L2 Korean learners' pragmalinguistic features
Focusing on making requests in power-asymmetrical situations

Lan Kim and Sang-Seok Yoon
Pennsylvania State University | University of Iowa

This study investigates the pragmalinguistic features of Korean as a Foreign Language (KFL) learners' request speech acts in power-asymmetrical situations, focusing on interactions with social superiors. Through a discourse completion test (DCT), 31 KFL students and 12 Korean native speakers (KNS) were analyzed using a coding system which is developed based on the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). Despite acquiring basic linguistic elements, KFL learners struggle to apply them effectively, particularly in nuanced social contexts. The findings underscore the necessity of explicit instruction on the pragmalinguistic functions of grammatical forms to bridge the gap between classroom learning and real-world language use. This study contributes valuable insights into the intercultural pragmatics of KFL learners, addressing gaps in the literature regarding the detailed analysis of learners' language use in request speech acts, especially in situations involving social superiors. The pedagogical implications emphasize the need for enhanced instruction in KFL pragmatics to cultivate learners' pragmatic awareness.

Keywords: Korean as a Foreign Language, Communicative Competence, L2 pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics, request speech act, pragmalinguistic features, Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP)

1. Introduction

In the field of second language (L2) acquisition, communicative competence is now considered the main goal of language learning. Accordingly, language teaching/pedagogy emphasizes promoting L2 learners' pragmatic competence. Much

research on the acquisition of L2 pragmatics has been conducted within a variety of languages and cultures, including English, European languages (e.g., German and Spanish), and Japanese L2 learners (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989, Faerch & Kasper 1989, Fukushima 1996, Hassall 2003, Félix-Brasdefer 2007, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008, Iwasaki 2008, Woodfield & Economidou-Kogetsidis 2010).

In the last few decades, there has also been a limited but growing number of studies in the field of KFL (e.g., Byon 2002, 2004, Yoon 2011, Kim 2013). Previous studies on KFL learners' interlanguage pragmatics have agreed that the learners often diverge from the target pragmatic norms, despite having acquired sufficient linguistic features to convey their intentions, resulting in pragmatic failure. However, more research remains to be conducted in order to address KFL learners' lack of pragmatic competence, particularly in settings that involve interacting with social superiors, as such situations have been reported as highly challenging and complex for KFL learners. Honorifics in particular stand as one of the most difficult aspects of the Korean language to acquire as honorifics encompass address terms, sentence endings, and honorific vocabulary. As a result, Korean L2 students need to invest a substantial amount of time into the learning and practicing honorifics.

In the research on interlanguage pragmatics, two aspects have been noted: sociopragmatics (i.e., the social perceptions underlying the interpretation and performance of participants' communicative acts) and pragmalinguistics (i.e., the language resources used for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings) (Rose & Kasper 2001). While L2 learners who have the chance to interact with native speakers (L1) have greater opportunities to develop these two aspects of pragmatics, in reality many L2 students learn the language in their own country and often have limited opportunities to gain sufficient exposure to interacting with native speakers outside of the classroom. This means that in order to make up for the lack of opportunities to interact with native speakers experienced by those learning in the L2 classroom pragmatics should be taught in the L2 classroom, and instructors need to be familiar with these two sociopragmatic concepts when developing materials that include pragmatics.

The main focus of the current study is to identify the pragmalingusitic features of KFL students' request speech act, which is one of the most commonly used but challenging speech acts in daily life, by comparing them to those of KNS. Although various attempts have been made to understand KFL learners' pragmatic competence in the field, there has been limited exploration into learners' real language usage. While basic honorific expressions, address terms, sentence endings, and structures used for common request situations (e.g., 'Can/May I...?', 'Can/Could you...?', and 'Will you please...?') are learned relatively early on, as they are essential to carrying out a basic level Korean conversation, numerous

KFL learners struggle to apply them appropriately in actual request situations. To the best of our knowledge, empirical studies analyzing KFL learners' pragmalinguistic data involving various honorifics and sentence structures in request situations are scarce in the literature. Therefore, we delve into KFL learners' language uses within request speech acts in detail and identify pragmalinguistic performance differences between KFL learners and KNS. Using our collected learners' data indicating that numerous KFL learners have difficulty applying pertinent expressions they have learned in class to a real-life situation, we describe L2 learners' pragmalinguistic deviations in power-asymmetrical request situations, emphasize the need to teach the pragmalinguistic functions of grammatical forms, and aim to offer KFL educators insights to enhance their instruction of Korean L2 pragmatics. The present study addresses important research topics concerning: (1) what types of request strategies and modification devices are employed by KFL learners and KNS; (2) how KFL students' requests deviate from those of KNS and what are pragmalinguistic features of common expressions that the learners have used; and (3) what are the pedagogical implications of the current study, which seeks to develop L2 learners' pragmatic awareness and competence in intercultural pragmatics?

The request situations we focus on are ones where a speaker needs to make a request to someone who is in a higher social position. From a KNS's standpoint, making a request to one's superior may impose heavier psychological burdens than making a request to someone of a similar or lower status. Also, in Korean, making a request to a social superior requires understanding the differences between the social statuses and the proper use of honorifics. Therefore, such pragmatically challenging situations allow us to examine the language use of KFL students and KNS in greater detail. A DCT was administered to thirty-one KFL students, including Beginning and Intermediate groups, and twelve KNS; it required them to articulate requests in three different situations where the addressee was of a higher social status. While DCT data possess limitations due to the fact that it is in a written format, it offers advantages in terms of probing students' comprehension of request situations and the pragmatic elements within the structures they have learned. For that reason, as Byon (2015) mentioned, DCT has been the most popular data gathering method for KFL pragmatics studies. Moreover, considering the overall proficiency level of the study participants, who might not readily generate responses for each situation if they had to generate verbally, the DCT method presents the benefit of providing the necessary data for our study's objectives. Their responses were first analyzed based on our coding system, developed based on the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). CCSARP is a cornerstone study in interlanguage pragmatic research and aims to identify differences in requests across diverse languages by examining sociopragmatic and prag-

malinguistic features of various levels of L2 learners. Hence, it is a useful tool for comparing cross-cultural differences between L1 and L2 students. For our analysis, we used a revised version of the CCSARP coding system in order to examine request strategies and modification devices. Through a close analysis we further identify additional linguistic features to figure out what constitutes pragmatically appropriate behavior when making a request in Korean. We will show that while beginning to intermediate level students have already learned the necessary linguistic forms for making simple requests, there has been a lack of detailed discussions among instructors and lack of instruction in the classroom for students on how students employ these forms and how to effectively teach them in order to make requests appropriately. In this study, we aim to illustrate how KFL students utilize the linguistic forms and expressions they have learned and discuss their relevance to students' pragmatic competence.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the pertinent literature on request speech acts. Section 3 discusses the participants, data collection, and methods of analysis. Section 4 presents our findings and analysis of the data, which will be followed by discussions about them in Section 5. In Section 6, we discuss the implications of this research and present our concluding remarks.

2.   Literature review

Interlanguage pragmatics refers to "the nonnative speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts and how their L2-related speech act knowledge is acquired" (Kasper & Dahl 1991:1). To successfully develop these pragmatic abilities, Martinez-Flor & Usó-Juan (2010) identified three crucial conditions for learners: providing appropriate input, offering opportunities for production or output, and delivering effective feedback. Studies on interlanguage pragmatics emphasize the importance of introducing pragmatic instruction during the early stages of language learning (Bardovi-Harlig 2001, Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor 2003). Furthermore, as Taguchi (2011) highlighted, studies on interlanguage pragmatics have substantiated the benefits of explicit instruction on pragmatic functions. However, teaching pragmatics in language classes still remains very challenging, as there have been fewer discussions on how and what to teach. Fortunately, pragmatics is currently receiving more attention, and various attempts have been made to teach pragmatics. One common approach is the instruction of commonly found speech acts.

Among many speech acts, requests have received much attention because they are one of the most commonly used speech acts in daily life and are essential

for observing a learner's pragmatic knowledge and competence. Requests are realized through a variety of linguistic forms, express multiple pragmatic functions or intentions, and encode the relative status of the speaker and the addressee; requests create an environment that allows us to examine how linguistic forms are related to intentions (e.g., Achiba 2003). Therefore, research on requests can provide valuable information for examining L2 learners' pragmalinguistic competence and development.

Numerous studies on the pragmatic development of requests have revealed a marked tendency for learners to use direct strategies that rely on many unanalyzed formulae and repetition in the earlier stages of their L2 development and then gradually expand their pragmatic repertoire, including employing various indirect strategies that demonstrate more productive language use (e.g., Rose & Kasper 2001). For example, Rose's (2000) cross-sectional study showed that ESL learners with a lower level of proficiency use direct strategies, consisting of simple language in request situations (e.g., 'Give me your notes'), and showed progress in the movement from direct to conventionally indirect request strategies. However, even after learners reach a higher level of proficiency, it remains quite taxing for many of them to achieve native-like communicative competence in that learners may still face difficulties developing a full understanding of the sociopragmatic aspects of the target language and culture in face-threatening situations. For instance, Kim (1995) reported that Korean ESL students with a high-intermediate to advanced level of proficiency in English failed to employ appropriate strategies in highly face-threatening request situations using pragmatically adequate linguistic expressions.

Recent studies on speech acts avoid determining a specific speech act without considering the overall interaction. House & Kádár (2021) mentioned that research on speech acts should be done in an interactionally anchored way. Studies on speech acts used to focus on the linguistic structures or directness of the head act, but recently, more studies are focusing on requests from a perspective of discursive pragmatics or interactional competence (Young 2011). As Ackermann (2023) mentioned, discussions of requests, linguistic indirectness, and politeness should not be focused simply on the head act, but the overall supportive moves (both internal and external) should be considered comprehensively.

In a KFL setting, managing requests in Korean can be a challenging task for many KFL learners. One challenging factor is that interlocutors are expected to make appropriate use of honorifics and expressions that adequately mark the required level of formality in various power-asymmetrical situations. In order to do this, it is important for interlocutors to sufficiently understand the hierarchical social relationships. Previous studies on Korean L2 learners' requests have reported that KFL learners perceive power-asymmetrical situations differ-

ently from KNS, and this difference can lead to pragmatic failures for many learners. For example, in a study involving American KFL students, Byon (2004) discussed how social status (or power) and social familiarity (or distance) were the most crucial factors for his KNS participants when formulating requests, while the KFL learners could not understand the concepts of power and distance. In a similar vein, Rue et al. (2007) found that when there were more power relationships among Korean workers, more indirect strategies were preferred. They have argued that power status is the most important factor when making requests in the Korean workplace. Kim & Lee (2017) also compared workplace emails written by Korean and American employees and discussed how they perceived power-asymmetry situations differently. According to them, for Korean employees, hierarchical power was a more important factor than familiarity, while American employees prioritized maintaining solidarity over caring about power relationships.

