day, year)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I can order a simple meal in a restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I can ask for directions on the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I can buy clothes in a department store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I can introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greetings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) I can use appropriate leave-taking expressions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) I can give simple biographical information about myself (place of birth, composition of family, early schooling, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) I can talk about my favorite hobby at some length, using appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) I can describe my present job, studies, or other major life activities accurately and in detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>with some difficulty</td>
<td>with great difficulty</td>
<td><em>fairly easily</em></td>
<td>quite easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I can tell what I desire to be doing 5 years from now, using appropriate future tenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) I can describe the American educational system in some detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) I can state and support with examples and reasons a position on a controversial topic (for example, birth control, nuclear weapons, environmental pollution)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) I can describe the role played by Congress in the American governmental system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The category “fairly easily” was added to the scale developed by Educational Testing Service (Barrows et al., 1981, p. 33) for the current study as it was thought that there is a big gap between “with some difficulty” and “quite easily.”*
Appendix B: Background information for NNS
(Pre-instrument interview)

Coding Number ______________

1) Name (Optional) ______________

2) Age: ________________

3) Gender: M F

4) Areas of study: ________________

5) What is your native language? What is the native language of your parents, siblings, or other relatives who you often interact with?

6) Were you born in the U.S.? If not, at what age did you come to the U.S.?

7) Where did you learn Korean? Have you attended any Korean schools or taken classes? If so, where, when, and how long did you study Korean in a formal setting? What did you learn? (grammar, speaking, writing, etc.)

8) Did your parents encourage you to learn and improve Korean?

9) Have you taken any summer language courses in Korea?

10) Tell me about the circumstances in which you use Korean other than classrooms. Do you speak in Korean with your family?

11) When and with whom do you use Korean? How often do you use Korean?

12) Can you also read and write Korean?

13) Have you visited Korea? How long did you stay there, and what language did you speak?

14) What do you know about Korean culture or history? Have you taken any courses about it?

15) What other languages can you speak/use? How proficient are you in those languages?
Appendix C: Background information for NS
(Pre-instrument interview)

Coding Number

1. Name (Optional)

2. Age:

3. Gender:  M  F

4. Areas of study:

5. How long have you been in the U.S.?

6. Did you graduate from high school in Korea? Did you attend college in Korea?

7. How long have you studied English? When and where did you study English?

8. Do you have more interactions with Americans or Koreans here in the U.S.?

9. Do you feel that your English has improved since you came to the U.S.?

10. What other languages can you speak other than Korean and English? When and where did you study the language(s)?
Appendix D: Post-instrument Interview Questions

1. When you responded, what factors did you take into consideration? For example, the relationship between you and the person you are talking to (intimacy, power relationship), social status, age, gender, the intention or the purpose, situation, your language proficiency or anything else? Can you give me examples?

2. Did you learn the expressions that you used in responding before? Was the production automatic? Or did it take a while for you to formulate the expressions before you spoke?

3. Self-evaluating your responses, do you think you used appropriate forms and styles in Korean? How confident were you?

4. Do you think you were polite enough? How would you evaluate your responses in terms of politeness?

5. Did you think in English first and translate into Korean? If so, did you do it all of the time? Most of the time? Or in only a few cases?

6. Did you pay attention to grammatical accuracy and vocabulary? Did you pay attention to pronunciation? Did you pay attention to Korean language styles (formal, informal)?

7. What was the most difficult DCT situation for you? Can you tell me why?

8. Tell me in your own words about your feelings related to the study tasks that you have just completed.
Appendix E: Discourse Completion Test - Speech Act/Request

Name: _______________ Code: ___________

Instruction:

The following is a questionnaire to examine how you request in Korean. Please read the description of each situation carefully and speak in Korean what you would say in the given situation. Because this is not a test or measure of your language skills, there is no right or wrong answer. Please speak as naturally as you can. For all situations, the setting is Korea.

Part I

S1. You are in bed to get some sleep, but you can’t sleep because of the noise made by two children outside your window. They are the kids of your new neighbor, so you don’t know them well yet. You approach the window. What would you say to them?

S2. You are taking a course. Last week you missed some classes since you had a bad cold. You know that one of your classmates takes good notes. You don’t know him well, but you need to borrow his notes. What would you say to him? He looks about your age (name - 한승우).

S3. You have a new roommate (name - 박성훈/ 김미라). You have lived with him/her for two weeks, so you don’t know him/her well yet. Yesterday, your roommate cooked, but did not clean the kitchen. You have invited some of your friends and they are coming over for dinner today. What would you say to your roommate? He/she is older than you by 5 years.

