

Teaching the polite and the deferential speech levels using media materials: Advanced KFL classroom settings

Andrew Sangpil Byon
University at Albany, State University of New York

Introduction

The application of media materials in teaching Korean pragmatic elements in Korean as a Foreign Language (KFL) classroom settings is still an underdeveloped research area. This paper explores how one can apply media materials to the teaching of Korean pragmatic elements in advanced KFL classroom settings.¹ One can generate various teaching activities using televised media materials, such as television talk shows, dramas, news, and commercials. The focus of this paper is on teaching two Korean speech levels: the polite speech level (the *yo* form) and the deferential speech level (the *supnita* form) as well as the alternation between the speech levels, using two short video clips from Korean television talk shows.² The video clips include a morning talk show presentation (3 minutes), and a multi-party interaction from a shopping channel show (3 minutes). Both clips were transcribed and subjected to an in-depth analysis of the participants' uses of the deferential speech level and the polite speech level.³ The paper addresses the following three issues:

1. What do previous studies say about teaching pragmatics and the instructional uses of media materials for KFL classroom settings?
2. What are some possible teaching activities that may be developed from the given materials?
3. What are the pedagogical implications and directions for further research?

The paper aims to raise KFL teachers' and researchers' awareness regarding the use of television media materials for teaching pragmatic elements. Although the case presented in this paper is about teaching the two speech levels, it is hoped that the instructional model presented and its pedagogical implications can be extended to teaching other pragmatic elements. In addition, it is hoped that the study may stimulate KFL teachers' and researchers' interest in this crucial dimension of KFL pedagogy.

The paper is organized in the following way. First, the paper discusses published findings in the literature regarding pragmatics-focused pedagogy and the instructional uses of media materials in KFL classroom contexts. Second, the paper proposes seven practical steps one can take when developing teaching activities from media materials. It then discusses the rationale for choosing the target elements, reviews relevant literature with respect to the target elements, and establishes the instructional points (e.g., "what to teach") based on data analysis of the given excerpts. Next, it discusses how one can develop several teaching activities using the media texts. It also explores various classroom assessment tools that can be used to evaluate and enhance the efficiency of the activities. In the final sections, the paper discusses the pedagogical implications of the findings, and then suggests directions for further research.

Literature Review

Pragmatic learning and teaching in KFL classrooms

Teaching pragmatic features in American college KFL classroom settings is still an underdeveloped research area when compared to teaching directed at developing a learner's grammatical competence or lexical knowledge (Byon, 2005). Among the research issues of those few existing studies are the teaching of Korean honorifics to American KFL students (e.g., Byon, 2000; 2004, Lee, 1997; Sohn, 2001; Wang, 1995), investigating American KFL students' pragmatic errors (e.g., Wang, 1999a), examining speech acts in Korean language textbooks (e.g., Choo, 1999; Wang, 1999b), teaching speech acts (Byon, 2005), and the use of discourse completion tasks (DCT) in raising pragmatic awareness in the KFL classroom context (Byon, 2006).

Byon (2004) investigates second-year KFL students' assessment of the pragmatic appropriateness of speech acts (e.g., with a focus on the appropriate use of honorific elements) and discusses pedagogical implications based on the findings. The study involved 30 KFL students (for listening tasks), and two KFL instructors (for interviews). The pragmatic listening task was as follows: the subjects listened to a sequence of three audio-taped request speech act situations, each followed by four choices of requests. After listening to each situation, the subjects were prompted to listen to four audio-taped possible request forms, which were played three times, and then to judge the most appropriate request among the four choices in each given context. They were asked to judge the most appropriate request according to the referential content of the message, the social meaning (e.g., indicated by the level of honorifics used), and the pragmatic meaning (e.g., directness). The study reports that the KFL students were able to identify the correct response 73.3% of the time and notes five possible reasons for learners' incorrect responses: 1) misjudging the use of the appropriate speech level; 2) difficulty in recognizing euphemistic verbs; 3) failure to use the honorific suffix in addressing a familiar professor; 4) different perceptions regarding the appropriate level of directness in speech acts; 5) lack of knowledge regarding Korean honorifics. Moreover, the study identifies a) the KFL instructors' lack of awareness regarding the need to teach KFL pragmatic elements and b) the grammar-oriented instructional goals of the KFL curriculum as two factors that need to be re-addressed in

order to enhance current KFL pragmatic teaching. Although Byon's study is interesting, its pedagogical insights are limited to understanding KFL students' pragmatic ability (e.g., the ability to assess the appropriateness of a speech act based on the proper knowledge of honorifics), resulting from previous classroom language learning. It does not offer practical guidelines regarding teaching directed at developing learner pragmatic ability (e.g., the use of honorifics).