Another major finding in the KFL context concerns the notion of directness. It has generally been accepted that KFL students tend to use direct and simple strategies when they are at the beginning level, and they can make use of a variety of linguistic forms to elaborate their requests more indirectly as they advance toward a higher level of proficiency. However, other studies (e.g., Yu 2004, Byon 2006, Hahn 2009) have shown that the concept of (in)directness in Korean is not always compatible with that of Indo-European languages (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). For example, Byon (2006) analyzed head acts of requests made by KNS and has shown that indirectness and politeness are not always correlated in Korean: his study's participants preferred the most direct strategy in a situation where they had to request a letter of recommendation from their professor. He argues that when the contents of the request are concerning a listener's duty, it is more natural to make the request using direct expressions with adequate honorifics. Thus, even though the overall structure of a request seems direct and impolite, using honorifics can make the request polite and appropriate. Yu (2004, 2011) has also shown that KNS perceive explicit request forms as more polite than implicit request forms, which is different from English conventions. Yu (2011) compared Korean with English and Hebrew and argues that conventional indirect strategies, such as strong hints, mild hints, and suggestory formulae within the nine request categories of requests strategies (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), are not significantly correlated with politeness in Korean; rather, direct strategies involving performatives and want statements are perceived as polite strategies in Korean.

The studies mentioned above indicate that KFL learners may face different and pragmatically more challenging situations than Western language learners. This is because understanding complex hierarchical social relationships is critical to selecting adequate linguistic expressions in Korean. Power-asymmetrical situ-

ations are commonly encountered in daily life in Korea, and the speakers' choice of language should always appropriately reflect these complex social relationships. Byon's (2002, 2004) research presents observations pertinent to this point that KFL learners exhibit distinct sociopragmatic features such that they are less sensitive to power, more direct, and individualistic compared to native speakers of Korean when making a request act in Korean. Byon (2002) shows that 50 female advanced KFL learners' pragmalinguistic errors are typically found in their choice of lexical items, phrases, and address terms supporting Sohn (1986) that Koreans are more hierarchical and collectivistic than Americans. Byon (2004) analyzes KFL learners' request strategies, request head acts, and supportive moves (see Section 3.3 for the explanations of these terms) based on data drawn from written DCTs and reveals that a number of sociopragmatic differences existent between KFL learners and KNS. For example, the majority of KFL learners make a request first and employ a ground later and use a number of greeting openers, as opposed to Korean native speakers. Byon (2006) examines the usage of honorific forms among Korean native speakers and argues that the indirectness of Korean requests differs from English due to Korean's complex honorific system. While a number of Byon's studies produce initial findings on KFL learners' request acts in Korean and offer an understanding of the sociopragmatic features of a request speech act, empirical studies that substantially focus on KFL learners' pragmalinguistic features and describe KFL learners' erroneous linguistic data (including learners with a beginner level) remain to be conducted, which is the main purpose of our current study. As noted in the introduction, honorific expressions, address terms, sentence endings, and structures that are used for common request situations are learned relatively early on when studying Korean. However, it is no surprise that KFL learners struggle in applying them appropriately in actual request situations, which indicates that work addressing pragmalinguistic usages of grammatical forms need to be conducted. The current study is in line with previous studies, but what is different is that we identify and examine in more detail the students' common patterns that makes overall requests inappropriate. We suggest that students learn to use known linguistic features appropriately in pragmatic contexts to prevent miscommunication due to their limited sociolinguistic knowledge. In this respect, this study will contribute to studies of Korean request speech acts, which has been under-researched other than in the representative works by Byon (2002, 2004, 2006), and contribute to an understanding of the pragmalinguistic competence of KFL learners.

In the remainder of the current paper, we present KFL learners' request strategies and their pragmalinguistic features in detail in power-asymmetrical situations and compare them with those of KNS. We also discuss Korean-language specific pragmalinguistic features that can be taught to KFL learners in the class-

room and suggest that pragmatic components need to be included when designing curriculum and activities.

3.   Methodology

3.1   Participants

Thirty-one KFL undergraduate students enrolled in Korean language courses at two large state universities in the United States participated in this study. For comparison, twelve KNS students from the same universities also participated.[1] The KFL students had no experience studying or living in Korea, nor did they have a Korean background heritage. These learners were further divided into two groups, Beginning and Intermediate, based on their proficiency level. The Beginning group consisted of seventeen students who were enrolled in the second semester of first-year Korean language courses. All students in the Beginning group had to have completed one semester of formal KFL instruction, where they had learned basic words and expressions, to qualify as participants so they could communicate in uncomplicated, basic settings using simple language. The Intermediate group consisted of fourteen students who were enrolled in the second semester of third-year Korean language courses at the same universities. Compared to the Beginning group, they could communicate in more complicated settings using extended sentences and they had completed a minimum of two and a half years (equivalent to 5 semesters) of formal KFL instruction by the time of the study. The ages of KFL learners ranged between 19 and 22. The twelve KNS students were from the same universities. They were international undergraduate students who were born and lived in Korea until they started studying at the US universities. Their ages ranged between 20 and 23. We did not consider gender differences for our analysis.

3.2   Data collection

The main data collection method for the present study was a DCT, which has been a popular data elicitation method to assess various speech acts since it was

---

1. As an anonymous reviewer points out, the sample size for the current study is be relatively small and the number of participants is different for each group. Despite the relatively small sample size, the elicited data revealed systematic and common patterns that allowed us to discuss pragmalinguistic features of KFL learners and KNS students that are consistently found in the data.

first used by Blum-Kulka (1982) to examine the requestive behavior of English learners of Hebrew and then adopted by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) for their cross-cultural speech act project. We selected a DCT as our data elicitation instrument because it fits the purpose of the present study. Specifically, DCTs are useful because they allow us to manipulate hierarchy and power, the important contextual variables considered in the current study. In addition, DCTs enable us to examine the particular speech act of our study (request speech act), whereas in natural conversations the occurrence of a target speech act (request) is difficult to predict. Despite these advantages, we are aware that eliciting data through DCTs may not be the ideal option. As Byon (2015) mentions, various studies have pointed out the limitations of DCTs. One primary drawback is that DCTs elicit oral data in a written discourse context, which means the way people actually speak may not be reflected in written language (e.g., Kasper & Dahl 1991, Kasper 2000, Kasper & Rose 2002). Also, DCT data do not involve interactions among speakers, which can include turn taking, emotional depth, or other pragmatic features that may be unique to naturally occurring dialogues (e.g., Beebe & Cummings 1996). Nevertheless, we believe that DCTs were an appropriate method for investigating pragmalinguistic features of KFL learners in the request speech act. As mentioned above, DCTs allow us to elicit data comparable to real-world speech act performances by letting us set up a request situation and manipulate the contextual factors; they also allow us to collect a significant amount of data in a quick and convenient manner.

In our study, we presented the request situations using a Google Form, and the participants were asked to write what they would say in given situations. Our DCTs contained three scenarios that commonly occur between a student and a professor in American universities. Each situation was designed to resemble those that would take place in an academic setting familiar to the participants. The first scenario was to ask a professor the speaker does not know well for permission to register for a class next semester that is already full. This situation requires a relatively high level of imposition because a student has to make a formal request to a professor who does not know them. The second one was to ask a professor for a make-up exam because the speaker cannot take the scheduled one due to their sister's wedding. This type of family occasion is often considered a legitimate excuse for absence from a class, but asking for a make-up test may not be a simple request. We wanted to see how students would deal with this tricky situation. The third scenario was to schedule an appointment outside of the professor's usual office hours. This is a common and relatively easy request situation compared with other two. The DCTs in the Google Form were written in Korean for both the KFL learners and the KNS. The DCTs for the Beginner group included English supplements for words they had not learned in class to avoid potential

pitfalls due to not understanding a word or an expression on the DCT, and for the Intermediate and the native speakers, a version without English supplements was provided. Both the KFL learners and the Korean native speakers were allowed to ask questions if they needed help clarifying the situations. (The DCT situations are presented in the Appendix.) Informal interviews were also conducted to aid the interpretation of the data after collection when necessary.

3.3 Methods

Our analysis of the data consists of two parts: (1) following the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), we examine a sequence of requests by focusing on strategies and modification devices used by the participants, and (2) we pay close attention to the linguistic forms and expressions used by the participants to identify what linguistic features constitute pragmatically appropriate behavior when making a request in Korean.

   As noted in Section 1, we adopted a coding system created by the CCSARP and used the classification systems developed by Kasper (1989), Zhang (1995), Hassall (2003), Trosborg (1995), and Kim & Jeon (2013), who also followed the CCSARP. We adjusted the CCSARP coding manual according to the linguistic forms and expressions found in our Korean language data.[2]

   On the basis of the revised CCSARP, we analyzed an entire sequence of requests that usually contain head acts and peripheral elements, such as an alerter and supportive move, as illustrated in (1) below, and examined head acts within request strategies.

(1)   <u>Tommy</u>,   <u>open the window, please</u>.   <u>This room is so hot</u>.
      alerter   head act   supportive move

The head act refers to a core request (*open the window*) and may have varying levels of directness (i.e., direct and indirect), which are further classified into various strategies and substrategies that consider the level of their directness; the directness is the degree to which the speaker's illocutionary intent is apparent from the locution (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989: 278). As illustrated in the appendix, which is classified based on the level of directness, the direct request strategy refers to one in which requests are realized in the most direct manner, employing the direct form of the language. To avoid the force of a request, speakers may employ the indirect request strategy; the indirect strategy is conventional or nonconventional depending on whether requests are realized in a particular linguistic form.

---

2. Our revised coding manual is attached in the Appendix.

In addition to request strategies, speakers may use various linguistic devices that internally modify head acts or are external modifications (i.e., supportive moves) adjacent to the main request (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984, Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). Internal modifications that are part of head acts occur within the speech act itself and play the role of minimizing or intensifying the illocutionary force of a request act, known as downgraders or an upgraders, respectively. In (1), the internal modification *please* is used to soften the force of the request. External modifications play the same role as internal modifications: they usually soften the force of the request, but they occur in the surrounding context of the head act, either preceding or following the request act. In (1), *this room is so hot* functions as an external modification device. As discussed in the literature (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), the presence of internal or external modifiers is not essential for the utterance to be potentially understood as a request, but using such modifiers can help relax the force of the request.

On the basis of our initial analysis, we closely examine linguistic features in detail to discover what constitutes pragmatically appropriate behavior when making a request in Korean, and we suggest some specific linguistic forms and expressions that are commonly used to make a request in Korean. As will be shown below, Korean linguistic features are different from those of the Western languages (i.e., Australian/American/British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, and Russian) dealt with in the CCSARP. The level of directness in a Korean request is not solely determined by sentence structure. Byon (2006) also argues that, while Anglo-American studies assert a universal positive correlation between politeness and linguistic indirectness, this universality cannot be applied to Korean. This is because, in Korean, various honorific devices can be incorporated into sentence structures to convey politeness. Therefore, we considered Korean-specific linguistic features (e.g., honorifics, sentence endings) in head-act strategies in detail while following the original CCSARP's classification.

