English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. ***15***, No. 2 Summer 2009

Beyond Politeness: A Spoken Discourse Approach to Korean Address Reference Terms*

Jin-ok Hong
(In-je University)

Hong, Jin-ok. (2009). Beyond politeness: A spoken discourse approach to Korean address reference terms. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(2), 93-119.

Internalized Confucian cultural scripts trigger meta-pragmatic thinking in Korean communication. Commonly shared cultural knowledge acts as a powerful constraint upon the behavioral patterns of each participant and this knowledge can be strategically manipulated to avoid confrontations. The strategic use of address reference terms utilizes cultural values as a face-redress mechanism to achieve situation-specific goals. This paper offers a view of Korean address reference terms that rests on four revisions of politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987). First, the notion of discernment – or 'wakimae' – as a culture-specific mechanism is reanalyzed. Secondly, culture-specific values as another *R* (ranking of imposition) variable are introduced. Thirdly, a reevaluation of the notion of positive face (respect) is discussed. Finally, the address reference terms in combination with other honorifics by the speaker that can be strategically applied either to threaten or to enhance the face of the hearer is observed. Because Confucianism is embedded in Korean cultural identity, teaching cultural values ~~integrated~~ and their roles in situation-dependent politeness is required in order to understand interactional nature of politeness occurring from particular discourse contexts.

[politeness theory/Confucian cultural script/cultural values/meta-pragmatic thinking/Korean address reference terms]

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper reconsiders Korean address and reference terms (A-R terms) in examining

* This work was supported by the 2008 Inje University research grant.

the culture-specific nature of the forms and how they contrast with face saving theory that construct the basis of the politeness formula by Brown and Levinson. Culturally known ways of thinking are prerequisite elements that must be taken into account in the study of A-R usage. A number of researchers have focused on politeness with respect to linguistic strategies, but have often lacked analysis of the inter-dependent relationship of politeness and power (Blum-Kulka, 1987; Eelen, 2001; Fraser, 1990; Ide, 1989; Lakoff, 1973; Leech, 1983; Matsumoto, 1988, 1993; Pan, 2000; Watts, 1989). The politeness formula of Brown and Levinson includes power (P), distance (D), and ranking of imposition (R) as essential components in the computation of the magnitude of face-threatening acts (FTAs). It also defines politeness as a strategy available for mitigating the weightiness of an FTA (Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp.16-17). Brown and Levinson then explain how politeness forms can be used to mitigate FTAs. The more face threatening an act is, the higher the level of politeness the speaker needs to employ. According to this, *volition* (selecting a strategy to redress the face threats depending on interactive speech act situations) takes precedence over *discernment* (social norms of a society that are expressed with grammatically and lexically encoded forms of honorifics) in terms of politeness forms (see Byon 2006, p. 255). Brown and Levinson are concerned with FTAs and do not fully elaborate on how to account for culture-specific variables within the formula.

Some Asian scholars strongly disagree with the conclusions of Brown and Levinson. Matsumoto, for instance, maintains, “The negative face want of preservation of individual territories seems alien to the Japanese” (Matsumoto, 1988, p. 408). In view of Matsumoto, ‘relation-acknowledging devices’ (1988, p. 409), i.e. discernment, appear to predominate the usage of Japanese honorific devices while the volitional aspects are regarded as optional considerations. However, the notions of Matsumoto and Ide are static, because they do not employ natural language data that focuses on culturally specific discourse patterns (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1473). Matsumoto insists, “the role of imposition can be regarded as vehicles for deference” (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1483). However, Matsumoto does not see that highly deferential honorific forms are not only used for giving imposition, but are also used for conveying the face enhancing act (FEA).

The basic notion of Korean deference that is embedded in the deferential honorific forms displays ‘the speaker-lowering and the hearer-elevating’. This culture-specific notion of deference embedded in the Korean honorific forms can be used for either FTAs or FEAs. Matsumoto has thus overlooked the fact that cultural values function as an additional *R* using honorifics. Quite appropriately, the functional view of Pizziconi associates polite behavior with strategic intention (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1483). The ideas of Pizziconi can be integrated into a spoken discourse approach that views the deliberate flouting of A-R usages as a means of maintaining interactional goals on a discursive

level. Honorific usages depend on the personal motivations of the participant in relation to the confines of the particular interactional norms. The more that the discursive goals of the speaker are inconsistent with the local norms, the higher the level of politeness tends to become. The politeness forms of the speaker are proportionate to the magnitude of the FTA derived from the delicate balance between the strategic intention, local norms, and discursive identities. This allows the speaker to employ over-politeness or under politeness to compensate for the FTAs required to pursue pragmatic goals. The same FTAs can be interpreted differently depending on what the local norms are. Pizziconi does not see how strategic politeness is able to utilize culture-specific paradigms on an interactional level (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1497).

Confucian cultural script is an example of another rational mechanism that controls linguistic strategies in the mind of the Korean hearer. Korean cultural deference stresses the concept of 'respect for super-ordinates and benevolence to subordinates' as a method of establishing power relationships (Hong, 2007a, 2007b, 2008). This happens, because cultural emphasis on deference stresses a 'mutuality' that aims at establishing harmonious relationships between different power relationships. This cultural knowledge of Korean deference can be strategically employed in order to threaten the face of the hearer: highly deferential honorific forms can be understood as scorn or blame in a particular context (see section 4.2 and 4.4). Korean deference can often mitigate FTAs with commonly shared cultural knowledge. Also of note is that Korean deference is based on Confucian values and can function as another *R* variable in the interpretation of politeness forms. This paper argues that a Confucian thinking of *R* combined with the politeness formula of Brown and Levinson can better renegotiate politeness and power arising from discursive situations.

This paper shows that the strategic use of A-R terms utilizes cultural values and functions as face redress mechanisms in order to achieve the pragmatic goal of the speaker. According to actual spoken data gathered, institutional participants deliberately employed marked A-R terms that reflected Confucian values in order to trigger commonly shared cultural implications in situations of a high level of imposition.

II. KOREAN DEFERENCE

'Deference'[1] and 'politeness'[2] are the two integral elements that comprise Korean

[1] Deference reflects the relative status of the participants on a hierarchical social dimension (Hwang, 1990, pp. 42-48).
[2] Politeness is a linguistic strategy the speaker uses for various pragmatic purposes (Hwang, 1990, p. 48).

politeness. According to Korean spoken data, ‘deference’ and ‘politeness’ cut across and often coexist within the construction of face redress mechanisms. ‘Pwunpyelseng’ (Korean deference) has a dual nature allowing it to simultaneously acknowledge the relationship between the speaker and the hearer as well as display the strategic intentions of the speaker (Lee, 1999, p. 18; Suh, 1989, p. 3). Korean ‘pwunpyelseng’ has relevance to Korean deference, because social indexing can be used to signal the pragmatic meanings of the speaker (e.g. intention, deference and interactional goals). The level of deference is not regulated by social norms but by the calculation by the speaker of the surrounding interactional features.