The studies by Choo (1999) and Wang (1999b) concern textbook analysis for pragmatic teaching and learning. Choo (1999) examines four major existing Korean textbooks and identifies several shortcomings with respect to the presentation of Korean pragmatic elements (e.g., speech levels): the textbooks do not reflect changes in Korean culture and society appropriately. Moreover, the materials often fail to provide background information about the situations being modeled, such as the identities of the participants involved, their status, and other sociolinguistic variables. After reviewing ten KFL textbooks at the beginning and intermediate level, Wang (1999b) reports similar findings: the speech acts presented in the texts do not reflect the content and variability of naturally occurring discourses.

Byon's (2005; 2006) recent studies are noteworthy in that they more directly address instructional issues of pragmatics in KFL classroom settings. For instance, Byon (2005) addresses the issues associated with teaching speech acts to KFL students, offering practical guidelines. Asserting that teaching speech acts is one of the best ways to infuse a structural syllabus with cultural knowledge in action and to raise students' motivation, the author discusses several approaches to teaching speech acts (e.g., refusals) for KFL classroom contexts: 1) analysis and explicit presentation of a target speech act; 2) teaching receptive skills; 3) student project approach; and 4) productive skill approach (teacher-guided and controlled). Byon (2006) investigates a case of raising awareness of the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic dimensions of Korean speech acts among intermediate KFL students in an American university using a discourse completion task (DCT). The study shows that the DCT provided a very practical tool for enabling KFL students to recognize the pragmatic features of speech acts. Although it is encouraging to see the gradual but steadily growing number of KFL studies that address teaching and learning pragmatic features in KFL classroom settings, more studies are still needed on this crucial aspect of KFL pedagogy.

The use of media materials in KFL instruction

The benefits of using authentic media materials in second language (L2) education have been well supported in existing L2 studies (e.g., see Brinton, 1991 for more detail). Their pedagogical value has been acknowledged in Korean language classroom settings as well (Park, 1997). However, the number of studies that address the issues of using media materials, such as films and television programs, in Korean language classroom settings is relatively low (Lee, 1999). The topics of those limited studies include television commercials (e.g., Strauss, 1999; Wang, 2000), television drama scripts (Ahn, 2001), films (Lee, 1999), and Korean language education programs on television (Choi, Chang, Kim, & Chae, 2005).

Strauss (1999) argues for the value of using television commercials for KFL education: "television commercials, by virtue of their simplicity in structure and their creative use of language, can indeed be developed into extremely effective supplementary teaching materials" (p. 236). She also maintains that commercials can provide a rich source of linguistic (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, speech styles, and pragmatic features) as well as cultural input (e.g., both covert and overt cultural elements). By offering a number of sample learning activities, Wang (2000) explores how commercials can be exploited for KFL language and culture education. Lee (1999) examines the instructional advantages of using films in Korean language classroom contexts, listing the following benefits of using films:

1. Teachers can obtain authentic language data by analyzing the film scripts.
2. Teachers can use films to teach four language skills.
3. Teachers can use films to create tasks that are related to daily life.
4. Teachers can use films to teach Korean culture.
5. Teachers can use films to stimulate Korean language learners' interests and motivation.

Ahn (2001) analyzes two types of naturally occurring spoken texts (e.g., formal spoken texts and informal television drama scripts). She investigates the types of cohesive devices, used in each text and how each text differs in terms of the devices used and their frequency of use. Her paper discusses the pedagogical implications of the findings. However, as the focus of the investigation is primarily on the use of Korean cohesive devices, the paper does not offer more general tangible instructional implications. Choi et al. (2005) review major Korean language education television shows in terms of their contents, arrangement, and pedagogical perspectives. In addition, they discuss what needs to be done to enhance the quality and instructional efficiency of those shows.

While these studies all maintain the benefits of using televised media materials for KFL pedagogy, only a handful of studies (e.g., Lee, 1999; Wang, 2000) offer practical instructional models (e.g., sample learning activities). More needs to be done in order to understand the full benefits and instructional roles of media materials for KFL education. This is particularly true for using television materials to teach Korean pragmatic elements. For instance, to this date, there has been no single published KFL study that investigates how to teach the speech levels using Korean televised media materials. To fill this void, the current study explores possible instructional models and proposes the following practical steps one can take to utilize television media materials for teaching pragmatic elements.