In the following section, we will demonstrate that KFL students used strategies that were similar to those of KNS students, but their actual responses often sound awkward because they could not use appropriate linguistic forms, such as the combined forms of different auxiliary verbs, sentence endings, or honorific expressions that were routinely used by all KNS students who participated.

4.   Findings

4.1   Alerter

In Korean, the most common terms used to address a professor include *kyoswunim* 'professor' and *sensayngnim* 'teacher.' While *kyoswunim* 'professor' is the official title for a university professor, *sensayngnim* 'teacher' is a more general term used to address an educator, and *kyoswunim* 'professor' is more commonly used in university, regardless of the official position of the instructor.

Our participants show differences in their use of address alerters. Most KNS students used *kyoswunim* 'professor' without a last name, as in (2), with the exception of one student who used *sensayngnim* 'teacher.'

(2)   KNS
      kyoswunim, cey-ka swuep tut-tolok   helakhay
      professor   1-NOM class   take-in order to allow
      cwu-si-l swu iss-nunci-yo?
      give-HON-can-whether-POL
      'Professor, can you allow me to take your class?'

In contrast, most KFL students, both Beginning and Intermediate, used *sensayngnim* 'teacher' to address their professors while also using their last name, as illustrated in (3). This result may be due to the fact that the conversations in many American university textbooks commonly use *sensayngnim* 'teacher' rather than *kyoswunim* 'professor', and in general, in the United States KFL students are taught to call their professors *sensayngnim* 'teacher' of their first Korean language class.

(3)   KFL-Intermediate
      kim sensayngnim, sikan-i   encey iss-usey-yo?
      kim teacher   time-NOM when have-HON-POL
      'Prof. Kim, when do you have time?'

4.2   Head act strategies and linguistic forms used

As illustrated in Table 1,[3] our data show that across all the groups, the most frequently used head act strategies were conventional indirect strategies. However,

---

3. We calculated the number in each category for each group to identify general distributional differences among the groups. We did not conduct a detailed statistical analysis, as the primary focus of this study is to analyze the actual language use of each group based on understanding the learners' strategies and modification devices in their request.

as shown in Table 1, KFL and KNS students differ in that while all native speakers unanimously used conventional indirect strategies, the learners used both direct and indirect strategies: the Beginning students employed direct and (non-)conventional indirect strategies, and the Intermediate students used direct and conventional indirect strategies.

Table 1.

Strategies		Situation 1	Situation 2	Situation 3
Direct	Beg	11.1%	11.1%	23.5%
	Int	7%	0%	0%
	KNS	0%	0%	0%
Indirect (Conventional)	Beg	88.9%	55.6%	70.6%
	Int	93%	100%	100%
	KNS	100%	100%	100%
Indirect (Non-conventional; Hint)	Beg	0%	33.3%	5.9%
	Int	0%	0%	0%
	KNS	0%	0%	0%

It is worth noting that considerable differences are attested between the KFL-Beginner group and the KNS groups: even though a number of the KFL-Beginner and most of the KFL-Intermediate students used conventional indirect strategies, like the native speakers, numerous pragmalinguistic aspects of the learners' linguistic productions show deviations from native usage. In what follows, we focus on these differences in the pragmalinguistic expressions of the requests.

-e/a cwuseyyo 'please do something for me'

Overall, the Beginning students used simple linguistic expressions in their requests. Although a number of the Beginning students used indirect strategies similar to the KNS, their choice of predicates and sentence endings is plain and limited to plain verb and adjective forms, as opposed to those of the KNS. The expression the Beginning students most commonly used is the plain request form *-e/a cwuseyyo* 'please do something for me'; this form was attested as a direct strategy in all three situations. In Korean, *-e/a cwuta* is frequently used (1) when a speaker expresses the meaning 'to do something for someone' in a statement and (2) when making a request/command, 'please do something for me (the speaker)'; in such cases, *-e/a cwuta* is used with the polite ending *-seyyo*. The pattern *-e/a cwuseyyo* is often used for direct requests that require the listener's immediate

action (e.g., Kim 2021); therefore, using it when talking to one's professor may sound inappropriate in Korean. This is shown in (4).

(4) KFL-Beginning
　a. *kyoswunim-kkay(kkeyse) ce-nun(hantey) swuep-ul*
　　　professor-NOM　　　　　I-Dat　　　　class-ACC
　　　tulko swu isse cwuseyyo (tut-key hay cwu-si-l swu iss-eyo)?[4]
　　　take-let give-HON-can-POL
　　　'Professor, please make me take your class for me.
　b. *talun　　nal-ey sihem-i(ul) poye(po-key hay) cwu-sey-yo?*
　　　another day-at test-ACC　　take-let-give-HON-POL
　　　'Professor, please allow me to take a test on other days.'

As shown in (5), some Beginning students used the expression *towa cwuseyyo* 'please help me,' an expression typically used when seeking immediate help in Korean.

(5) KFL-Beginning
　a. *Kim sensayngnim sikan-i　　iss-usey-yo?　　sihem-ul towa cwu-sey-yo*
　　　Kim teacher　　　time-NOM have-HON-POL test-ACC help give-HON-POL
　　　'Teacher Kim, do you have time? Please help me with the test.'
　b. *kyoswunim coysongha-ciman, towa cwu-sey-yo*
　　　professor　sorry-but　　　help give-HON-POL
　　　'Professor, I am sorry, but please help me.'

Note that the KNS also used *-e/a cwuta* as exemplified in (2) above, but their use of *-e/a cwuta* is significantly different from that of the KFL learners; the KNS always used *-e/a cwuta* in combination with other modal expressions that make the entire request more polite and indirect. We will come back to this point later when discussing *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' and *-keyss* 'will' below.

-ko siphta 'want to'

Another frequent expression used by the Beginning students was *-ko siphta* 'want to,' an expression used to indicate one's desire. A number of Beginning students commonly used this simple form as an indirect strategy, as shown in (6); however, neither the Intermediate nor the KNS used it.

---

4. Errors in data are corrected in parentheses throughout the paper. The glosses are of the corrected forms.

(6) KFL-Beginning

a. *sihem-ttaymwuney kim sensayngnim manna-ko siph-eyo*
    test-because of   Kim teacher   meet-want-POL
    'Because of the exam, I want to meet you.'

b. *kyoswunim, swuep-ul tut-ko siph-supnita*
    professor   class-ACC take-want-DEF
    'Professor, I want to take your class.'

Why is it that the simple forms *-ko siphta* and *-e/a cwuseyyo* are preferred by the Beginning students and not used by the KNS and Intermediate students? These expressions are taught at the beginning level; the Beginning students had learned this form recently and could not make use of other indirect forms to make a request more polite. They might not have had sufficient exposure to the appropriate use of these forms in power-asymmetrical situations, as opposed to the Intermediate group. Previous studies (e.g., Trosborg 1995) have also reported that simple direct request strategies, like a statement of wish, are generally not used for formal requests unless combined with other devices that lessen the request force. However, several instances of the simple *-ko siphta* 'want to' structure were found in beginning-level students' data.

Absence of head act (Hint)

Another noteworthy finding regarding the Beginning students' use of request strategies is the absence of a head act. Some Beginning students could not express their request clearly and simply provided reasons or background situations that required the hearer (i.e., the professor) to guess what they wanted to request. Specifically, in the scenario where the student needs to arrange a make-up exam, some Beginning students (33%) offered only contextual information, failing to request rearranging an exam. This is shown in (7).

(7) KFL-Beginning

a. *cey enni kyelhonsik taymwuney(ttaymwuney) ce-nun hankwuke swuep*
    my sister wedding because of   I-TOP Korean   class
    mos   wa-yo.   kuliko sihem-to mos   pwa-yo.
    cannot come-POL and   test-also cannot take-POL
    'I cannot attend the Korean class because of my sister's wedding. And I cannot take the test either.'

b. *yetongsayng kyelhonhay-se sihem-i(ul) hal swu eps-eyo*
    sister   marry-so   test-ACC   do cannot-POL
    'I cannot take the test because my sister is getting married.'

Following Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), we classified these examples as hints, as they only used contextual information relevant to the performance of a request. How-

ever, it does not appear that they intentionally used the hint strategy to convey their request intention indirectly. Rather, we assume that they lacked the linguistic and pragmatic ability to express their request intention appropriately because asking for permission is practiced in intermediate-level classes in our curriculum.

pwuthak tulipnita 'I am asking you a favor/I am looking forward to your cooperation.'

As reported so far, the Beginning group used direct strategies using the simple direct expressions *-e/a cwuseyo* and *-ko shipta* to make a request to a professor. A very small number of the Intermediate students also used such direct strategies, but their expressions used a more formal one, *pwuthak tulipnita* 'I am asking you a favor/I am looking forward to your cooperation.', as exemplified in (8).

(8) KFL-Intermediate
   a. *swumanhun salam-tul-un   imi   tut-nun-ci   al-ciman*
       many   people-PL-TOP already take-REL-fact know-but
       ce-nun kkok   tul-eyaha-ki ttaymwuney
       I-TOP definitely take-must-because
       ce-lul chwuka-lul pwuthak-tuli-pnita.
       I-ACC add-ACC ask-give-DEF
       'I know there are already many people registered for this course, but I am asking you to add me because I have to take the course.'
   b. *colepha-lye-myen   i swuep-i   philyohay-se swuep-ey tayhan*
       graduate-intend to-if this class-NOM need-so   class-about
       sungin-ul   pwuthak-tuli-pnita
       approval-ACC ask-give-DEF
       'In order to graduate, I need this class, so I am asking for your approval for this class.'

However, *pwuthak tulipnita* was not found in the KNS. This can be explained by the fact that *pwuthak tulipnita* is a direct and literary expression that occasionally may be used in formal writing, such as a letter or an email (Yoon & Lee 2011), but sounds too formal in oral communications.

A query preparatory modal -(u)l swu issta 'can'

Turning to indirect strategies, the data revealed findings similar to those already presented. While Beginning students used simple expressions, Intermediate students used a wider variety of linguistic expressions, but a number of their usages are limited; they sound unelaborate and less formal. The major difference between the learners and the native speakers is that the latter made appropriate use of combined forms of different auxiliary/modal verbs in the given situations.

Let us start with *-(u)l swu issta* 'can,' one of the most frequently used expressions, as shown in (9).