The Confucian notion of deference, which focuses on ‘self-humbling and hearer elevation’, is strongly related to the cultural convention of mutuality, because the hearer elevation deference aims to trigger mutual support and harmony between different power relationships. The elevating deference of the hearer can be the normal register of the speaker, but can also be strategically used as an indication that displays the strategic intention(s) of the speaker. This realization can be seen as marked forms because the strategic use of Korean deference is often inconsistent with the existent social conventions. For example, the deliberate use by a professor of ‘cokyo sensayng nim’ (e.g. secretary teacher + ‘nim’) is a marked form, since ‘Lee cokyo’ (secretary Lee) or ‘Lee yang’ (‘Miss Lee’) is considered the normal register. In this case, the hearer would realize that the marked address term indicates the profit-oriented goal of the speaker.

Matsumoto claims that Japanese deference has nothing to do with FTA (Matsumoto, 1988, p. 419; Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1476). The weakness of that study was to overlook the inferential calculation of the *R* factor embedded in polite linguistic forms and to isolate culturally specific discourse patterns on a discursive level (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1473). The functional use of Korean deference contradicts the claim of Matsumoto (1988), because it shows that the ego of the speaker is more concerned with the mandatory social norms than the model by Brown and Levinson suggests (Pizziconni, 2003, p. 1474). Every predicate in Korean is accompanied by different level of deference that functions as FTAs or face enhancing acts (FEAs). The use of over deferential address terms by a more powerful professor can be perceived as an FEA on a particular context. The target of the honorifics is presented with FEA and can utilize the Korean notion of deference that is regulated by the strategic intention of the speaker. This evidence contradicts the claim by Matsumoto (1988) that honorific usages are constrained by social conventions (Matsumoto, 1993, p. 733). Similarly, Matsumoto, Ide, and Brown and Levinson do not see that the use of cultural values by the speaker functions as another verbal redress that affects the interpretation of linguistic politeness. They only associate linguistic forms (i.e. indirectness/directness) with politeness. However, the naturally occurring data in this paper shows that the wants of the speaker in regards to face are anchored on both

individual face needs as well as socio-cultural and contextual discursive norms and incorporate both cultural values and linguistic forms in the construction of linguistic politeness.

Hwang (1990, pp. 42-48) associates ‘deference’ with rank differences on a hierarchical dimension in regards to the Korean notion of ‘deference’. However, Hwang has neglected to see that deference becomes functional on an interactional level because the study did not employ interactional data in the analysis of politeness forms. Hwang does not employ longer stretches of naturally occurring data and it is not possible to see that the strategic intention of the speaker utilize both ‘deference’ and ‘politeness’ when motivated by strategic goals. The Korean notion of deference can be employed as a functional tool in the negotiation of politeness. Hwang is only concerned with social conventions not with the mutable nature of deference.

For example, Koreans utilize social indexing (‘discernment’) motivated by the pragmatic goals. Social indexing (‘discernment’) is exploited in order to maintain discursive identities on an interactional level. The strategic language use found in the data demonstrate that discernment politeness becomes a functional negotiator when it is used in interactional discourse, although Byon (2006, p. 258) argues that discernment politeness is motivated by ‘normative orientations’ that are regulated by the desire to index social relationships. The reason for this is that the functional notion of 'pwunpyelseng' reinforces hearer-elevating effects because the cultural connotations embedded in the lexical choices acknowledge that the hearer is more competent and capable than the speaker. This culturally understood thinking allows Korean discernment to be used for strategic purposes. Korean deference incorporates cultural values in which social indexing follows these cultural values. Because cultural values are common cultural knowledge, these cultural values mitigate the weightiness of *R* to create a common ground and solidarity between power differentials. Korean discernment ('pwunpyelseng') is able to utilize cultural values and displays multi-functionality combined with honorific forms (Hong, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008).

Korean data collected from institutional contexts demonstrate that 'pwunpyelseng' and the attendant cultural values are concerned with the strategic use of politeness. The functional notion of ‘deference’ is not regulated exclusively by predetermined social norms (Pizziconi, 2003, p. 1501). Korean spoken data shows that deference and politeness are mutually supportive in terms of the use of (im) polite language. Korean speakers may upgrade or downgrade address reference terms to pursue strategic goals. Korean politeness is the strategic agenda of the speaker for achieving various interactional purposes. This socio-pragmatic revision of Korean deference is concerned with strategic goals on an interactional level.

The experimental method employed should be comprehensive enough to encompass

all kinds of strategic interactions that occur from both lexical and meta-pragmatic dimensions (e.g. Confucian thinking, cognitive, and interactional discursive contexts) in order to explore the functional aspects of Korean A-R terms. What is considered 'appropriate' in discursive situations indicates that the strategic notion of polite behavior is whatever is considered functionally appropriate to the on-going discursive interaction. The discursive position of this paper views that the subjective choice of the speaker has a stronger regulative power than any social indexing system. A spoken discourse approach combined with a Confucian framework is employed in order to explore the subjective language use by the speaker. The Korean version of CA (see Conversational Analysis Schegloff, 2007) will enable a more functional view of the aspects of Korean A-R usage.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Collection

This study utilizes authentic data collected from faculty and department office secretaries. Secretaries were selected because they are ubiquitous and unobtrusive members of the academic community that are well suited to observe, collect, and record interactions as well as clarify the information they gather. Cameron (1995) correctly pointed out that the perception of power and identity by participants is a central obstacle in collecting natural spoken data (Cited from Hong, 2006, p. 79). It was agreed that secretaries were in a better position to unobtrusively gather data because they were in a lower position than the researcher. They were able to interact naturally with a wider range of people in terms of power and identity. Field observations by the secretaries allowed for the close examination of socio-cultural contexts and naturally occurring data from three different contexts: one college (Biomedical Science and Engineering), and three departments (Food Science and Nutrition, International Trade, and Chemical Engineering). The researcher recorded data when fortuitous opportunities presented themselves (such as faculty meetings in Convention Hall) (see Extract 2).

The intention was to record culture-specific phenomena that represented the Korean institutional communities under study. In field observations, the secretaries were required to examine the socio-cultural situation and collect contextual information related to the collected spoken data. Over eighteen months, ten secretaries participated in the recording process, and collected 48 tapes in three different locations: one college (the College of Biomedical Science and Engineering), three departments (Food Science and Nutrition, International Trade, and Chemical Engineering). I have chosen two extracts among the actual spoken data gathered herein. The extracts used in this study were

collected from two different contexts (e.g. Food Science & Nutrition and Convention Hall). In order to investigate socio-cultural situation and contextual information that are reflected in the data secretaries employed feedback sessions (see section 3.2.4).