1. Decide on the target pragmatic elements.
2. Conduct a review of the literature regarding the target elements.
3. Select, transcribe, and analyze relevant media materials.
4. Develop teaching activities from the selected materials.
 - a. The activities can be deductive-oriented and/or inductive-oriented.
 - b. The activities can focus on teaching receptive skills and/or productive skills.
5. Develop classroom assessment tools.

6. Implement the teaching activities.
7. Use the assessment tools to evaluate the learning outcomes.

The rest of the paper is devoted to elaborating the above seven steps by applying them to teaching the target elements.

Teaching

Deciding on the target speech levels

There has been disagreement among grammarians on the number of speech levels that should be recognized in Korean and on the hierarchical ordering of those levels. Some scholars propose six levels (Martin, 1964; Sohn, 1988, 1994, 1999), others five (Lee, 1970), or four (Hwang, 1975), or two (Suh, 1984). Despite the disagreement, it is the six-level system of sentence endings (adopted from Sohn, 1994, p. 8) that receives the most support.

Table 1. Korean speech levels

| | Declarative | Interrogative | Imperative | Propositive |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Deferential | <i>-supnita</i> | <i>-supnikka</i> | <i>-sipsio</i> | <i>-sipsita</i> |
| Polite | <i>-e-yo</i> | <i>-e-yo</i> | <i>-e-yo</i> | <i>-e-yo</i> |
| Blunt | <i>-o</i> | | <i>-o</i> | |
| Familiar | <i>-ney</i> | <i>-na/-nunka</i> | <i>-key</i> | <i>-sey</i> |
| Intimate | <i>-e</i> | <i>-e</i> | <i>-e</i> | <i>-e</i> |
| Plain | <i>-ta</i> | <i>-ni /-nya</i> | <i>-la</i> | <i>-ca</i> |

The target pragmatic features chosen for exemplification in this paper are the polite speech level (or the *yo* form) and the deferential speech level (or the *supnita* form).

The reason for choosing these two speech levels is twofold. First, in both informal and formal conversations, alternation between these speech levels commonly takes place (except in certain contexts such as news broadcasting). As the use of the two speech levels is influenced by socio-contextual factors (e.g., the formality of the situation, and social variables such as power and distance between interlocutors) as well as metalinguistic features (e.g., the information status of referential messages), learning which speech level to use and when is a daunting task for KFL learners. Television materials can be developed into excellent teaching materials, since they can provide the the teachers and learners with naturally occurring linguistic data as well as full socio-contextual information associated with the use of the target language features. The second

rationale derives from the scarcity of the KFL studies that investigate the instruction of scarcity of KFL studies that investigate the instruction of this crucial aspect of KFL language use.

Reviewing the literature on the target speech levels⁴

The polite speech level (hereafter the *yo* form), the most commonly used speech level among the six levels, is broadly used in any situation where polite language is called for (Lee & Ramsey, 2000). Sohn (1999) notes that Koreans use the *yo* form when addressing someone of senior status in casual, non-formal, and everyday types of conversations. On the other hand, the deferential speech level (hereafter the *supnita* form), the formal counterpart of the *yo* form, is used for public or formal discourse: "The deferential style is used when addressing the public or by a junior person to a senior person and serves to index a formal conversational setting" (Lukoff, 1982, p. 170-172). Lee & Ramsey (2000) remark that what distinguishes the *supnita* form from the *yo* form lies in the degree of formality that the *supnita* form generates. Sohn (1994) also observes that the *supnita* form is used predominantly by male speakers.

Despite the seemingly clear distinctions between these two forms, the alternation of these two speech levels does occur in both informal and formal situations: "Both the polite and deferential levels are used to a social equal or superior person, but in general, the polite level is favored between close persons. Even in a formal conversational situation, the deferential and polite levels are usually intermixed by the same interlocutors in the same discourse" (Sohn, 1994, p. 10). The use of the *yo* form generates an effect of making a dialogue sound less formal, even in formal conversational contexts. The use of either form depends on "the feel of the situation and the atmosphere that one wishes to convey" (Lee & Ramsey, 2000, p. 261).