(9)   KFL

    a. Beginning
       sey si-ey   *manna-l swu iss-usey-yo*?
       three o'clock-at meet-can-HON-POL
       'Can you see me at three o'clock?'

    b. Intermediate
       hoksi   *talun*   *moim-ul*   *yaksokha-l swu iss-eyo*?
       by any chance another meeting-ACC promise-can-POL
       'Can we make an appointment for another meeting?'

As illustrated in (9a) and (9b), the learners used the simple expression *-(u)l swu issta* when making a request to their professors. Utterances like (9), however, were not found in the KNS group. This may be because, unlike English *can* or *be able to*, the Korean possibility modal *-(u)l swu issta* is not perceived as a request by itself. Instead, in order to express one's request in Korean, *-(u)l swu issta* needs to be used with other auxiliary verbs, such as *-e/a cwu-si-l swu issta* 'to be able to do something for someone' (a combined form with the benefactive expression *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for ...' and the subject honorific suffix *-si-*). In Korean, such an extended pattern is almost always used with adverbs such as *com* 'a little' or *hoksi* 'by any chance,' which can soften the force of one's request (e.g., Yu 2004), as shown in (10).

(10)   a. *changmwun-ul yel   swu iss-eyo*?
       window-ACC   open can-POL
       'Can you open the window?'

    b. *changmwun-ul com   yele cwu-l swu iss-eyo*?
       window-ACC   a little open give-can-POL
       'Can you open the window (for me)?'

    c. *changmwun-ul com   yele cwu-si-l swu iss-usey-yo*?
       window-ACC   a little open give-HON-can-HON-POL
       'Can you possibly open the window (for me) please?'

For example, (10a) is interpreted as merely a question inquiring about the listener's ability, while (10b), which involves the benefactive form and the adverb *com* 'a little,' is understood as requesting someone to open the window. When one asks such a favor from a social superior, (10b) it should be used with the subject honorific suffix *-si-*, as in (10c). These forms are indeed attested in one Intermediate student and our KNS group, both of which used *-e/a cwusil swu issta* 'to be able to do something for someone' in combination with other sentence endings. This is shown below:

(11)   KFL-Intermediate
    kyoswunim-i cey-ka swuep tut-tolok   helakhay cwu-si-l swu iss-nunci-yo?
    Prof.-NOM   I-NOM class take-in order to allow   give-HON-can-wonder-POL
    'Can you allow me to take the class, professor?'

(12)   KNS
    a.   *kyoswunim cey-ka kkok   i swuep-ul   tul-eya ha-nuntey*
        Professor   I-NOM definitely this class-ACC take-have to-so
        hoksi   neh.e-cwu-si-l swu iss-ulkka-yo?
        by any chance put-give-HON-can-POL
        'I have to take this class, can you possibly put me into your class?'
    b.   *hoksi   chwukalo   nehe-cwu-si-l swu iss-nayo*?
        by any chance additionally put-give-HON-can-POL
        'Can you possibly put me in (your class)?'
    c.   *hoksi sillyey-ka ani-la-myen   kyoswunim-uy swuep-ul*
        by any chance discourtesy-NOM not-QUOT-if professor-GEN class-ACC
        tul-ul swu iss-nun pangpep-ina swuep-ey nehe cwu-si-l swu iss-nunci
        take-can-REL   way-or   class-at   put give-HON-can-whether or not
        yeccwue-po-lyeko wa-ss-supnita
        ask-try-in order to-come-PST-DEF
        'If it is not a problem, I came to ask you if there is a way to take your class
        or if you can put me in your class.'

As shown above, *-e/a cwusil swu issta* is used in an extended pattern involving
other sentence endings, such as *-(u)lkkayo* 'Do you think…?, Shall we…?' and
-nayo 'Is that the case…?, which are used to indirectly and cautiously ask the lis-
tener's opinion and soften the imposition of their requests. In our KNS data, these
extended forms were frequently used with lexical downgraders, such as *hoksi* 'by
any chance.' Further, as shown in (12c), one KNS student expressed her intention
of making a request in an indirect statement form, which makes the request sound
more indirect.

-(u)l swu issta 'can' for seeking permission

In Korean, *-(u)l swu issta* 'can,' along with the first person subject, may also
be used for asking for permission, meaning 'Can I…?' In one study analyzing
requests, Hahn (2009) reports that one of the forms KNS most commonly used
to ask for permission was *-u(l) swu issulkkayo*? 'Do you think I can do…?' (the
combined form of *-(u)l swu issta* 'Can I…?' with the ending *-(u)lkkayo* 'Do
you think…?'), which asks the listener's opinion, as exemplified in *kyoswunim
coysongha-ciman inthepyu-ka iss-ese taum swuep han pen ppaci-l swu iss-ulkkayo*?
'Professor, I am sorry, but I have an interview, so can I skip class next time?'
(Hahn 2009).

The form *-(u)l swu issta* was also used by a number of our KFL students to request permission. For example, both the Beginning and the Intermediate students used the simple form of *-(u)l swu issta* to ask for permission, as shown in (13) and (14).

(13) KFL-Beginning

    a.   *i swuep-ul   tul-ul swu iss-supnikka*?
        this class-ACC listen-can-DEF
        'Can I take this class?'

    b.   *talun   sikan-ey pol swu iss-eyo*?
        another time-at   see can-POL
        'Can I see you on different days?'

(14) KFL-Intermediate

    a.   *hoksi   ce-nun i swuep-ul   tul-ul swu iss-eyo*?
        by any chance I-TOP   this class-ACC take-can-POL
        'Can I take this class?'

    b.   *talun nal-ey sihem-ul pol swu iss-eyo*?
        other day-at test-ACC take can-POL
        'Can I take the test on different days?'

    c.   *i swuep-ul   tul-ul swu iss-supnikka*?
        this class-ACC take-can-DEF
        'Can I take this class?'

While both (13) and (14) are grammatically correct, they sound pragmatically inappropriate; using only *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' without auxiliary verb *cwu* 'give' and subject honorific suffix *-si-* makes the request less polite.

What about the use of *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' in the requests of KNS? As illustrated in (15), the KNS consistently used it in the extended form, as in *-e/a cwu-si-l swu issulkkayo*? 'Do you think you do something for me…?,' which contains the auxiliary structures *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for someone (speaker)' and ending *-(u)lkkayo* 'Do you think…?, Shall we…?' Thus, it is found that KNS prefer to use more extended structures for formal polite requests.

(15) KNS

    a.   *kyoswunim cey-ka kkok   i swuep-ul   tul-eya ha-nuntey hoksi*
        professor   I-NOM definitely this class-ACC take-must-so   possibly
        nehe-cwu-si-l swu iss-ulkkayo?
        put-give-HON-can-POL
        'Professor, I have to take this class, so can you let me in?'

b. *saceng-i*   *sayngkye-se talun*   *nalcca-ey taychey sihem-ul*
   situation-NOM arise-so   another day-at   makeup test-ACC
   pol swu iss-ulkkayo?
   take can-POL
   'Something came up, so can I take a make-up test another day?'

Therefore, what we have learned from the data drawn from the KNS group is that when making a request to social superiors in Korean, the routinely used expressions involving -*(u)l swu issta* 'can' are *hoksi ... -e/a cwusil swu issnayo?* or *hoksi ... -e/a cwusil swu issulkkayo?*, meaning 'by any chance, could you do something for me?,' the extended forms combining different modal/auxiliary endings with the lexical downgrader *hoksi* 'by any chance.' The same is attested when requesting permission from a social superior in Korean: the KNS used extended forms, such as -*(u)l swu iss-ul-kkayo* 'Can I...?'; the simple form -*(u)l swu issta* 'can' is never used alone. Unlike the KNS, a number of KFL learners could not use such extended forms, and this can be attributed to a few factors. It is assumed that even though students learned each structure separately, they did not have enough opportunities to learn the pragmatic functions when those structures are used together.

'-eto/ato toyta' for requesting permission

Another modal expression used to ask for permission, which was used mostly by the Intermediate group, is -*eto/ato toyta* 'may.' While most Beginning students used the plain form -*(u)l swu issta* 'can' for asking permission, a number of Intermediate students used -*eto/ato toyta* 'may,' as illustrated in (16).

(16)   KFL-Intermediate
   a. *yaksok-ul*   *hay-to tway-yo*?
      appointment-ACC do-also okay-POL
      'Can I make an appointment?'
   b. *cilmwun-ul*   *mwulepwa-to tway-yo*?
      question-ACC ask-also   okay-POL
      'Can I ask you a question?'

While -*eto/ato toyta* is commonly glossed as *may* in English, using -*eto/ato toyta* alone to request permission can sound direct and aggressive if one is asking their superior. In such situations, the commonly used forms, as found in our KNS data, include -*eto/ato toy-lkkayo* (the combined form of -*eto/ato toyta* 'may' and -*(u)l kkayo* 'Do you think...?') and -*eto/ato toy-keyss-supnikka* (the combined form of -*eto/ato toyta* 'may' and -*keyss-supnikka* 'Will I...?'); -*(u)l kkayo* and *keyss-supnikka* are modal expressions used for cautiously asking the listeners' intention. We will discuss -*keyss-* separately below.

As shown in (17), a small number of the Intermediate students used *-eto/ato toy-lkkayo*, similar to the KNS. This is shown in (17) and (18), respectively.

(17) KFL-Intermediate
　　a. *hoksi   talun nal-ey   sihem-ul pwa-to toy-lkkayo*?
　　　　by any chance another day-at test-ACC take-okay-POL
　　　　'Can I take the test another day?'
　　b. *olhay   colepha-lye-myen   i swuep-i   philyohay-se swuep-ey*
　　　　this year graduate-in order to-if this class-NOM need so   class-at
　　　　chamyehay-to toy-lkkayo?
　　　　participate-okay-POL
　　　　'In order to graduate this year, I need this class, so can I participate in the class?'

(18) KNS
　　a. *hoksi   talun   nal-ey sihem-ul pwato toy-lkkayo*?
　　　　possibly another day-at test-ACC take   okay-POL
　　　　'Can I possibly take the test another day?'
　　b. *colep-ul   wihay swuep-ul tul-eya ha-nuntey*
　　　　graduation-ACC for   class-ACC take-have to-so
　　　　pwuthak-tulye-to toy-lkka-yo?
　　　　ask-give-okay-POL
　　　　'I have to take the class to graduate, can I ask you a favor?'

So far, we have shown that similar to *-(u)l swu issta* 'can,' the KNS group did not use *-eto/ato totya* 'may' alone but consistently used extended forms of *-eto/ato totya* 'may,' as in *-eto/ato toy-lkkayo* and *-eto/ato toy-keysssupnikka*.