3.2 Data Analysis

Discursive orderliness analyzed linguistic forms[3]. As noted in 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, CA focused on discursive orderliness in relation to marked linguistic forms (e.g. over-polite or under-polite linguistic forms) inconsistent with the normative language used to signal the strategic intentions of the speaker. As noted in 3.2.2 the paper employed CA focusing on the discursive orderliness in relationships to marked linguistic forms (e.g. marked A-R terms). Using a CA approach, the discursive orderliness was observed from surrounding discursive situations: 1) social norms 2) interactional norms 3) discursive identity 4) institutional identity 5) interactional goals (especially in relation to marked linguistic forms). Confucian values embedded in the semantics of honorific forms were evaluated using the Confucian framework of personhood, to examine the marked linguistic forms (e.g. over-polite or under-polite A-R terms) inconsistent with the normative language use that signal the strategic intentions of the speaker. This study takes the view that Confucian cultural framework is a culturally shared cognitive paradigm that resides in the psychology of the Korean people. The cognitive value of the meta-pragmatic language usage of the speaker is observed through a Confucian framework. In the analysis of linguistic data, the actual cognitive and inferential process is also viewed through a Confucian framework.

3.2.1 Confucian Framework

This cultural framework is similar to the one presented by Kang in a study of the meetings by a Korean American organization (Kang, 2000, p. 78). The CA of Kang employs a Confucian framework in order to explore locally specific linguistic behavior. Following the example of Kang, this study uses a Confucian framework when analyzing value oriented linguistic behavior (Kang, 2000, pp. 79-80). Value oriented linguistic practice represents that Confucian values may be tied to the performance of the linguistic behavior of participants. Confucian values are a cultural framework of meaning and ideology that affects all kinds of social interactions, in addition value oriented linguistic behavior triggers meta-pragmatic thinking that can be directly connected to the performance of the speaker's linguistic behavior (Kang, 2000, pp. 79-80).

[3] I've used "the Yale Romanization type 5" for Korean language transcription convention.

The foundation of Korean culture and politeness is Confucianism and the following values operate as basic principles for smooth social practice: 1) ‘li’ stresses ritual and etiquette 2) ‘chih’ means wisdom 3) ‘i’ stresses righteousness 4) ‘jen’ stresses warmth and humanism (Yum, 1988, p. 74). Confucian cultural values stress hierarchical social relations between different social positions. Korean relational work can be characterized by hierarchical interactions in which the scope of roles and obligations must follow ‘the five relations of Confucianism’ as the various social contexts require: e.g. loyalty between king and subject, filial piety between parents and child, distinction between husband and wife, precedence between senior and junior (in terms of age, sex, generation or social status), and confidence between friends (Sohn, 1986, p. 45; see also Chang, 1976, p. 154). Due to this emphasis on hierarchical power variables, Koreans are very sensitive to social positions in relationship to others. Confucian values emphasize the duties and obligations of individual social roles in a given situation. They also focus on subordinate loyalty and respect toward super-ordinates and super-ordinate benevolence toward and the protection of subordinates.

The two elements of ‘i’ and ‘jen’ are key concepts for representing the Confucian ethical system. (Yum, 1988, pp. 77-78): i.e. ‘i’ is an embodiment of ‘jen’ (warmth). It is noted that ‘jen’ is considered the crucial element of social practice. If someone lacks ‘jen’ they are regarded as impolite and cannot progress in further social interactions. Regarding Korean cultural emphasis on warmth, Kang (2000, p. 102) states “Koreans prefer using blanket quantifiers rather than exact numbers, because the use of precision gives them a chill as an expression of being too practical and calculating and of a mind being too geared to maximum profit and efficiency while neglecting the warm-hearted sentiment of ‘ceng’” (Suh, 1996, p. 43). Suh (1996, pp. 42-43) also claims that Koreans often employ blanket quantifiers, because they regard explicitness as a lack of humanity and warmth. Implicit expressions make negotiations stronger, because the Korean cultural convention of warmth is linked to a tentativeness that makes Koreans seem uncertain when actually they are really trying to exhibit the Korean cultural convention of warmth. Also of note is that all these elements are mutually dependent and complementary. For example, to practice ‘jen requires the incorporation of the other three elements. The fundamental etiquette of human behavior ‘li’ stems from ‘i’ (warmth) and ‘li’ (politeness/social hierarchy and order) without humanity ‘jen’ is useless and vain. (Yum, 1994, p. 77). Therefore, warmth is a prerequisite for becoming a respectable and virtuous person.

Confucianism is the cultural paradigm that controls how cultural values (e.g. implicitness, warmth, and reciprocity, along with in-group relationships, age, familiarity, gender, relative status, harmony, and attachment) are used and understood in both Korean culture and language. All of these are closely intertwined and inter-connected

with one another that are fundamental to the way Korean people interact and communicate. Confucian cultural emphasis on warmth and mutuality percolates into the minds of Korean people and can be refined into a virtue. These cultural values are fundamentally built into the basics of Korean honorific devices and highlight positive politeness, because the concept of the Korean deference that is embedded in Korean honorific forms is almost entirely composed of the elevation deference of the hearer (subordinate-respect and super-ordinate benevolence) (Brown, 2005, p. 4).

Confucian values create an intra-interactionally relevant context for the language use of the participant, since Confucian thinking is built into the fabric of Korean honorific usages. Confucian thinking is ingrained in Korean culture and thought to become a common sense knowledge that is shared by all Koreans. This common sense knowledge is the paradigm that members of a society use as a resource for understanding the social world (Schegloff, 1992, p. 1299). That is why common cultural knowledge is often a more powerful constraint upon the action of the participant and why it is often strategically used to avoid confrontations with a different discursive stance. Confucian values play a critical role when determining the *R* variable. It is this cognitive value that value oriented linguistic behavior by a speaker (mental, strategic, and meta-pragmatic) that cannot be effable directly from empirical data, but can only be readable through the culture-specific framework (Eelen, 2001, p. 158).

Due to a Korean cultural emphasis on implicitness, participants attempt to mitigate the force of FTAs by appealing to a culturally shared ethos. The use of cultural values is strategically motivated and focuses on value oriented linguistic behaviour (see Locher, 2004, p. 59). In this respect, Confucian frameworks can show underlying culture-specific mechanisms for how Korean institutional participants utilize Confucian values in particular interactional contexts. Value oriented linguistic behaviour will be noticed, because it will be inconsistent with discursive orderliness (Fairclough, 1992; Thorborrow, 2002, p. 39).

3.2.2 Conversational Analysis

An essential starting point for Conversational Analysis (CA) is the realization that institutional discourse is a social action (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 164; Psathas, 1995). Hutchby and Wooffitt claim that institutional talk is ‘institutional action’ that can be seen in the construction of contextual identities in which the specific agenda of a participant is geared toward accomplishing pragmatic goals (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 21; ten Have, 1999, p. 165). However, institutional talk cannot be understood without looking at local actions, since the discursive practice of the speaker depends heavily on local norms (particular contextual norms) in relationship to the institutional identities,

roles, and/or relationships (see ten Have, 1999, pp. 106-108).