While these studies account for the differences between the two speech levels and the alternations between the levels in terms of various contextual factors (e.g., social status, degree of intimacy between interlocutors, formality level, and type of discourse), Eun & Strauss (2004) and Strauss & Eun (2005) propose an alternative interpretation regarding the use of these two speech levels, analyzing naturally occurring talk in an oral discourse corpus. They discuss the discourse-functional use of these two speech levels and their mixed uses in terms of "the status of information" (2004) and "the semantic features of +/- boundary" (2005). For instance, Eun & Strauss (2004) assert that the *yo* form is used with shared or otherwise known, common sense notions, or information that is being repeated to the interlocutor. The *supnita* form is used with new or non shared information to the addressee; the *supnita* form is used to introduce and/or frame people, topics, and upcoming activities in less formulaic discourse genres. According to the study, information status is the primary factor behind the use of the deferential form and is also sometimes a factor in the use of the polite form in Korean discourse.

Strauss & Eun (2005) interprets the alternating use of the speech levels based on the semantic features of the forms. They argue that the alternation between the *yo* form and the *supnita* form bears a strong relationship with the concept of boundary:

That is, when the speakers use the deferential form (+BOUNDARY), they index a stance of EXCLUSION with the interlocutor, such that the interlocutor is positioned as outside the sphere of the speaker's cognitive and/or experiential domains; discourse marked with the deferential form is thus framed as detached, objective, and authoritative. In contrast, when speakers use the polite form (-BOUNDARY), they index a stance of INCLUSION. Essentially then, the deferential form creates bounded distance between speaker and addressee, while the polite form establishes and/or reinforces common ground (Strauss & Eun, 2005, p. 611).

Summary of the analysis

Having reviewed the literature, one is ready to analyze the given materials and arrange possible instructional points. The following teaching points were developed based on the data analysis (see Appendixes A and B for the entire transcribed data):

1. The *yo* form is the informal politeness marker, and the *supnita* form is the formal politeness marker.
2. The *yo* form appears:
 - a. After clause-endings: *hayse(yo)*, *nikka(yo)*, *hayss-kwu(yo)*, *hayss-nun-tey (yo)*, *hay-ss-ketun (yo)*, *inka(yo)*, *ul-kka(yo)*?⁵
 - b. After particles: *wusum-i(yo)* [smile-NM], *cey-ka(yo)* [I-NM], *hakkyo-nun (yo)* [school-TC].⁶
 - c. After affect (evidential) markers: *-e(yo)*, *-ci(yo)*, *-ney(yo)*. These index the following pragmatic messages in addition to their function of rendering an utterance informal:
 - i. One indexical meaning of *-e* is **assertion**. This suffix is the unmarked and most basic informal sentence-final suffix whose function is to convey the information of the speaker directly to the addressee (Lee, 1991).
 - ii. The function of *-ci* is to **call forth agreements or to obtain affirmation** about what the speaker believes to be true.
 - iii. The function of *-ney* is to indicate the speaker's **momentary reactions** to (e.g., surprise and sympathy) **and/or realization** of some new information.
3. In the data, the speakers used the *yo* form more often than the *supnita* form for backchannelling purposes: *kulayyo?* [is that so?] or *kulehcyo?* [that is so, right?] (nine instances) vs. *kulehsupnikka?* [is that so?] (two instances).
4. When the *supnita* form and the *yo* form are used in an alternating manner, the use of the *yo* form emphasizes its meaning (e.g., by adding the speaker's affect or rendering the utterance more informal).
5. The *yo* form is used with shared or otherwise known information to the interlocutor, whereas the *supnita* form is used with new or non-shared information, such as introducing topics and people, and sequence framing.

6. In the data, when quoting information, the participants tend to use more *-lako kulayyo* [...they said so](four instances) than *-lako kulepnita* [...they said so] (one instance). This may be due to the fact that the *yo* form adds informality to the referential message.

Developing teaching activities

The following activities are designed for advanced intermediate KFL classes or above, and/or undergraduate Korean linguistics courses.⁷ In addition, since questions of grammaticality are not relevant during this instruction (e.g., the use of either level does not render the sentence ungrammatical), the primary pedagogical goal is to raise students' pragmatic awareness regarding the use of these two forms.

Receptive skills. The following activities are designed to enhance the students' ability to recognize and understand the use of the target forms. One can take either a deductive approach or an inductive approach.