-keyss-...? '*will...?*'

The suffix *-keyss-* 'will' is used to express one's willingness, intention, or volition in the first person or to inquire about future intention in the second person. Although the corresponding gloss of *-keyss-* is 'will,' using *-keyss-* alone to ask about one's willingness can be a very direct strategy in Korean, as illustrated in (19a). Therefore, unless it is modified with other honorific devices, expressions involving *-keyss-* are generally used for a person whose social status is similar to or lower than the speaker. Adding other forms to *-keyss-*, such as *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for someone (speaker)' and the subject honorific suffix *-(u)si-*, however, seems to soften the imposition of the request, as shown in (19b).

(19) a. *nayil   manna-keyss-eyo*?
          tomorrow meet-will-POL
          'Will you meet tomorrow? '
      b. *nayil   manna-cwu-si-keyss-eyo*?
          tomorrow meet-give-HON-will-POL
          'Will you meet tomorrow? '

Turning to the KFL students' data, both the Beginning and the Intermediate students often used *-keyss-* to make a request, and unlike *-(u)l swu issta* 'can', they all used *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for someone (speaker)' together with the subject honorific suffix, which would make the request sound too stiff or overly formal, as in (20) and (21).

(20) KFL-Beginning
      a. *i   swuep-ul tule(tutkey hay) cwu-si-keyss-supnikka*?
          this class-ACC take-let   give-HON-will-DEF
          'Can you allow me to take this class?'
      b. *sikan-i(-ul) com   cwu-si-keysss-upnikka*?
          time-ACC   a little give-HON-will-DEF
          'Can you give me a little time?'

(21) KFL-Intermediate
      a. *swuep-ey pincali   eps-ciman   tutki-lul   helakhay-cwu-si-keyss-eyo*?
          class-at empty seat not exist-but taking-ACC allow-give-HON-will-POL
          'There is no seat available, but can you allow me to take your class?'
      b. *sikan-i   toy-si-myen   talun sikan-ey manna-cwu-si-keyss-eyo*?
          time-NOM available-HON-if another time-at meet-give-HON-will-POL
          'If you are available, can you meet me another time?'

The KNS also used the combined form of *-keyss-* with *-eto/ato toyta*, which may be used to seek permission in a polite manner, as shown in (22).

(22) KNS
      hoksi   kwaynchanh-usi-ta-myen talun   mithing-sikan-ulo
      possibly okay-HON-QUOT-if   another meeting-time-toward
      cap-ato toy-keyss-supnikka?
      set-also okay-will-DEF
      'Can I set another meeting time if you are okay?'

Note that the use of *-keyss-* appears more frequently among the Intermediate students than the Beginning students. This may be due to the fact that *-keyss-* is taught later in the beginning level course. Thus, many Intermediate students knew the basic meaning of *-keyss-* (better than the Beginning group), but the fact that

no KNS used *-keyss-* might indicate that the Intermediate students did not under-stand its pragmatic function clearly.

So far, we have shown that even though a number of KFL students used con-ventional indirect strategies like the KNS, the numerous pragmalinguistic aspects of the learners' linguistic productions show significant deviations from native usage. Overall, the Beginning students made use of simple forms, focusing on semantic meanings, which makes their requests sound direct and rude. They sometimes could not express their requests clearly. Compared with the Beginning students, the Intermediate students showed patterns slightly closer to the KNS; they used more indirect strategies, and some of their linguistic expressions were extended forms, similar to those of the KNS. However, a number of their linguistic expressions are still not elaborate enough and are relatively simple compared to those used by the KNS, which would make their requests sound somewhat direct and coercive. Our findings reveal that the KNS group chose to use not plain forms but rather used extended forms combining various modal expressions and suf-fixes to lessen the imposition of making a request to social superiors.

4.3 Internal modifications

Apart from the different strategies used by the participants, speakers may choose to use internal and external modifications to decrease the force of a request, as noted in Section 2. In the following sections, we present several internal modifi-cations and external notifications (supportive moves) attested in our data.

Generally, internal modifications are split into two groups, downgraders and upgraders (e.g., Faerch & Kasper 1989, Schauer 2007): the former is used to soften the force of a request, and the latter is used to increase it. Since our data did not reveal any upgraders, we will only pay attention to downgraders. Downgraders can be syntactic, lexical, or phrasal. Syntactic downgraders refer to the structural properties that are used to mitigate the impositive force of a request (e.g., condi-tional clauses, tag questions, negation). Lexicon and phrasal downgraders include politeness markers (e.g., please), understaters (e.g., a little), hedges (e.g., some-how, kind of), subjectivisers (e.g., I wonder, I think), downtoners (e.g., possibly, perhaps), etc. While Korean speakers may use extended verb forms to soften the force of a request, as discussed in the previous sections, adding adequate down-graders in requests seems crucial for making a request to superiors. Our data reveal that the KNS used downgraders more frequently than the KFL students to increase the politeness of their requests, and many of the downgraders used by the learners sounded inappropriate and direct.

hoksi 'by any chance, maybe'

Most native speakers used the lexical downgrader *hoksi* 'by any chance, maybe' in almost all requests to modify a request head act, as in (23).

(23)   KNS
    hoksi   talun   nal-ey meyikhuep sihem-ul po-l swu iss-ulkkayo?
    maybe another day-at make-up   test-ACC take-can-whether or not-POL?
    'Can I possibly take a make-up test another day?'

Hoksi 'by any chance, maybe' was also frequently used along with the syntactic downgrader *-myen* 'if,' which introduces a conditional clause in Korean. The following examples in (24) illustrate the common expressions that were used by the KNS to make a request.

(24)   KNS
    a.   *hoksi   sillyey-ka   an-toy-nta-myen...*
        by any chance discourtesy-NOM not-become-QUOT-if
        'If it is okay for you...'
    b.   *hoksi   kwaynchanhu-si-ta-myen...*
        by any chance okay-HON-QUOT-if
        'If it is fine with you...'

A small number of the Intermediate students used *hoksi* either independently, as in (25a), or with *-myen* 'if' to lessen the force of a request, as in (25b).

(25)   KFL-Intermediate
    a.   *hoksi   ce-nun i swuep-ul   tulul swu iss-eyo?*
        by any chance I-TOP   this class-ACC take-can-POL
        'Can I possibly take this class?'
    b.   *hoksi   sikan-i   toy-si-myen   talun sikaney*
        by any chance time-NOM become-HON-if another time-at
        manna-cwu-si-keyss-eyo?
        meet-give-HON-will-POL
        'Can you meet at another time if your time allows?'

The Beginning students, however, were not able to use *hoksi* in their requests. One student used *ama*, meaning 'perhaps, maybe,' as illustrated in (26). However, adding this makes the request sound unnatural; *ama* is used only in statements, and *hoksi* is used only in questions.

(26)   KFL-Beginning
    ama   talun   halwu-ey pwato tway-yo?
    maybe another day-at   take-okay-POL
    'Can I see you another day, probably?'

Not using *hoksi* can be attributed to the fact that the Beginning students had not learned the expression yet.

kanunghata 'to be possible' and kwaynchanhta 'to be okay'

Other frequent downgraders used by the KNS were *kanunghata* 'to be possible' and *kwaynchanhta* 'to be okay,' consultative devices the speaker uses to invite the hearer to cooperate. As exemplified in (27), they often used these devices with the syntactic downgrader *-myen* 'if.'

(27) KNS
  a. *kwaynchanh-usi-ta-myen*
      okay-HON-QUOT-if
      'If this is okay with you...',
  b. *kanungha-si-myen*
      possible-HON-if
      'If this is possible for you...'

These downgraders are attested in the KNS and Intermediate students; no Beginning students employed them. Also, the Intermediate students used other consultative devices, including the verbs *helakhay cwuta* 'to allow to do for someone' and *hay cwu-l swu issta* 'to be able to do for someone' (see (28) below), which were not attested in the KNS; the responses of the KNS were restricted to using the expressions in (27) above.

(28) KFL-Intermediate
  a. *hay cwu-l swu iss-umyen...*
      do give-can-if
      'If you can do...'
  b. *helakhay cwu-si-myen*
      allow   give-HON-if
      'If you allow me to ...'
  c. *sikan-i   toy-si-myen*
      time-NOM okay-HON-if
      'If time allows ...'

com 'a little'

The lexical downgrader *com* 'a little' is not found in the native speakers, only in the learners, as exemplified in (29).

(29)   KFL

   a.   Intermediate
   i swuep-ul   com   tut-key ha-sil(hay cwu-si-l) swu iss-eyo?
   this class-ACC a little take allow-do-give-HON-can-POL
   'Can you allow me to take this class?'

   b.   Beginning
   sikan-i(-ul) com   cwu-si-keyss-supnikka?
   time-ACC   a little give-HON-will-DEF-Q
   'Could you give me a little bit of time?'

The sentences in (29) are grammatically perfect, but none of the KNS used the same downgrader in their requests. Its absence in the KNS data can be attributed to the usage of *com* 'a little': while *com* is used to tone down the force of a request in Korean, it is usually used when making a direct command rather than making a request to superiors.

4.4   Supportive moves

Unlike the internal modifications discussed earlier, supportive moves are external to the head act, occurring either before or after it. As additional statements, their main function is to support the request. In our data, supportive moves were employed by all KNS and most learners when making requests, and the most commonly used supportive moves include grounders that provide reasons, explanations, or justifications for requests. As shown in (30) and (31), all KNS and some KFL students provided reasons (i.e., grounders) before their head acts.

(30)   KNS

   a.   *colep-ul   wihay swuep-ul tul-eya ha-nuntey* (grounder)
   graduation-ACC for   class-ACC take-have to-so
   pwuthak-tuly-eto   toy-lkkayo?
   request-give-even so okay-POL
   'I have to take your class for graduation so could I ask you a favor?'

   b.   *kyoswunim, cipan-ey saceng-i   sayngky-ese sihem-ul mos   pol*
   professor   house-at problem-NOM rise-so   test-ACC cannot take
   ke kath-untey (grounder) *hoksi   talun   nal-ey sihem-ul*
   seem-so   possibly another day-at test-ACC
   pwa-to toyl-kkayo?
   take-okay-POL
   'Professor, it seems that I can't take a test because of my family situation so could I possibly take a test on a different day?'

(31) KFL
    a. Intermediate
       kyoswunim-uy swuep-ul tul-eya ha-ciman, haksayng-i   nemwu manh-ase
       professor-GEN class-ACC take-must-but   student-NOM too   many-so
       ce-nun swuep-ul tulul mos hayyo(mos tul-eyo)
       I-TOP class-ACC cannot take-POL
       'I have to take your class, but I cannot take it because there are too many
       students. Can you allow me to take your class?'
    b. Beginning
       kim sensayngnim, ceyka manhi cilmwun iss-nuntey
       Kim teacher   I-NOM many question have-but
       sikani eps-eyo.   kulayse, kim sensayngnim-hako
       time-NOM not have-POL so   Kim teacher-with
       mannaseyyo(manna-l swu iss-eyo)?
       meet-can-POL
       'Professor Kim, I have many questions, but I have no time to ask.'