The socio-pragmatic approach to CA of this paper adopts a Confucian framework that will explore common cultural knowledge that affects the choice of linguistic forms by participants. In order to explore the functional notion of Korean A-R terms, reference is made to the view of Schegloff that language is an interactive phenomenon. As Schegloff (1992, p. 199) correctly pointed out, "it is a context-sensitive interactional achievement" (Schegloff, 1992, p. 199). This can be attributed to the fact that honorific use also interplays with the interactional nature of discourse management in a particular context. In the data analyses, discursive orderliness is a prompt that makes honorific use locally sensitive and interactionally relevant to the interactional discourse contexts.

3.2.3 Discursive Orderliness and Marked Forms

'Discursive orderliness' is relevant to a 'marked linguistic behavior', because the locus of strategic politeness lies in the intentionality of the speaker. This analytic method recognizes that contexts are not fixed, but rather mutable and controllable according to the discursive goals of the participants and the interactional norms.

These transformable interactional norms (the openings and closings) inconsistent with the social conventions, become analyzable as evidence of intentionality (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 20).

1) Naturally occurring data
2) Local norms
3) The strategic intention of the speaker (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 21)
4) The common cultural values

The local production of orderliness is the result of a negotiation between local norms/circumstance, commonly shared cultural knowledge, institutional identities, institutional relationship, and the intentions of the participants (ten Have, 1999, pp. 39-42). Naturally occurring data demonstrates that there are two kinds of linguistic forms to maintain orderliness: normative and deviant cases (ten Have, 1999, p. 40). Normative cases can be seen in the use of a normal register while deviant cases can be seen in marked linguistic behavior. In order to avoid 'disorderliness' with the particular contexts, the participants can strategically employ marked linguistic forms (e.g. over politeness or under politeness) as face redress mechanisms. When analyzing 'marked linguistic forms' the concept of 'deviant cases'[4] by Heritage will be referred to. The concept set forth by

[4] It is also termed as a negative case that is a deviation from a regular pattern of interaction (ten Have, 1999, p. 40).

Heritage of “three consecutive analytic phases” is modified in the following ways:

1) Normative utterances anchored by social conventions are regular pattern of linguistic behavior.

2) When the discursive agenda of the speaker is confronted with social norms, it affects the choice of marked linguistic forms. Multi-functionality embedded in naturally occurring data and local norms should be observed from the broadened perspective of a culture-specific framework (ten Have, 1999, p. 40).

3) For the coherence of discursive interaction, and to keep orderliness, the institutional participants employ functionally appropriate ‘marked linguistic forms’ in order to successfully maintain discursive identity.

Institutional talk cannot be understood without looking at the particular contextual norms, since the context and identity are often treated as inherently locally produced (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 158, pp. 165-166; ten Have, 1999, p. 165; Zimmerman, 1991, p. 77). When the speaker is oriented toward a pragmatic goal inconsistent with the social conventions, the speaker will employ marked linguistic forms (e.g. under politeness or over politeness) in order to convey this intentionality. This can be seen in the deliberate flouting of the normal register (section 4.2).

3.2.4 Feedback Session

Cameron *et al.* (1992, pp. 42-45) claim that feedback sessions can help the researcher gain additional information by reinforcing accuracy and refining informants’ information. Also, the ways in which higher-level linguistic behavior interacts with cognitive dynamics (i.e. a participant’s rational, emotional, and psychological state) cannot be explained based on a limited number of inter-personal interactions. Instead, multi-dimensional interactions in a specific situation are needed (Cameron *et al*., 1992, pp. 8-9). Lastly, locally explosive issues that the researcher cannot work on benefit from feedback sessions. I used Cameron’s idea of feedback sessions (Cameron *et al*., 1992, p. 44), which enabled me to augment my qualitative analysis.

Feedback sessions that incorporate question and answer sessions can unveil information that the researcher is not aware of (Cameron *et al*., 1992, p. 43). I conducted feedback sessions with some of the participants who had been interviewed by secretaries with written questionnaires. The goal of having feedback session was to analyze why the participants (e.g. students, secretaries academic and non-academic

staff etc.) adopted marked forms of politeness that they used. I inquired about highly deferential honorific forms that were adopted when speaking with close intimates. I was curious about situations in which participants employed non-deferential language with more powerful people. The feedback sessions also enabled me to conduct qualitative analysis by exploring the participants' internal motivations to better understand particular, locally specific linguistic features, and to better grasp the context features of the conversation (Cameron *et al*., 1992, p. 45). Respondents, who ranged from undergraduate secretaries to professors (see extracts 1 and 2), were very interested in these sessions and offered information sincerely and cooperatively.

IV. KOREAN A-R TERMS AND MULTI-FUNCTIONALITY

4.1 Address Terms

This section demonstrates that Korean A-R terms display multi-functional and situational sensitivity. For example, A-R terms are employed for various pragmatic purposes, according to locally specific contextual features. In the field study, by Koo (1992), 64 A-R terms were collected for the address term, 'you'. Among the most commonly used forms are 'kwiha' and 'elusin/elusine', which are the most deferential forms. 'Ne' is the non-deferential form of 'you' and between these two extremes are 'sensayng-nim', 'kutay', 'caki', 'imca', and 'caney'. However, Korean third personal pronouns are not deferential. Therefore, there are many variants of pronouns and deferential meanings depending on the local norms. For instance, 'he' has many referential variants according to locally specific contextual norms; the same man may be called 'caney' by his supervisor at work, 'Kim se bang' by his mother in law at home, 'sacangnim' by his coworkers at the office, and 'acessi' by a third party at the supermarket. The honorific use of 'he' is likely to depend on local norms rather than FTAs.

Address terms are vocatives that are either direct references to the addressees (such as Mr. or Mrs.) used to refer to the addressee or vocatives that call attention to the addressee or both (Hwang, 1975, p. 1990; Okamura, 2005, pp. 1-2). The Oxford English Dictionary (1989, p. 146) defines address terms as, "the style by which a person is addressed especially formally". Korean address terms are very hierarchical and can be used both formally and informally. For example, Dr. Professor, Director, President, boss, and teacher are classified as formal, while 'Mr.', 'Mrs.', 'Madame' and Miss' are classified as informal. However, in my study's data, A-R terms can be used either formally or informally according to the speaker's intentions. The interpretations of A-R

terms display either face threatening acts (FTAs) (see Extract 2) or face enhancing acts (FEAs) (see Extract 1) depending on locally specific contextual features. The choice of the following A-R terms for faculty heavily depend on the local norms of discourse contexts, because the speaker utilizes marked forms of A-R terms in order to show his/her strategic intentions according to locally changing discourse contexts.