Deductive approach. When teaching deductively, teachers first give an explicit presentation (e.g., lecture) regarding the aforementioned properties of the target elements. Then, they distribute the presentation handouts and explain how the target elements are used in context. For instance, consider the following sample segment, adapted from the given material:

Sample [1]

A presentation handout

Instructional points:

1. *The supnita form: Introducing topics and people/formal politeness marker.*
2. *The use of the supnita form and the yo form in an alternating manner to emphasize the meaning of the utterance (e.g., by adding the speaker's affect or rendering the utterance more informal).*
3. *The yo form: Informal politeness marker with affect marker (e.g., -e "assertion").*

41. 요셉: 오늘 최고의 배려 웃음입니다.
42. 인식: 음
43. 요셉: 어, 제가 오늘 배려에 대해서 얘길 하면서 과연 배려가 무엇 일까에 대해서 한번 생각해 본적이 있습니다. 얼마전에 제가 어떤 분의 이야기를 들었어요. 어떤 앞을 보지 못하는 시각 장애인이 길을 가고 있었습니다. 가고 있는데 이 사람이 등불을 들고 걷고 있는 거예요.
48. 청중: 아
49. 요셉: 앞을 보지 못하는 사람이 지나가는 나그네가 말합니다. 보니까 기가 막혀요.

41. Yoseyp: *Onul choyko-uy paylye wusum-i-pnita.*
 Today the best-GN consideration laughter-be-DEF
 "Today, laughter can be the best way to show consideration for others."
42. Insek: *Um*
43. Yoseyp: *E cey-ka onul paylye-ey tayhayse yaykil ha-myense kwayen paylye-ka mwues-ilkka-ey*
 Well I-NM today consideration about talking while as expected consideration-NM what
 "When I prepared for the talk about consideration today,
tayhayse hanpen sayngkak hay poncek-i iss-supnita.
 regarding once thinking do try time-NM exist-DEF
 I thought about what consideration might be.
Elma cen-ey cey-ka etten pwun-uy iyaki-lul tul-ess-eyo.
 A while ago at I-NM certain person-GN story-AC listen-PST-POL
 A while ago, I heard one person's story.
Etten aph-ul poci mos hanun sikak cangayin-i kil-ul kako iss-ess-supnita.
 Certain front-AC can't see visual handicapped person-NM road-AC going-PST-DEF
 A blind person was crossing a road.
Kako iss-nuntey i-salam-i tungpwul-ul tulko ketko issnun ke-ey-yo.
 Going but this person-NM lamp-AC carrying walking fact-be-POL
 He was walking, holding a lamp."
48. Audience: *Ah... (Oh)*
49. Yoseyp: *Aph-ul poci mos hanun salam-i cinaka-nun nakuney-ka mal ha-pnita.*
 Front-AC cannot see person-NM passing passer-NM talk do-DEF
 "The person cannot see... A passer-by said to him,
Ponikka ki-ka makhye-yo.
 See-because spirit-NM being blocked-POL
 thinking that it doesn't make any sense."

Here in line 41, Joseph uses the *supnita* form to introduce a new topic, "laughter". In line 43, Joseph emphasizes the meaning by shifting the speech levels. Teachers can explain that the *supnita* form is used for new information, introducing topics, and sequence framing, whereas the *yo* form is used with shared or otherwise known information. In addition, the teacher can point

out the use of *yo* form that appears after *-e* (in line 43 and 49) whose indexical meaning is assertion.

After the explicit instruction, the teacher shows the video clips, presenting the patterns in context. A follow-up activity can be designed to direct the students to practice the dialogues in groups or pairs. (See Appendix C for more sample presentation handouts for the deductive teaching approach.)

Inductive approach. When using an inductive approach, teachers can distribute the activity handouts to the class and have students circle which form they think is a better choice. For instance, consider the following sample activity handout for the following teaching points:

1. *The supnita form: New information / Introducing topics and people / Sequence framing.*
2. *The yo form: Informal politeness marker that occurs with affect markers (e.g., -e "assertion").*
3. *The use of the yo form for backchannelling.*

Sample [2]

An activity handout for inductive teaching

62. 청중: 어
63. 요셉: 웃음이 요/none. 실제로 배려입니다 / 이에요. 왜냐하면 웃음은 애한테 웃음... 애기 좋아하는 애기를 볼때 웃지요/웃지 않습니까?
65. 청중: 예
66. 요셉: 나는 너를 좋아한다.
67. 청중: 어
68. 요셉: 난 널 인정하고 난 너한테 관심이 있어 라는 말이 바로 웃음 이에요 / 입니다.
70. 청중: 그래요 / 그렇습니다.
71. 요셉: 웃음이 실제로 배려한다는 최고의 방법이라는 거지요 / 겁니다.
62. Audience: A... (oh)...
63. Yoseyp: *Wusum-i-yo/none. Silceylo paylye i-pnita/i-eyyo.*
Laughter-NM In fact consideration be-DEF/ be-POL
"In fact, laughter is consideration (for others).