Disarmers are the next commonly found supportive move; they are used when a speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise upon being confronted with the request (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). As exemplified in (32), the Intermediate students used the disarmer strategy to indicate that they are aware that the registration deadline has passed. However, no disarmers were found in the Beginning students' data.

(32) KFL-Intermediate
    wenlay   tunglokha-l kihoy-nun pelsse cinaka-ss-tako
    originally register-REL chance-TOP already pass-PST-QUOT
    alko kyeysi-ciman (iss-ciman) thukhi   i swuep-ul   tule yaci
    knowing-but   especially this class-ACC take only if
    colep-i   kanungha-pnita.
    graduation-NOM possible-DEF
    'I know that the registration chance has passed, but I can graduate only if I
    take this course.'

While the KFL learners used some of the supportive moves that KNS used, the KFL learners are distinct from the KNS regarding the order between supportive moves and the head act and their use of connective endings. First, all KNS and Intermediate students used their supportive moves prior to the head act. However, supportive moves appeared after the head act in some data from the Beginning students, as shown in (33).

(33)   Beginning

a.   *sensayngnim-i(uy) swuep-to cey-ka tuleka-to toy-nayo? ce swuep-sikan-i*
      teacher-GEN   class-also I-NOM enter-also okay-POL I class time-NOM
      naynyeneyya colepha-l swu iss-ketunyo.
      next year   graduate-can-you know
      'Can I take your class? I need it to graduate next year.'

b.   *kyoswunim, ceyka swuep-ul tul-ul swu iss-supnikka? colep-ul*
      professor   I-NOM class-ACC take-can-DEF   graduation-ACC
      hako siph-umyen, i kes swuep-ul tul-eya toysapnita(toypnita)
      do-want to-if   this class-ACC take-must-DEF
      'Professor, can I take the class? If I want to graduate, I have to take this
      class.'

The examples in (33) show that placing the head act at the beginning of a request
makes the overall request a little more direct in comparison to when supportive
moves are placed first. Considering that many beginning students did not use any
supportive moves in their requests, the above examples stand out in the beginning
students' data. However, the overall structure of these examples was still different
from that of intermediate students and KNS.

The second noticeable difference between the KNS and the learners is regard-
ing the connectives used to conjoin supportive moves and main requests. As
noted above, both KFL learners and KNS used supportive moves. However, the
two groups are different: all KNS invariably used the connective ending -*nuntey*,[6]
among other connective endings, to justify their requests, whereas most Begin-
ning and Intermediate learners failed to use this connective; instead, they used
other connective endings, or none.

---

6. -*nuntey* is one of the most frequently used connective endings in Korean (e.g., Choi 1965,
Lee 1980, 1993, Park 1999). It is often translated as 'and,' 'but,' 'so,' or 'given that' as a background
introducer, depending on the context. However, there are also many instances where none of
the glosses suit an intended utterance in Korean. Its exact meaning and function have been the
subject of controversy.

(i)   *ce-nun mikwuk-ey sa-nuntey   cey enni-nun   hankwuk-ey sal-ayo.*   'But'
      I-TOP   America-in live-nuntey my older.sister-TOP Korea-in   live-POL
      'I live in America, but my older sister lives in Korea.'

(ii) *sam wel-ey   pom   panghaki-ntey, mwe ha-l keyey-yo?*   'Background'
      three month-in spring break-nuntey   what do-Fut POL
      'Given that it is our spring break in March, what are you going to do?'

(34)   KNS
   a. *kyoswunim, ce kanguy-ey tayhan cilmwun-i   myech kay iss-nuntey*
       Professor   I   class-about   question-NOM some item have-but
       yenkwusil sikan-ey mos   chacapoy-l kes kath-untey hoksi   talun
       office hour-at   cannot visit-seem-so   possibly another
       kanunghan sikan iss-usi-nkayo?
       possible   time have-SH-POL
       'Professor, I have a few questions about your lecture but I am not able to
       visit you during your office hours so are you available any other time pos-
       sibly?'
   b. *kyoswunim, cipan-ey saceng-i   sayngkye-se sihemul mos pol*
       Professor   home-at problem-NOM happen-so   test-ACC cannot take
       ke kath-untey hoksi   talun nal-ey   sihem-ul pwa-to toy-lkkayo?
       seems-so   possibly another day-at test-ACC take-also okay-POL
       'Professor, it seems that I can't take a test because of my family situation so
       could I possibly take a test on a different day?'

As shown in (34), the native speakers used the sentence connective *-nuntey* to
offer justifications prior to making requests. In (34a), the native speaker used
-nuntey to say that he/she would not be able to make the office hours. In (34b),
also using *-nuntey*, the native speaker justified that he/she would not be able to
take a test due to a family situation.

   No Beginning or Intermediate learners used *-nuntey* in the same situations
where only *-nuntey* is used by the KNS. Instead, they used other connective end-
ings, such as *-e/ase* 'because,' *-ki ttaymuney* 'because,' *ciman* 'but,' or none. For
example, as illustrated in (35), the learners used *-e/ase* in (35a), *-ki ttaymuney* to
provide reasons in (35b), and *-ciman* in (35c); (35e) shows that some learners did
not use any connective endings.

(35)   KFL
   a. Beginning
       enni kyelhon ttaymwuney onul sihem-ul haci moshay-se talun   sikan-ey
       sister marriage because   today test-ACC do-cannot-so another time-at
       sihem-ul hapnikka?
       test-ACC do-DEF
       'Because of my sister's wedding I cannot take a test so could I take it at
       other times?'

    b.   Intermediate
       ce-nun kkok   tul-eyaha-ki ttaymwuney celul chwuka-lul
       I-TOP   definitely take-have to-because   I-ACC add-ACC
       pwuthak-tuli-pnita
       ask-give-DEF
       'I have to take this class so may I request you to add me to your class?'

    c.   Intermediate
       swuepey pin-cali   eps-ciman   tutki-lul   helakhay-cwu-si-keyss-eyo?
       class-at   empty-seat not exist-but taking-ACC allow-give-HON-will-POL
       'There is no available spot in your class but would you approve for taking
       your class?'

    d.   Beginning
       naynyen-ey ce-nun collepha-lkeyey-yo. i swuep-un   phillyeha-n
       next year-at I-TOP   graduate-will-POL this class-TOP necessary-REL
       swuep-i-ntey, cali iss-usey-yo?
       class-CPL-but seat have-HON-POL
       'I will graduate next year. This class is required, so are seats available?'

The sentence connectives used by the KFL students semantically convey the intention of the speaker. Their utterances, however, sound awkward pragmatically; the connective endings that indicate specific reasons to justify their requests sound too direct and forceful. The contrast between the learners and KNS regarding the use of *-nuntey* is attributed to the pragmatic functions of *-nuntey* in Korean: it is commonly used to provide background information (for making a request), but the meaning of 'background' is vague and broad. While KFL textbooks introduce the usage of *-nuntey* as a background builder, the notion of 'background' is not described in detail and the pragmatic meaning and function of *-nuntey* are not explained in connection with a particular speech act (i.e., request). Previous studies on KFL acquisition have reported that *-nuntey* is one of the most challenging connective endings for learners to acquire; learners make a considerable number of errors and mistakes (compared to other connective endings) in both conversations and writing due to the various meanings of *-nuntey* (e.g., Lee 2002, Kim 2004).

4.5   Honorifics and humble expressions

The use of proper honorifics and humble expressions are essential for making appropriate requests to social superiors in Korean. In this section, we will examine how the KFL participants used honorifics when they made a request to professors.

Sentence endings

The DCT situations we set up required participants to use honorific endings, such as deferential -(*su*)*pnita* or polite -*e/ayo* endings. While both endings are generally used when one talks to a socially superior person, the use of deferential endings is commonly limited to some idiomatic expressions (e.g., *kamsahapnita* 'thank you,' *coysongha-pnita* 'I apologize'), public presentations, or formal institutional communications in Korean (Yoon 2011). This is because the use of the deferential ending often sounds literary, rigid, or unnatural in a number of ordinary contexts (Yoon 2010). The deferential ending question form -(*su*)*pnikka*? is also rarely used in personal oral communications. Our data from KNS reveal that the native speakers predominantly used the polite ending -*e/ayo*, except in fixed expressions such as *kamsahapnita* 'thank you' and *coysonghapnita* 'I apologize.'

Unlike the KNS, the Beginning and the Intermediate students used both polite and deferential endings with similar frequency. In particular, they frequently used -(*su*)*pnikka*, the deferential question ending, in their requests, as in (36).

(36) KFL
   a. Beginning
      encey sikan-i   iss-usi-pnikka?
      when time-NOM have-HON-DEF
      'When do you have time?'
   b. Intermediate
      ce-lul patatulye cwu-si-keyss-supnikka?
      I-ACC accept   give-HON-will-DEF
      'Can you accept me in your class?'

It seems that the learners' frequent use of deferential endings could be because the deferential style is simply explained as the one to use in formal settings (Cho et al. 2010). The KFL students may have considered making a request to professors to be a formal situation, but as our data shows, KNS did not use the deferential style in interpersonal oral interactions.

Subject honorific suffix -(u)si-

The honorific suffix -*(u)si*- is used to indicate the speaker's respect or deference to the person being referred to or talked about in Korean. Failing to use it may result in sounding awkward and impolite when a speaker describes a superior's action or the superior subject's state in utterances. In particular, a request speech act naturally requires a speaker to use -*(u)si*-, as the speaker needs to ask the listener (the subject) to take an action for their sake. Therefore, the use of -*(u)si*- is essential when one makes a request to a socially higher person. This is attested

in the speech of the KNS. As observed in Section 3.2, the KNS consistently used *-(u)si-* with the expression *-e/a cwul swu issta* 'to be able to do something (for the speaker)' when making requests of their professors.

However, a number of KFL students failed to use *-(u)si-*, which results in their request sounding impolite and rude, as in (37).

(37)   KFL-Intermediate
       hay cw-ul swu iss-umyen kamsaha-keyss-supnita.
       do give-can-if   thankful-will-DEF
       'It would be thankful if you do that for me.'

In (37), *-(u)si-* should be used after *hay-swu-*, as in *hay-cwu-si-l swu iss-umyen.*

Another error that was found in the KFL students is that *-(u)si-* was often used to describe the speaker's own action or state. As exemplified in (38), some KFL students used *-(u)si-* when the subject was the speaker.

(38)   KFL-Intermediate
  a.   *talun   nal-ey po-l swu iss-umyen toy-si-n   ke-nkayo*?
       another day-at see-can-if   become-HON-REL thing-POL
       'Is it okay for you if I see you at another day?'
  b.   *ce-nun sensayngnim-uy swuep-ul tul-eto   toy-si-l*
       I-TOP teacher-GEN   class-ACC take-even so become-HON-REL
       ke-pnikka?
       thing-DEF
       'Can I take your class?'