TABLE 1

Address Terms for Faculty

Deferential levels	Address term + personal name
Very formal and deferential	Professor Park Young Ho + '*nim*' (박영호 교수님)
Average deferential	Professor Park + '*nim*' (박 교수님)
Moderately raised and formal deference	Professor Park (박 교수)
Moderately raised and informal deference	Teacher Park + '*nim*' (박 선생님)
Lowering and non-deferential	Teacher Park (박 선생)

Address terms are generally used as vocatives but they can be applied differently according to status differences, but the connotations of these address terms depend on locally specific contexts. According to my study's data, Korean A-R terms can be used as marked address terms to carry specific meanings (i.e. disparagement, scorn, insult, and gender differentiation) (Okamura, 2003, p. 17). For example, the more powerful professor employs over polite A-R term, 'secretary teacher' combined with the honorific marker, 'nim' motivated by her personal goal (see Extract 1). On the other hand, professors employed either under polite or over polite A-R terms when they try to insult the immoral president (see Extract 2).

4.2 Positive Politeness of Korean A-R Terms as Reflected in the Naturally Occurring Data

The Korean address term, 'ssi' (i.e. 'Mr.' in English) is used to refer to men who have lower class jobs such as street cleaners, janitors, street merchants, technicians, and cleaners. 'Ssi' is more deferential than 'kwun' ('Mr.') or/ 'yang' ('Miss'). However, these A-R terms can be applied in any situation in which offense is intended toward the

hearer. For the use of ‘ssi’, Full Name +‘ssi’, ‘Family Name +‘ssi’, ‘First Name + ‘ssi’ demonstrates a descending order of deference. However, as noted earlier, the intentions of the speaker are the predominate criteria for regulating the use of address terms[5]. The same professor can be referred to differently according to the intentions of the speaker and these interpretations depend heavily on locally specific contextual features as shown below:

Extract 1

K: professor (aged 45)
L: secretary (aged 26)

1. K: *Cokyo sensayng-nim cikum iphak kwanli sente-ey cenhwa hay-la.*
   (Secretary teacher-HM now application admission center-LOC call-do-IMPER-NDVS.).
   Secretary teacher, call the application admission's office now.

2. K: *Iphak kwanli sente-ey cenhwa hay-ya toy-l-kes kat-untey…*
   (Application admission center-LOC phone call-do-NECESS-become-ATTR1-thing –seem-CIRCUM.)
   I'm wondering if you could call the application admission's office.

3. L: *Iphak kwanli sente-ey cenhwa hal-kka-yo?*
   (Application admission center -LOC phone call-do -ATTR –1-ADVS-INTERR?)
   Shall I call the application admission's office?

4. K: *Na-to ka-ya toyn-tako kule-nun-kes-kat-tentey.*
   (I-also go -NECESS -become -ATTR2- CONN2 –so-thing-seem- CIRCUM.)
   I was told that I would probably have to go there.

5. *Cokyo sensayng-nim-i kassta-o-myen an-toy-nun-ka mwule-po-sey-yo.*
   (Secretary teacher-HM-NOM go: PAST-come-COND become: NOT-TOP-ATTR2-NOM ask -CONN1-see –HM-IMPER- ADVS.)
   Please ask if it can be possible if the secretary goes there.

[5] Among the honorific markers attached to the address terms are ‘kwun’ (‘Mr.’), ‘yang’ (‘양’), ‘ssi’ (‘씨’), and ‘yesa’ (‘여사’).

6. L: *Na cikum swuep ka-nuntey. Lee yang, cenhwa com hay-cwu-sey-yo.*
(I NDPP now class go-CIRCUM.
Miss Lee, phone call-please-do-PRECED-give-HM-ADVS.)
I'm going to the class. Miss Lee please give a ring for me.

The personal goal of the professor is inconsistent with the usual duties of the secretary and prompts the professor to employ over politeness in order to dilute the negative face threats imposed on the secretary. The professor employs the directive form '-hayla' (which is normative) but can be perceived as unpleasant. When a request is consistent with the regular duties of the secretary, the more powerful professor employs the normal register, "LN + Miss". However, in line 5 and 6, when a request is motivated by a personal goal, the more powerful professor employs a deferential request form, '~ cwuseyyo' (the most deferential request form is, 'cwusipsiyo').

The turn of K is composed of two Turn Constructional Units (TCUs) as can be seen in line 4 and 5: e.g. "I was told that I had to go there." "Please ask if it can be possible if the secretary goes there." Each does display the meaning by the speaker and is addressed to the question L has asked in line 3. Specifically, the utterance in line 5 shows that what the professor is going to do in order to get things done (e.g. marginally personal request). This example reveals that the professor chooses over-deference or non-deference based on the strategic goals and the relevance of those goals to the scope of the roles and obligations of the secretary.

If a request is inconsistent with the expected local norms, the more powerful person may employ an extremely deferential address term, such as professional title (PT) + additional PT + highly non-reciprocally used 'nim' ('secretary + teacher + nim'), in order to trigger epistemological sympathy toward the difficult situation and mitigate any negative face threats (Wierzbicka, 2003, p. 196). Teacher Kim ('Kim sensayng') is the normal register, because there is a substantial difference in age. Therefore, Title + Title + 'nim' considerably elevates the face of the secretary as can be seen in line 5. This is a deliberate flouting of the normal register, which is linked to age, rank, and gender variables. The use of 'secretary teacher' therefore suggests a pragmatic meaning manifested in the guise of over-deference. In the above extract, the more powerful professor shows value oriented linguistic behavior (e.g. this means that the speaker utilizes Korean deference that basically hinges on Confucian cultural value, 'the hearer elevation deference) (see section II & 3.2.1).

4.3 Korean A-R Terms and Situation Sensitivity

Korean A-R terms reflect Confucian values focusing on multi-functionality. This

section demonstrates that Korean A-R terms display situation sensitivity focusing on multi-functionality. For example, A-R terms can be employed according to the various pragmatic purposes in terms of locally specific contextual features as shown below.

TABLE 2

Pronominal Forms

2nd person pronoun 'you'	*'kwiha'* ('귀하') *Elusin* ('어르신')-deferential forms *kutay* ('그대') *caki* ('자기') *imca* ('임자') *tayk* ('댁')- average deference *caney* ('자네'), *ne* ('너')- non-deference, *tang- sin* ('당신')
2nd person pronoun (plural) ' you'	*yelepwun* ('여러분')-deferential form *nehuy-tul* ('너희들'='you')-non-deferential '들' ('tul') is a plural suffix
3rd person pronoun 'he/she'	ku ("그")-'he' kunye ('그녀')-'she'
3rd person pronoun (plural) 'they'	kutul ('그들') 'tul' is a plural suffix.

In the findings by Koo (1992), 64 A-R terms are collected to address 'you' in the field survey. Among the most commonly used are 'kwiha' 'elusin/elusine' as the most deferential forms. 'Ne' is the non-deferential form of 'you' and between these two extremes are 'sensayngnim', 'kutay', 'caki', 'imca', and 'caney'. The personal pronoun for the third person male referent is 'he' in English. However, Korean personal pronouns do not reveal deferential meanings. Therefore, there are many variants for addressing pronouns and deferential meanings depending on the local norms. For instance, 'he' has many variants to be referred to according to locally specific contextual norms: e.g. 'caney' by his supervisor at work place, 'Kim se bang' by his mother in law at home, 'sacangnim' by his employee at office, 'acessi' by a third party at supermarket. The honorific use of 'he' is likely to depend on local norms rather than FTAs. The multi-functional aspects of Korean reference terms usages in local contexts are explored further in the following section.