Waynyahamyen wusum-un ay-hanthey wusum...

Because laughter-TC child-to laughter

Because laughter is like... to a child, you smile...

ayki cohaha-nun ayki-lul pol ttay wus-ci-yo/ wus-ci-an-supnikka?

Baby like child-AC see time smile-SUP-POL/ smile-SUP-not-DEF

You may smile when you look at a baby you like, right?"

65. Audience: *Yey* (yes)
66. Yoseyp: *Na-nun ne-lul cohahan-ta.*
I-TC you-AC like-DC
"I like you."
67. Audience: *Yey* (yes)
68. Yoseyp: *Nan nel inceng ha-ko nan ne hanthey kwansim-i isse la-nun mal-i palo wusum i-eyyo/i-pnita.*
I-TC you-AC acknowledge do-and I-TC you-to interest-NM have utterance-NM just laughter be-POL/be-DEF
"Laughter means that I acknowledge you and I am interested in you."
70. Audience: *Kulay-yo/ kuleh-supnita*
So-POL/ So-DEF
"Right."
71. Yoseyp: *Wusum-i silceylo paylye hanta-nun choyko-uy pangpep-i-la-nun ke-ci-yo/ ke-pnita.*
laughter-NM in fact consideration do the best-GN means-NM thing-SUP-POL/thing-DEF
"In fact, laughter is the best way to show consideration (toward others)."

Then, students discuss their choices in groups or pairs and list their reasons for their choices. Next, the teacher shows the video clip and explains the aforementioned properties of the two forms. (See Appendix D for more sample activity handouts.)

Productive skills: Cloze-type exercises. Cloze-type exercises can enhance the students' ability to produce the target forms. In a cloze-type exercise, students are given a series of conversations with the target elements deleted.⁸ Students can complete the blanks with the correct speech level ending either orally or in written form. The following is a sample cloze-type practice developed from the materials.

Sample [3]A cloze-type exercise for the mixed use*Teaching Points:*

1. *The supnita form: Formal politeness marker/ New information.*
2. *The yo form: Politeness marker with affect markers (e.g., -ci / -ney) & informal politeness marker.*

41. 요셉: 오늘 최고의 배려 웃음_____ (입니다).
42. 인식: 음
43. 요셉: 어, 제가 오늘 배려에 대해서 얘길 하면서 과연 배려가 무엇 일까에 대해서 한번 생각해 본적이 있_____ (습니다). 얼마 전에 제가 어떤 분의 이야기를 들었_____ (어요). 어떤 앞을 보지 못하는 시각 장애인이 길을 가고 있었_____ (습니다). 가고 있는데 이 사람이 등불을 들고 걷고 있는 거_____ (예요).
48. 청중: 아
49. 요셉: 앞을 보지 못하는 사람이 지나가는 나그네가 말_____ (합니다). 보니까 기가 막혀요.
51. 요셉: 보지도 못하는 사람이 등불을 들고 있으니까.
53. 청중: 어
54. 요셉: 아니 당신 지금 제정신이요?
56. 요셉: 아니 당신 미친 사람 아니요?
57. 청중: 아
58. 요셉: 보지 못하면서 왜 등불을 들고 있는 거요 라고 말을 꺼냈더니 이 시각 장애인이 하는 말이 이 등불은 나를 위해서가 아니라 당신을 위해서 들고 있_____ (습니다).
62. 청중: 어
63. 요셉: 웃음이요. 실제로 배려_____ (입니다). 왜냐하면 웃음은 애한테 웃., 애기 좋아하는 애기를 볼때 웃지요.
65. 청중: 예
66. 요셉: 나는 너를 좋아한다.
67. 청중: 어