Mueller & Jiang (2013) found that even among advanced KFL learners, many could not demonstrate their knowledge of the honorific suffix *-(u)si-*; therefore, the KFL learners' lack of or inappropriate use of *-(u)si-* is not surprising.

Humble expressions

Humble expressions in Korean include the first person pronoun *ce* 'I' and some verbs describing an action taken by a socially lower person toward a higher person, including *tulita* 'to give (to a social superior)' and *poypta* 'to meet (a social superior).' While honorific expressions are used when talking about a social superior's actions, humble expressions should be used to describe the speaker's own action or state. Because honorific and humble expressions should be used together appropriately when talking to a socially superior person, the KFL students are often confused about how use them. The sentence endings of the examples in (39) are all honorific endings, which are appropriate in the context. However, the verbs *mulepota* 'ask' and *mannata* 'meet' should be used in their humble forms *tulita* and *poypta*, respectively, as exemplified in the parentheses,

because these verbs describe the speaker's own actions and the addressee is a social superior.

(39)   KFL
    a.   *cilmwun-ul   mwulepwa-to tway-yo*? (→ *tulyeto*)
        question-ACC ask-also   okay-POL
        'Can I ask a question?
    b.   *manna-l swu iss-supnikka*? (→ *poyl swu*)
        meet-REL can-DEF
        'Can I meet you?'

5.   Discussion

In the current study, we have examined the pragmatic competence of Beginning and Intermediate learners' requests while investigating the learners' pragmalinguistic developments and deficiencies by comparing their utterances with those of KNS. Similar to the results reported in previous studies (e.g., Kasper & Rose 2002, Wang 1999), in general, the Beginning students were found to use direct strategies with limited linguistic devices, and their intentions for requests were not clearly expressed. Unlike the Beginning students, the Intermediate students generally appeared to use patterns similar to those of the KNS; they expressed their intentions to make a request more clearly than the Beginning students by employing indirect strategies, like the native speakers.

The Intermediate students were able to utilize diverse linguistic elements to perform request speech acts to their professors. The Beginning students were restricted to using plain forms such as *-e/a cwuseyyo* 'please do something (for me),' one of the most direct and simple command expressions in Korean, and *-ko sipheyo* 'I want to,' which strongly indicates their desires in their requests, whereas no Intermediate students were found to use such direct expressions. In addition, the Intermediate students were able to provide reasons or justifications prior to making a request more naturally and to make use of indirect strategies to mitigate their head acts. The overall length of their utterances is also similar to those of the native speakers.[7]

---

7. In his study, Byon (2004) has shown that the length of advanced KFL learners' utterances is much longer than that of native speakers; learners sometimes make unnecessary remarks while trying to make their requests more convincing. Unlike Byon's (2004) participants, our Intermediate students did not produce utterances longer than those of the KNS. This might be because our participants' proficiency level was not high enough to try the various strategies used by the participants in his study.

Even though the Intermediate students showed quite strong and solid pragmatic competence compared to the Beginning group, it is noteworthy that in order to capitalize on their utterances, they revealed limitations when trying to naturally and appropriately make use of the linguistic forms that are consistently found in the utterances of the KNS.

First, most of the Intermediate students and all the Beginning students addressed their professors using "last name + title," which was not found in the KNS group. Second, although the learners showed similar patterns to the KNS regarding employing indirect strategies overall, their choice of linguistic expressions and forms often appear to stem from directly translating them from English. One example illustrating this comes from the frequent use of *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' in the learner's data, as shown in Section 4.2, which overall leads to their requests sounding blunt and even rude. While *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' is commonly considered equivalent to the English 'can' regarding its semantic meaning, their pragmatic functions are different; the Korean *-(u)l swu issta* is rarely used to indicate one's intention for making request without additional appropriate sentence endings and various discourse markers, such as *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for someone (speaker)' and *-kess-* 'will,' as discussed in Section 4.2. A related pertinent point concerns the learners' use of honorific and humble expressions and various sentence endings and modals that are commonly used to express a speaker's affective and epistemic stance in Korean. As stated earlier, a number of Intermediate students still encountered difficulties when utilizing honorifics and extended forms of verbs to express cautious attitudes. For example, essential modal verbs such as *-(u)l swu issta* 'can' and *-eto/ato toyta* 'may' are generally used in extended forms involving sentence endings such as *-(u)lkkayo* 'Do you think…?, Shall we…?' which asks the listener's opinion, and *-nayo*, which expresses the speaker's uncertainty. Many intermediate students could not utilize such extended forms; some representative forms are illustrated below.

(40) a. *~e/a cwusita + ~(u)l swu issta + ~(u)l kkayo?* → *~e/a cwusil swu issulkkayo?*
      b. *~e/a cwusita + ~(u)l swu issta + ~nayo?* → *~e/a cwusil swu issnayo?*
      c. *~(u)l swu issta + ~(u)l kkayo?* → *~(u)l swu issulkkayo?*
      d. *~e/ato toyta + ~(u)l kkayo?* → *~e/ato toylkkayo?*

Another important point that needs further attention is that most KFL learners failed to use the connective ending *-nuntey* 'and,' 'but,' 'so,' 'given that,' which was invariably used by all native speakers to provide reasons and justifications before making their requests. Previous literature on Korean language education has reported a high frequency of *-nuntey* occurring in spoken Korean, but teaching and learning *-nuntey* is very challenging because it has so many functions

and there is no equivalent in English. Park (1999) has observed that the *-nuntey* clause is used when a speaker mentions what they found out, saw, or heard from their side as circumstantial and evidential and invites the interlocutor to infer the speaker's intention. Accordingly, it has been reported that *-nuntey* has various discourse functions in such speech act situations as request, denial, rejection, and declinations (e,g., Park 1999). As reported in Section 4.2, in places where KNL speakers consistently used *-nuntey*, the Intermediate learners employed other clausal connectives, such as *-ese/ase* 'because,' *-ki ttaymuney* 'because,' or *-ciman* 'but' to give justifications before making their requests. We found that the appropriate use of the clausal connective *-nuntey* is an essential element for making one's request more polite and native-like in Korean, which should be considered an important element within KFL education.

Finally, an anonymous reviewer questions about level of imposition regarding whether or not students' familiarity with the professor could impact on students' pragmatic competence. Our findings do not reveal differences in terms of using their strategies.

6.   Implications for teaching

Pragmatics tends to be underrepresented in KFL textbooks; they do not present how numerous common grammatical forms are connected and used in a particular speech act (e.g., making a request). That is, KFL textbooks seem to provide a list of formulaic expressions with short explanations, but little information is included regarding how to use them in a particular speech act, in what situations they are appropriate, and with whom the particular expressions should be used. For example, in a study that analyzed requests in Korean textbooks, Yun (2021) points out that most KFL textbooks introduce structures that are used for very direct mood derivable strategies, such as *-(u)seyyo* (polite ending marker), *-e/ala* (imperative ending marker), *-e/a cweseyo* 'please do something (for me),' whereas a number of linguistic forms that are commonly used in certain speech acts are absent.

To overcome such limitations in textbooks, we would like to emphasize the need to teach the pragmalinguistic functions of grammatical forms in appropriate situations in order to accomplish social actions rather than merely teaching them out of context as isolated forms. As discussed earlier, KFL students would benefit from being provided with related forms that are commonly used together to demonstrate their pragmatic functions. For example, *-nuntey* should be introduced with structures used for requests and/or proposals that include *-(u)layyo*?

(Would you like to…?), *-(u)lkkayo*? (Do you think…?, Shall we…?), *-cwusil-swu isseyo*? (Can you please …?) and *-e/ato toy-nayo*? (Would it be okay if I …?).

Further, simple one-to-one correlation between English and Korean may cause students' pragmatic failure. Korean structures are often extended with auxiliary verbs and sentence endings to express various pragmatic meanings. Therefore, it is necessary for KFL students to be exposed to commonly used extended structures, not just the basic forms. As discussed in the earlier sections, all KNS used extended structures combined with different sentence endings, such as the benefactive form *-e/a cwuta* 'to do something for someone (speaker),' *-(l)ul swu issta* 'can,' and *-(u)lkkayo/-nayo* 'Do you think…?, Shall we…?'); no native speakers used a simple sentence structure to express the request act to their superiors. This tells us the importance of providing students with a sequence of combined linguistic forms that are commonly combined and used together to make requests in Korean. Teachers should explain linguistic and pragmatic differences with respect to using extended structures and expressing politeness by means of extended structures that involve combined forms with different endings.

Finally, we would also like to suggest that textbooks should provide explanations of how differences in relative social status influence the level of politeness needed (Ishihara & Cohen 2018). The majority of the conversation situations in commonly used textbooks are between social equals. We believe that textbooks should contain more explicit instructions on how Koreans interact differently depending on the social hierarchical differences and illustrate interactions in such situations.

7.   Limitations and suggestions for future study

While the present study has delved into significant aspects of pragmalinguistic features among KFL learners, it is important to acknowledge the presence of several limitations. First, the data were elicited through the DCT method since the purpose of the current study is to examine L2 learners' pragmalinguistic knowledge of the linguistic means and forms in a particular context. However, as discussed earlier, the data elicited by DCTs in a written form may lack pragmalinguistic features that are unique to oral discourse. Second, the sample size is relatively small and the number participants is different: twelve participants were included in the native group and thirty-one in the KFL group, which was further divided into different proficiency groups. This might influence the results of the study. Therefore, the findings of the present study should be interpreted only when these limitations are taken into consideration.

The limitations of the present study highlight a number of future research areas for consideration. First, there is an obvious need for future research to investigate more types of speech acts in L2 Korean given the paucity of existing studies in this area compared to those in L2 English. Second, future studies could look at naturally occurring dialogues, role-play data, or natural conversations, which allow us to observe pragma(linguistic) features in more natural and interactive conversations. The drawback of DCTs could also be overcome by using picture-enhanced DCTs (Yamashita 2002) and student-generated DCTs (McLean 2005). Moreover, it would be desirable to adopt a multiple-method approach, including retrospective interviews, which can help researchers better understand learners' pragmalinguistic behavior.

Finally, a longitudinal study, which provides more direct observation of learners' pragmatic development, could be conducted to meet the need for developmental research in L2 pragmatics. Specifically, it is crucial to examine how KFL learners perform speech acts within the context of overall interaction, given that the current trend in interlanguage pragmatics emphasizes a more discursive approach.

Funding

References

Achiba, Machiko. 2003. *Learning to Request in a Second Language: Child Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual matters.

Ackermann, Tanja. 2023. Mitigating Strategies and Politeness in German Requests. *Politeness Research* 19:2.355–389.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 2001. Evaluating the Empirical Evidence: Grounds for Instruction in Pragmatics. *Pragmatics and language teaching* ed. by Gabriele Kasper & Kenneth R. Rose, 11–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen & Rebecca Mahan-Taylor. 2003. *Teaching Pragmatics*. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Washington DC, U.S.