4.4 The Multi-functionality of Korean Reference Terms

Reference terms can be used as subjects or objects and refer to either the addressee or a third person referent. Reference terms are variants that index proper names or noun phrases that denote the addressee (Korean often uses reference terms in place of second person pronouns). Hwang excludes pronouns from the category of address terms, because pronouns are only used in rare cases (Hwang, 1975, p. 19). Likewise, this study classifies pronouns as reference terms, because the second person pronouns (e.g. 'tangsin' and 'kwiha'[6]) cannot only indicate the addressee but can also refer to addressee referents. Due to cultural tentativeness, when speakers do not wish to refer explicitly to the addressee, they can employ various reference terms. It is for this reason that Korean reference terms often replace FNs or pronouns.

Korean reference terms often replace pronouns in order to convey more deferential meanings. 'Samonim' (i.e. wife of the teacher) for instance, indicates a highly marked deference, because the speaker pays extreme deference to the addressee or addressee referents by connecting the hearer to a culturally revered person. Due to Confucian values, reference terms, 'samonim' or 'sensayngnim' ('teacher') can be employed as a marked form through culturally shared thinking. Reference terms are also used when the name of a third person is defocalized. The choice of reference terms depends on a variety of situational features and the intention of the speaker. There are various options depending upon the ranks of the addressees: e.g. 'yeng pwuin' (The first lady), 'samonim' (a wife whose husband holds a revered social status) 'manim' (the wife of an upper class wife during the 'Chosun dynasty'), yesa (an older woman who achieved a higher position in society). All of these forms represent women of different social ranks from within Confucian values.

Due to Korean situation sensitivity, reference terms options for indicating the same woman have multitudinous including 'haksayng' (student), 'yeca' (she), 'agassi' (young woman), 'acwumeni' (aunt), 'imo' (aunt), 'enni' (elder sister), 'chenye' (maiden), 'kongcwu' (princess). All mean 'she' but vary depending on local contexts. 'Kongcwu' ('princess'), in particular, carries the specific implication that the addressee thinks she is a distinguished person. 'Yeca' has a disparaging connotation, because it implies gender differentiation. In an institutional context, if a male professor addresses a senior female professor as 'yeca', it will likely be taken as an insult, because gender differentiation predominates the meaning of this reference term. In Korean there are many variants to indicate a female depending on contexts as well as emotional attitude as shown in the

[6] On an envelope the sender tends to employ 'kwiha' to show deference for the receiver, the addressee referent.

following. The following extract shows that Korean reference terms display multi-functionality and situation sensitivity in locally specific contexts on a discursive level.

Extract 2

L: professor (aged 46)
S: professor (aged 45)

1. L: *Chong cang manwula-ka haksayng-eykey yoksel-ul phepwu-ess-tako ha-tentey…*
   (President wife-NOM student-OBJ offensive language-OBJ pour on-PAST-CONN2-do-CIRCUM.)
   I was told that the President's wife used offensive language with a student.

2. S: *Ku-key cengmal in-ka-yo?*
   (The thing-NOM true-be: verb-ATTR2-NOM-ADVS-INTERR?)
   Is it true?

3. L: *Han-haksayng-i email-lo chongcang-ul pinan-han-kes-ul ku-yeca-ka poko nan-twi-ey tangcang chaca-kaci-ko simhakey kkwucisko hak kyo-lul ttena-lako han moyang-i-tentey…*
   (Students-NOM email-OBL President-OBJ blame do: -ATTR2 –thing-OBJ the female-NDRT-NOM see -CONN2-after-LOC straight away search –take-CONN2 severely-scold-CONN2 school-OBJ quit–CONN2 do: ATTR2-seem-NOM–CIRCUM.).
   A student sent the President a reproachful email and the wife of the President quickly found out who the student was and told the student to quit the school.)..

4. S: *Chongcang samo-nim-i kyoyang-i ep-kwuna…*
   Ku-acwumma-ka chongcang bodyguard-kwuna.

   (President wife-NOM culture-NOM not: exist-UNASSIM.
   The woman-NDRT-NOM President bodyguard-UNASSIM.)
   The wife of the President is uncultured. The acwumma is the bodyguard of the President.
   (One Professor's mobile phone is ringing and he receives the phone with a loud voice leaving the hall.)

5. *Eng kulay kal-kkey. Na cikum Ta-lun kyoswu-nim-hako iyaki-hako iss-nun cwung-i-*

ketun.
(Eng Yes NDHR go-ATTR1-INT.
I-NDPP now other Professor–HM and talk -do –CONN2 -exist: be ATTR2--PROG –CORREL.)
Yes, I'll do it. I'm now talking with other professor.

In this context, the President is holding a faculty meeting and the President is making it clear that he has nothing to do with the embezzlement of the public funds and the business trip expenses. The President also makes it clear that his wife has nothing to do with the allegations of indiscreet behavior. As can be seen in line 3, the wife of the President over reacted to a negative email by a student about the President and overtly scolded the students causing the student to leave the university as shown in lines 1, and 3. The President intentionally lied in the presence of the faculty staff, however because the faculty council had already investigated all the wrongdoings and posted the corrupt actions of the President on the campus bulletin board. Professors sitting in the back were claiming that the President embezzled the public funds. They also talked about the affair by the President with a female academic and that they often went on business trips together. All the professors were shocked at this news. However, the most important thing is that the President was telling a blatant lie.

These institutional participants (two male academics) strategically change reference terms according to ongoing contextual norms. In line 1, the male professor employs 'manwula' (a derogatory address term for the wife of a super ordinate) when referring to the wife of the President. In line 3, the address form, 'yeca', the most derogatory form possible, is used in reference to the wife of the President. Notice, that the choice of 'samonim' (the most deferential address form for a married woman), in line 4, is the normal register for referring to the wife of a super-ordinate, but it is understood as scornful because of the contextual flow of the utterances, all of which are employed to express the deep feeling of offence by the speaker. Importantly, in the same sequential talk, in line 4, the use of reference term, 'acwumma' toward the wife of the President clearly shows variations of emotional stances according to ongoing interactional contexts and the interpretations can also be regarded as contemptuous. In this utterance, the speaker does not pay attention to the conventionally appropriate address term; instead, interactional norms are exploited to show the negative emotional stance of the speaker. Interactional norms take precedence over institutional conventions as the academic staff disparages the wife of the President for her uncouth manner.