68. 요셉: 난 널 인정하고 난 너한테 관심이 있어 라는 말이 바로 웃음
_____ (이예요).
70. 청중: 그래요.
71. 요셉: 웃음이 실제로 배려한다는 최고의 방법이라는 거지요.
41. Yoseyp: *Onul choyko-uy paylye wusum _____ (i-pnita).*
Today the best-GN consideration laughter-(be-DEF)
"Today, laughter can be the best way to express consideration for others."
42. Insek: *Um*
43. Yoseyp: *E cey-ka onul paylye-ey tayhayse yaykil hamyense kwayen paylye-ka mwues-ilkka-ey*
Well I-NM today consideration about talking while as expected consideration-NM what
"When I prepared for the talk about consideration today,
tayhayse hanpen sayngkak hay poncek-i iss _____ (supnita).
regarding once thinking do try time-NM exist-DEF
I thought about what consideration might be.
Elma cen-ey cey-ka etten pwun-uy iyaki-lul tul-ess _____ (eyo).
A while ago at I-NM certain person-GN story-AC listen-PST-POL
A while ago, I heard one person's story.
Etten aph-ul poci mos hanun sikak cangayin-i kil-ul kako iss-ess- _____ (supnita).
Certain front-AC can't see visual handicapped person-NM road going-PST-(DEF)
A blind person was crossing a road.
Kako iss-nuntey i-salam-i tungpwul-ul tulko ketko issnun ke-ey _____ (yo).
Going but this person-NM lamp-AC carrying walking fact-be (POL)
This person was walking, carrying a lamp with him."
48. Audience: *Yey* (yes)
49. Yoseyp: *Aph-ul poci mos hanun salam-i cinaka-nun nakuney-ka mal _____ (ha-pnita).*
Front-AC cannot see person-NM passing passer-NM talk (do-DEF)
"The person cannot see... A passer-by said to him."

Ponikka ki-ka makhye _____ (yo).
 See-because spirit-NM being-blocked-(POL)
 He thinks it does not make any sense."

51. Yoseyp: *Pocito mos hanun salam-i tungpwul-ul tulko iss-unikka...*
 cannot see person-NM lamp-AC carrying-because
 "As a blind man carries a lamp..."
53. Audience: *O...* (Oh)
54. Yoseyp: *Ani tangsin cikum cey cengsin-i-yo?*
 No you now sane spirit-be-POL?
 "Are you insane?"
56. Yoseyp: *Ani tangsin michin salam ani-yo?*
 No you crazy person aren't POL?
 "Aren't you a crazy person?"
57. Audience: *Ah...* (Ah)
58. Yoseyp: *Poci mos hamyense way tungpwul-ul tulko issnun-keyo lako mal-ul kkenay-ss-teni*
 Cannot see while why lamp-AC carrying-fact utterance-AC bring out-PST as
 "As he asks the blind man why he is carrying a lamp even if he can't see,
i sikak cangayin ha-nun mal-i i tungpwul-un na-lul wihayseka anila
 this visual handicapped person saying utterance-NM this lamp-TC I-AC for not
 this blind man answers that I am holding this lamp not for me...
tangsin-ul wihayse tulko iss _____ (supnita)
 you-AC for carrying-be (DEF)
 but for you."
62. Audience: *Oh...*(Oh)
63. Yoseyp: *Wusum-i-yo. Silceylo paylye _____ (i-pnita).*
 Laughter-NM-POL. In fact consideration (be-DEF)
 "In fact, laughter is consideration (for others).
Waynyahamyen wusum-un ay-hanthey wusum...
 Because laughter-TC child-to laughter
 Because laughter is like... to a child, you smile..."

ayki cohaha-nun ayki-lul pol ttay wus-ci-yo?
 Baby like child-AC see time smile-SUP-POL
 you may smile when you look at a baby you like, right?"

65. Audience: *Yey* (yes)
66. Yoseyp: *Na-nun ne-lul cohahan-ta.*
 I-TC you-AC like-DC
 "I like you."
67. Audience: *Yey* (yes)
68. Yoseyp: *Nan nel inceng hako nan ne hanthey kwansim-i isse la-nun mal-i palo wusum (i-ey-yo).*
 I-TC you-AC acknowledge do and I-TC you-to interest-NM exist
 utterance-NM just laughter (be-POL)
 "Laughter means that I acknowledge you and I am interested in you."
70. Audience: *Kulay-yo.*
 So-POL
 "Right."
71. Yoseyp: *Wusum-i silceylo paylye hanta-nun choyko-uy pangpep-i-la-nun ke-ci-yo*
 laughter-NM in fact consideration do the best-GN means-NM fact-SUP-POL
 "In fact, laughter is the best way to show consideration (for others)."