S4. You were writing a term paper on your computer. Suddenly, the computer stopped working. The paper should be submitted by tomorrow. It is the end of the quarter, and the computer lab is very crowded. You know that your close friend (name - 채인표/ 우희정) bought a notebook computer a year ago. You call your friend. What would you say? Your friend is the same age as you.
S5. You are studying at home for a midterm exam tomorrow. However, you cannot concentrate on studying because your neighbor is playing music loudly. You have known her for two years, and you know her well. You go to her apartment. What would you say? She (name - 이영옥) is older than you by 5 years.

S6. You are living with a roommate (name - 신동현 / 윤선화). You have lived with him/her for two years, so you are close. You and your roommate alternately clean the apartment. Today is your turn, but you have many things to do. The apartment is such a mess that you want your roommate to clean the apartment today on your behalf. What would you say to your roommate? Your roommate is younger than you by 5 years.

Part II

S7. You are a 40-year-old professor at a college. You are planning to visit Turkey during the summer. You know that one of your former students works at a local travel agency. You want to obtain travel brochures from her. You have known her for years. You call her (name - 권나영). What would you say? She is 25 years old.

S8. You are a 45-year-old cashier at a very busy grocery store. Because of an urgent family matter, you need to request a one-week vacation. What would you say to the manager? The manager (name - 한상호) is 27 years old, and you have known him for years.

S9. You are a 26-year-old graduate student. Tomorrow is the due date of the final paper for a course you are taking. However, you are not able to turn it in on time. You want to talk to the professor (45 years old) about an extension on the paper. You go to his office. You have known him (name - 남광호) for a year. What would you say to him?

S10. You are a 34-year-old manager (과장) of a company. You have a secretary (name - 이청현 / married) who has worked for you for two years. There is an urgent report that you should take to your boss (부당) tomorrow. So today you want the secretary to stay after office hours and finish typing the report. What would you say to her? The secretary is 50 years old.
Appendix F: Discourse Completion Test - Speech act/Apology

Name: ___________________  Code: ______

Instruction:

The following is a questionnaire to examine how you apologize in Korean. Please read the description of each situation carefully and speak in Korean what you would say in the given situation. Because this is not a test or measure of your language skills, there is no right or wrong answer. Please speak as naturally as possible. For all situations, the setting is Korea.

Part I

S1. You were walking on the street in a city, with a cup of coke in your hand. While you were looking around and not paying attention to the front, you bumped into (부딪치다) a 10-year-old girl, shaking her up a bit and spilling coke over her clothes. What would you say to her?

S2. You were moving your car in a parking lot. While you were backing up, you hit someone else’s car, which was parked and pretty new. The collision left some scratches on the bumper of his car. The driver of the car saw the incident and approaches you. What would you say to him? He looks about your age.

S3. Two weeks ago, you borrowed tools from your new neighbor and forgot to return them. This morning, your new neighbor comes by and tells you that he needs the tools back. What would you say to him? He is a 50-year-old man.

S4. A week ago, you promised your nephew and niece that you would them take to a movie on Saturday. It is Saturday today, and your advisor called in the morning, saying that he needs to see you today. You have to cancel the movie. What would you say to your nephew and niece? They are middle school students.

S5. You borrowed a camera from your close friend (name - 이현철/황미연) for a class project. Yesterday, you dropped the camera and the lenses got broken. Now, you see your friend. What would you say to him/her? He/she is the same age as you.
S6. You are having dinner with your close friend (name - 최우성 / 현진주) and his/her parents. You have known his/her parents for two years. By mistake, you take his/her mother’s cup and drink the water in it. His/her mother tells you that it is her cup. What would you say to her?

Part II

S7. You are a 40-year-old professor. Today in class, you returned same graded mid-term papers to your students. After class, one of the students (name - 한수연; 20 years old) approaches you and tells you that there is no grade on her paper. It seems that you missed her paper while you were grading. What would you say to her? You have known this student for a year.

S8. You are a 35-year-old waiter at an expensive Korean restaurant. Today, a customer came in and ordered Bi-bim-bap (비빔밥), but you brought her Bul-go-gi (불고기). The customer says that she ordered Bi-bim-bap. What would you say to her? She (name - 신은주) is 25 years old, and you have known her as a customer for a year.

S9. You are the 30-year-old owner of a big grocery store. You promised one of the cashiers that he could take a one-week vacation next month. However, due to a serious shortage of cashiers, you have to rescind your promise. What would you say to him? The cashier is a 50-year-old man (name - 김병수), and he has worked at the store for a year.

S10. You are a 24-year-old graduate student. Last week, one of your professors (40 years old; name - 총현욱) asked you to buy a book, giving you money. She said that she was too busy to go to a bookstore. You have also been busy with papers, so you forgot to get the book. Today, the professor asks you about the book. What would you say to her? You have known the professor for a year.