Finally, half of the professors present in the meeting went outside as a token of protest, because the dishonesty of the President enraged the faculty staff. This extract clearly demonstrates that the misbehavior by the President made the meeting place unsettled so

that not everybody was inclined to say goodbye, because everybody was leaving the meeting place indiscreetly in the course of the communication by the President.

V. CONCLUSION, SUGGESTIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Taking a situation-specific approach to politeness (Pan~~:~~ 2000), this paper examines spoken data that are derived from situation-specific contexts and analyze how situational features affect the adoption of polite linguistic strategies in relationship to the P, D, and R variables. This paper also ~~In particular, my intention is to~~ analyzes the question of why in seemingly similar contexts different linguistic forms are employed. This paper specifically seeks to explore how cultural values influence the way politeness is constructed in an institutional context. Questions about ~~as well as~~ how the delicate balance between social conventions and the speaker's discursive identity is negotiated and how this negotiation affects local norms and institutional identity is also observed.

The results of this study has advanced the previous studies by showing how speakers intentionally manipulate cultural values in the combination of 'pwunpyelseng' (culture-specific discernment) in order to achieve pragmatic goals (Ide, 1989; Matsumoto, 1988; Pizziconi, 2003). The Korean deference focusing on super-ordinate-benevolence and subordinate-loyalty manifests itself in the form of over politeness towards superiors as a token of respect and faithfulness: the more respect shown to the hearer, the more devotion implied to the superior. This Confucian notion of deference can be conversely utilized in order to mitigate the *R* variable that exists within power relationships. This Confucian thinking helps to renegotiate power relationships that can be used to achieve the pragmatic goals of the speaker.

The data in the current study demonstrates that Korean deference (which reflects cultural values) displays dualistic aspects (e.g. positive versus negative aspects, FTA versus FEA and discernment versus volition) and focuses on multi-functionality that is dependent on a multitude of local norms. Unlike previous research on the actual spoken data, Korean A-R terms demonstrate that the use of honorific forms is subject to locally specific contextual norms utilizing culture-specific values. It is the local sensitivity of an FTA that causes Korean A-R terms to have such a large number of variants for a multitude of pragmatic goals ~~(See section 3.2.1 & 3.2.2)~~. This is a radical shift and belies the attempts of other researchers (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Fukada & Asato, 2004; Ide, 1989; Matsumoto, 1988; Pizziconi, 2003) to link linguistic politeness to locally normative structures.

The fact that the institutional participants utilize social indexing ('discernment') motivated by strategic goals can be applicable to the teaching of English conversational

skills. The practices of producing the target language (English) should be focused on cultural values and a culture-specific discernment that are embedded in the target language in order for the students master multi-functional language use. The reason can be attributed to the fact that students should be able to command multi-functional language use in order to deal with various kinds of situations (either FTAs or FEAs) especially in interactional discourse contexts. In English classrooms, Korean students must know the cultural knowledge that is embedded in the conventionalized cultural expressions in order to efficiently negotiate the pragmatic meanings (Park, 2007; Yun, 1991). The reason lies in the fact that cultural knowledge is not only used for indexing rank differences, it can be also utilized for marking the strategic intentions of the speaker. For example, Korean deference functions as a strategic tool that is used as a verbal redress mechanism for FTAs or FEAs due to the culturally shared knowledge (Brown, 2005, p. 4). Korean honorific forms display multi-functionality in order to achieve a specific pragmatic agenda.

All cultures have a different cultural discourse system that enables speakers to actively promote identities through self-conscious cultural values. Confucian cultural values can trigger sympathy and cooperation due to a culturally shared understanding. Due to the commonly understood thinking, Confucian values that reside in the minds of Korean speakers can trigger mutuality and warmth that strongly mitigate the *R* variable that exists within power relationship. English educators should provide conventionalized cultural expressions as well as cultural knowledge so that students can learn better communicative skills in the construction of polite linguistic behavior.

Actual spoken data employed in this study clearly demonstrates that linguistic politeness alone is not complete for the prevention of FTAs occurring from situation-specific contexts. It requires the inclusion of cultural values ~~integrated~~ and understanding their roles in situation-dependent politeness especially in constantly changing discourse contexts. In order for Korean students master good conversational skills, it is required that Korean English teachers provide both discernment (social indexing focusing on the grammatically and lexically encoded forms of politeness/honorifics) and volition (strategic language use depending on the situational features) (Byon, 2006, p. 255) practices in English classrooms. In order to do this, it is strongly required that Korean English teachers use lists of conventionalized cultural expressions as well as polite English expressions. It is also required that English educators teach both marked linguistic forms and A-R terms faced with various situational contexts. Because Korean language originates with Confucian values that have strongly influenced the foundation of Korean honorifics (including address reference terms), teaching cultural values will help students to grasp a better understanding of using situation specific polite linguistic forms.

REFERENCES

이정복. (1999). 국어 경어법의 전략적 용법에 대하여. *어학 연구*, *35*(1), 91-121.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*, 131-146.

Brown, L. (2005). *Korean honorifics, politeness and face*. Paper presented at the 2005 Politeness Conference, Nottingham: University of Nottingham, England.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987*). Politeness*: *Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byon, A. (2006). The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. *Journal of Politeness Research, 2*, 247-276.

Cameron, C. (1995). Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction (Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 53). *International Journal of Inter-cultural Relation, 19*(2), 335-339.

Cameron, D., Elizabeth, F., Penelope, H., Ben, R., & Kay, R. (1992). *Researching language: Issues of power and method*. London: Routledge.

Chang, Y. (1976). The urban Korean as individual. In S-Y. Chun (Ed.), *Korean society* (pp. 147-161). Seoul: International Cultural Foundation.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Fairclough, N. (Ed.). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 219-236.

Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: Application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1991-2002.

Hong, J-O. (2006). The functional notion of Korean honorific usages reflecting Confucian ideologies. *Modern English Education, 7*(1), 73-100.

Hong, J-O. (2007a). *Social norms can be discerned in the functional aspects of Korean honorific usage*. Poster presentation given at the 10th International Pragmatics Conference. Göteborg, the University of Göteborg, Sweden.

Hong, J-O. (2007b). *Situated politeness displays discursive, culture-specific and interactional values*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Symposium on Politeness conference, Leeds: the University of Leeds, UK.

Hong, J-O. (2008). *Confucian frame as a new communication framework for inter-cultural research on politeness.* Paper presented at the 4th International

Symposium on Politeness, Budapest: The Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and Applications*. UK: Polity Press, Black.

Hwang, J. R. (1975). *Role of sociolinguistics in foreign language education with reference to Korean and English terms of address and levels of deference*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Hwang, J. R. (1990). Deference versus politeness in Korean speech. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 82*, 42-55.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua, 8*(2-3), 223-248.

Kang, A. (2000). *Talk interaction, and cultural persistence: Constituting Korean American discourse in a meeting context.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Koo, J. H. (1992). The term of address "you" in South Korea today. *Korea Journal Seoul Korea, 32*(1), 27-42.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: or, minding your p's and q's. Papers from *the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305).