Beebe, Leslie M. & Martha Clark Cummings. 1996. Natural Speech Act Data Versus Written Questionnaire Data: How Data Collection Method Affects Speech Act Performance. *Speech Acts Across Cultures: Challenges to Communication in a Second Language* ed. by Susan M. Gass & Joyce Neu, 65–86. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

doi Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1982. Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics* 3:1.29–59.

doi Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Elite Olshtain. 1984. Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns. *Applied Linguistics* 5:3.196–213.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

doi Byon, Andrew S. 2002. Pragmalinguistic Features of KFL Learners in the Speech Act of Request. *Korean Linguistics* 11.151–182.

doi Byon, Andrew S. 2004. Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: Pedagogical Settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36.1673–1704.

doi Byon, Andrew S. 2006. The Role of Linguistic Indirectness and Honorifics in Achieving Linguistic Politeness in Korean Requests. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2.247–276.

doi Byon, Andrew S. 2015. Second Language Acquisition: Pragmatics. *Handbook of Korean Linguistics* ed. by Jaehoon Yeon & Lucien Brown, 389–404. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Choi, Hyunbae. 1965. *Wuli malpon. [Korean grammar]*. Seoul: Cengumsa.

Cho, Young-Mee, Hee-Sun Lee, Carol Schulz, Ho-Min Sohn & Sung-Ock Sohn. 2010. *Integrated Korean Beginning 1*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

doi Economidou-Kogetsidis, Maria. 2008. Internal and External Mitigation in Interlanguage Request Production: The Case of Greek Learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 4:1.111–138.

Faerch, Claus & Gabriele Kasper. 1989. Internal and External Modification in Interlanguage Request Realization. *Cross-cultural pragmatics* ed. by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, & Gabriele Kasper, 221–247. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

doi Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2007. Pragmatic Development in the Spanish as a FL Classroom: A Cross-Sectional Study of Learner Requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4:2.253–286.

doi Fukushima, Saeko. 1996. Request Strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences* 18.671–688.

doi Hahn, Jee Won. 2009. 'I want to skip your class': Being Polite in Korean Interlanguage Requests. *Linguistic Research* 26:3.161–179.

doi Hassall, Tim. 2003. Requests by Australian Learners of Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35.1903–1928.

doi House, Juliane & Daniel Z. Kádár. 2021. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ishihara, Noriko & Andrew D. Cohen. 2018. *Second Language Pragmatics-from Theory to Research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

doi Iwasaki, Noriko. 2008. Style Shifts Among Japanese Learners Before and After Study Abroad in Japan: Becoming Active Social Agents in Japanese. *Applied Linguistics* 31:1.45–71.

Kasper, Gabriel. 1989. Variation in Interlanguage Speech Act Realization. *Variation in second language acquisition: discourse and pragmatics* ed. by Susan Gass, Carolyn Madden, Dennis Preston & Larry Selinker, 37–58. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

doi Kasper, Gabriel. 2000. Data Collection in Pragmatic Research. *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport across cultures* ed. by Helen Spencer-Oatey, 145–164. London: Continuum.

doi Kasper, Gabriele & Merete Dahl. 1991. Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13:2.215–247.

Kasper, Gabriele & Kenneth R. Rose. 2002. *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kim, Hyeryun & Eun Ju Jeon. 2013. Critical Analysis of Teaching-Learning of the Korean Request Speech Acts Focused on the Beginner Level Materials, *Korean Education [Saekwukekyoyuk]* 97.233–259.

Kim, Julie. 1995. "Could you calm down more?": Request and Korean ESL Learners. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 11:2.67–81.

Kim, Jihye. 2013. A Study on the Implementation Patterns of Request Speech Acts by Korean Learners in Spoken Discourse. *The Korean Society of Bilingualism* 52.46–69.

Kim, Lan. 2021. Reconsideration of Korean Benefactive Expressions in Foreign Language Teaching Contexts. *The Korean Language in America* 25:2.87–109.

Kim, Sujeong. 2004. *A Study on the Ending Connectives for Korean Grammar Education as a Foreign Language.* Seoul: Hankuk Mwunwhasa.

Kim, Sun Hee, & Hikyoung Lee. 2017. Politeness in Power-Asymmetrical E-mail Requests of Korean and American Corporate Employees. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 14:2.207–238.

Lee, Jung-Hee. 2002. The Error Analysis of Korean Language Learners. Ph.D. Dissertation. Kyounghee University.

Lee, Keedong. 1980. The Pragmatic Function of the Connective *nuntey*. Ene [*Language*] 5:1.119–135.

Lee, Keedong. 1993. *A Korean Grammar on Semantic Pragmatic Principles.* Seoul: Hankwuk Munwhasa.

Martinez-Flor & Usó-Juan. 2010. Pragmatics and Speech Act Performance. *Speech Act Performance: Theoretical, Empirical and Methodological Issues* ed. by Alicia Martínez-Flor & Esther Usó-Juan, 3–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McLean, Terence. 2005. "Why no tip?" Student-Generated DCTs in the ESL Classroom. *Pragmatics in Language Learning, Theory and Practice* ed. by Donna Tatsuki, 150–156. Tokyo: JALT Pragmatics SIG.

Mueller, Jeansue & Nan Jiang. 2013. The Acquisition of the Korean Honorific Affix -(u)si by Advanced L2 Learners. *The Modern Language Journal* 97:2.318–339.

Park, Yong-Yae. 1999. The Korean Connective *nuntey* in Conversational Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31.191–218.

Rose, Kenneth R. 2000. An Exploratory Cross-sectional Study of Interlanguage Pragmatic Development. *Interlanguage Pragmatic Development* 22. 27–67.

Rose, Kenneth R. & Gabriele Kasper. 2001. *Pragmatics in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rue, Yongju, Grace Zhang & Kyu Shin. 2007. Request Strategies in Korean. *5th Biennial Korean Studies Association of Australasia Conference*, 112–119. Perth: Australia.

Schauer, Gila A. 2007. Finding the Right Words in the Study Abroad Context: The Development of German Learners' Use of External Modifiers in English. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4:2.193–220.

Sohn, Ho-min. 1986. Patterns of American Students' Composition Errors in Korean. *Korean Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* ed. by Nam-kil Kim, 150–202. Los Angeles: The University of Southern California Press.

doi   Taguchi, Naoko. 2011. Teaching Pragmatics: Trends and Issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31.289–310.

doi   Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage Pragmatics--Requests, Complaints and Apologies*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wang, Hye-Sook. 1999. Speech Acts in Korean Language Textbooks: Representations and Authenticity. *Journal of Korean Language Education* 10:1.195–220.

doi   Woodfield, Helen & Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis. 2010. 'I Just Need More Time': A Study of Native and Non-Native Students' Requests to Faculty for an Extension. *Multilingua* 29:1.77–118.

doi   Yamashita, Junko. 2002. Mutual Compensation Between L1 Reading Ability and L2 Language Proficiency in L2 Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading* 25.81–95.

Yoon, Sang-Seok. 2010. Situational meanings and functions of Korean speech styles. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Hawaii.

Yoon, Sang-Seok. 2011. Cross-Sectional Analysis of KFL Students' Requests and Refusals. *Language Information* 12.223–248.

doi   Yoon, Sang-Seok & Dong-Eun Lee. 2011. Request and Apology Speech Acts in Email Discourse of KFL/KSL Students. *The Journal of Studies in Language* 27:1.117–145.

Young, Richard F. 2011. Interactional Competence in Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* ed. by Eli Hinkel, 426–443. Routledge.

Yu, Kyong-Ae. 2004. Explicitness for Requests is a Politer Strategy than Implicitness in Korean. *Discourse and Cognition* 11:1.173–194.

doi   Yu, Kyong-Ae. 2011. Culture-Specific Concepts of Politeness: Indirectness and Politeness in English, Hebrew, and Korean Requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 8:3.385–409.

Yun, Ju Ri. 2021. Analysis of Direct Request Speech Act Types Appeared in Korean Textbooks. *Journal of Education Research*. Vol. 27, 169–190.

Zhang, Yanyin. 1995. Indirectness in Chinese requesting. *Pragmatics of Chinese As Native and Target Language* ed. by Gabriele Kasper, 69–118. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.

Appendix

1.   Revised CCSARP coding system

Strategies	Types	Examples
Direct Request (The speaker's intent is apparent from the locution; requests are realized in the most direct way.)	Mood derivable: Use of command endings	-e/ayo 'Do …' -(u)seyyo 'Please do … ' -e/a cwuseyyo 'Please do … (for me)' -ci maseyyo 'Don't do …' -e/ala 'Do …'
	Explicit performative: Use of verbs that express request	pwutakhata 'ask' -ki lul palata 'wish … to do…'
	Want Statement	*-ko siphta* 'want to'
Indirect Request, Conventional (The speaker employs indirect request strategies to minimize the request imposition; requests are manifested in the apparent linguistic forms.)	Listener- oriented	suggestion (e.g., -(u)lkkayo? 'Shall we…?, 'Do you think…?) asking for acceptability (e.g. -(u)l swu isseyo? Can you..?) asking for willingness (e.g. -(u)llayyo? 'Would you like to…?' asking for permission (e.g. -e/ato twaeyyo?/kwaynchachayo? 'Is it okay for me …?)
	Speaker- oriented	expressing the listener's obligation (e.g. -e/aya twayyo 'You must …' giving permission (e.g. (u)myen twayyo 'You can do …')
Indirect Request, Nonconventional (Requests are not manifested in the surface linguistic forms)	strong hint	e.g. changmwun-i tathye issneyyo 'Window is closed.' (speaker's intention: getting the hearer to open the window)
	mild hint	e.g. nemwu teweyo. 'It is so hot' (speaker's intention: getting the hearer to turn on A/C)

2. DCT situations

1. You have to take a certain course in order to graduate next year, but just found that the class is already closed. So, you decide to go to the professor and ask him/her (whom you probably do not know well), to allow you to take the class. How would you ask for permission in Korean?

2. You want to ask your professor to be allowed to take a test on an alternative day, because you have to miss the class due to an out-of-town wedding of your sister. How would you ask this to your professor in Korean?

3. You have many questions for your upcoming final exam, but the professor's office hours do not work for your schedule. Thus, you want to ask the professor to schedule an appointment outside of the office hour, How would you ask in Korean?

Address for correspondence

Sang-Seok Yoon
Department of Asian & Slavic Languages and Literatures
University of Iowa
111 Phillips Hall, 16 N Clinton St
Iowa City, IA 52245
United States
sang-seok-yoon@uiowa.edu
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6060-5920

Co-author information

Lan Kim
Department of Asian Studies
Pennsylvania State University
luk18@psu.edu

Publication history