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman

Locher, M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Re-examination of the universality of face: Politeness in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 403-426.

Matsumoto, Y. (1993). Linguistic politeness and cultural style: Observations from Japanese. In P. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics II* (pp. 55-67). Stanford University, California: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Okamura, A. (2003). *Do English speakers address their Japanese colleagues by their first name, while talking in English in Japan?* Unpublished article.

Okamura, A. (2005). What do you call your colleagues?: On address forms in cross-cultural communication. In A. Trosborg & P. E. Jogensen (Eds.), *Business discourse: Texts and contexts* (pp. 161-184). Bern: Peter Lang.

Pan, Y. (2000). *Politeness in Chinese face-to-face interaction*. UK: Greenwood.

Park, J-K. (2007). Korean children's English language learning and cultural adaptation in Australia. Paper presented at the 5th Asia TEFL Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examination, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1471-1506.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 191-228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sohn, H. M. (1986). *Linguistic expedition. Seoul*: Han Shin.

Suh, C. S. (1989). *A Study of politeness*. Hanshin Publishing Co.

Suh, C. S. (1994). *Korean grammar* (Revised ed.). Han Yang University: Han Yang University Press.

Suh, C. S. (1996). A cultural perspective on the Korean language. *Korea Journal, 36*(3), 40-52.

ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversational analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.

Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse.* London: Longman.

Watts, R. J. (1989). Relevance and relational work: Linguistic politeness as politic behavior. *Multilingua, 8*(2-3), 131-166.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003) The theory of cultural scripts as a tool of cross-cultural communication. *Korean Linguistics, Korean Linguistic Conference, 18*, 191-218.

Yun, Seon-Ok. (1991). *The effect of cognitive styles on foreign language learning.* Unpublished master's thesis. Ewha Woman's University, Seoul, South Korea.

Yum, J. O. (1988). Korean philosophy and communication. In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives* (pp. 71-86). London: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, D. H., & D. Boden (1991). 'Structure-in-action'. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethno methodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge: Polity Press.

APPENDIX 1

The Actual Use of Address Reference Terms

1. How do you address a person who is higher in status than you?
2. How do you address a professor who is older than you (within 5 years)?
3. How do you address a professor who is much older (more than 10 years) than you?
4. How do you address a secretary who works in your department?
5. How do you address a secretary who works in another department?
6. If you are a non-academic member of the staff, how do you address members of the academic staff?
   1) to a younger professor
   2) to an elder professor
7. If you are a member of the academic staff, how do you address members of the non-academic staff?

8. How do you address undergraduate students?
9. How do you address postgraduate students?
10. How do you address students during causal encounters outside the classroom?
11. How do you address your direct superior in a causal encounters outside work?
12. How do you address a younger director/department chair?
13. How do you address an elder director/department chair?
14. How do you address older postgraduate students?
15. How do you address older undergraduates?
16. Have you ever used different address-reference terms (A-R) towards your superiors while making professional, work-related requests?
17. Have you ever used different address reference terms when making job-related requests of a secretary or colleague? If so, please give examples.
18. Have you ever noticed a change in how you address or refer to your colleagues when you are emotional? If so, please give examples.
19. How do you refer to the following people?
    1) wife/husband
    2) colleagues (non-academic/academic staff)
    3) cleaning women/men
    4) wives of direct superiors
20. How do people address you?

APPENDIX 2

Situational Politeness Questions

1. When you use politeness forms, which one of the following items is most important to consider?
    1) status
    2) age
    3) what you want
    4) situation/context
    5) 1, 2, 3, and 4 should all be considered
    6) it depends upon the attitude of the speaker (volition)
2. Do you always use identical politeness forms with the same people? If not, when do you use different forms? What about these situations?
    1) a professor (a superior) towards a secretary (an inferior) – when the request is not relevant to work
    2) a professor (a superior) towards a secretary (an inferior) – when the request is relevant to work
3. If the following people are addressed in the same context, to whom would you use the most polite honorific forms?
    1) non-academic staff
    2) secretary

3) elder professors at the same department
4) janitor
5) cleaning woman
6) younger director/department chair at the same department

4. If you often use informal rather than formal forms, please tell me the reason. If you think Korean politeness forms are more complex than those of English counterparts, Please tell me why you think that.

APPENDIX 3

Abbreviations

ADVS = Average Deferential Verbal Suffix ('~*yo*, ~요')
ATTR1 = Attributive (Irrealis) ('~()-()l, ~을')
ATTR2= Attributive (Realis) ('()n, ~은)

CIRCUM = Circumstantial ('(n)*ntey*, ~는데')
COM = Comitative (*hako*/*haku* ~~하고/-하구)
COND = Conditional ('~*tamyen*, ~다면, ~면')

CONN1 = Connective (/a ~~어/-아) = connects verbs in serial verb constructions used in the resultant state construction.
CONN2 = Connective (~(-*ko*/-*ku* ~고/-구) = Connects clauses that express parallel actions used in progressive construction.
CORREL = Correlative (*ktn* ~거든) indicates the existence of necessity
HM= Honorific Marker ('~*nim*, ~님')
IMPER = Imperative ('~*la*, ~라', '~*sio*, ~시오, '~*sipsio*, ~십시오')

INT = Intentional ('~()-()*lkkey*, ~을께')
INTERR = Interrogative
LOC = Locative ('~*ulo*', '~*ey*', '~으로', '~에').
NDHR = Non-deferential Honorific Reply (*ung*, *kelay*, 응, 그래~~etc~~)
NDPP = Non-deferential Personal Pronoun
NDVS = Non-deferential Verbal Suffix ('~*hanta*, ~한다', '~*hayla*, ~해라')
NECESS = Necessitative ('()*ya*, ~야')
NOM = Nominative (~(-*i*, ~*ka* ~이, ~가)
OBJ = Object Case Marker ('~*eykey*, ~에게', '~*ul*, ~을', '~*lul*, ~를'
PAST = Past tense ('~*ess*, ~었', '~*ass*, ~았)
PRECED = Precedence ('~*s* ~서', '~()-() *s* ~어서'

PROP = Proposition ('ㅅ_*ca*, ㅅ_자', 'ㅅ_*haca*, ㅅ_하자')
TOP = Topic ('ㅅ_*nun*, 'ㅅ_는', 'ㅅ_ *un*, ㅅ_ 은')
UNASSIM = Unassimilated ('ㅅ_*kwuna*, ㅅ_구나', 'ㅅ_*kwun*, ㅅ_군', 'ㅅ_*keney*, ㅅ_거네')

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary and College

Jin-ok Hong
Institute of Foreign language Education
Inje University607 Obang Dong, Gim Hae City, Gyung Sang Nam Do
South Korea
Tel: (055) 320-3762
Fax: (055) 333-8231
Email: langhong@inje.ac.kr

Received in April, 2009
Reviewed in May, 2009
Revised version received in June, 2009