After completion of the task, students can engage in group or pair activity where they discuss their choices. Then, the teacher shows the video clip and explains the properties of the two forms. Since the use of either level is grammatical, the teacher's follow-up feedback is essential in explaining why a certain level is preferred over the other.

Developing classroom assessment tools

In order to assess and ensure the efficiency of the teaching activities, one can use various classroom assessment techniques (CATs). CATs are closely related to the educational practice called "feedback" (Carduner, 2002), in which teachers collect information from their students regarding the effectiveness of instruction, learning processes, affective stances, and any other reactions relevant to instructional content. In addition, CATs provide students with evidence that the teachers care about learning, and help them develop self-assessment and learning management skills as well as the ability to change study strategies if needed. The use of CATs should be viewed as a formative process (Carduner, 2002), rather than a summative process, such

as in the evaluation of students' performance for grading purposes, in that the primary benefits of CATs come into play when the feedback collected from students is used to adapt the teaching to better meet students' needs (Black & William, 1998).

Typically CATs, such as One-Sentence Summary, Minute Paper, and Feedback Form, are used to collect brief personal reactions from students usually immediately following a particular lesson. For instance, in the case of using the One-Sentence Summary and Minute Paper the teacher ends the class a few minutes early and asks students to write down their responses.

Sample [4]

One-Sentence Summary:

Please summarize what you have learned today in one or two sentences:

Sample [5]

Minute Paper:

- A. About the *yo* form, I have learned...
- B. About the *supnita* form I have learned...

The responses can be what they think they learned and/or still do not understand regarding a particular lesson (Minute Papers), or it can be a brief summary of the lesson (One-Sentence Summary). These data provide constructive feedback to the instructor so that he/she can reflect on his/her own teaching and also evaluate students' learning processes.

Teacher-designed Feedback Forms are administered to obtain responses to very specific questions regarding the effectiveness of a lesson, and/or particular instructional materials or approaches. The following are sample feedback forms.

Sample [6]

Rate the following categories based on the scale 1 – 5 (5 the best).

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Well prepared for the lecture? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Communicated course in ways you understood? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Challenged you intellectually? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Receptive to your ideas and questions? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Held you to high standards of performance? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Clear articulation? (volume and pace of speech) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Confident? (e.g., poise and comfort) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Non-verbal behavior? (e.g., eye contact) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Sincere in a professional manner? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. The use of blackboard (clear? and useful?) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Any Comments?

Sample [7]

1. Did you like **cloze-type practices**? How would you rate this activity for increasing your knowledge in the use of *yo* form and the *supnita* form? Circle one number and give any comments if you have them:

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Comments:

2. Would you recommend these activities to others who are learning Korean speech levels? Would you make any suggestions to improve the activities if you were to do them again? If yes, or no, please explain how much and why.

Sample [6] is a feedback form, designed to assess students' reactions regarding the instructor's teaching. The results can help instructors reflect on their own teaching so that they can enhance their teaching skills. In addition, Sample [7] is a feedback form (e.g., end of the term questionnaire) that can help teachers assess the effectiveness of a certain activity by collecting students' reactions.

Discussion

The proposals in this paper have the following three pedagogical implications. The first implication is about teaching materials. Lack of authenticity has been noted as a main drawback of foreign language teaching texts and even teacher-generated materials (Judd, 1999). For instance, many L2 texts do not include examples of speech acts that represent naturally occurring discourses, and materials created by teachers often suffer from the same shortcomings as published texts (Tomlinson, 1998). This is true for KFL education as well (Choo, 1999; Wang, 1999b). To fill this gap, the use of media materials, such as television shows, films, dramas, and commercials can be particularly beneficial for KFL pedagogical contexts. The exploitation of media materials may provide the teachers and students with more natural and authentic language data (Holmes & Brown, 1987). The second is related to "what to teach." This paper asserts that explicit instruction on Korean speech levels should be strengthened even in the High Advanced Korean class. In addition, it highlights the importance of metalinguistic factors (e.g., information status, formality of the situation, and social variables such as the power relationship and social distance between interlocutors) in teaching speech levels.

The third implication is about "how to develop teaching activities from media materials." The instructional activities presented above were developed from two short video clips from television talk shows. However, one can apply the principles used to design these activities for other types of media materials. For instance, since the two video clips were full of alternations between speech levels, which is common for television talk show settings, they were inappropriate for generating activities for teaching the target features for different contexts (e.g., situations where a single speech level is preferred). However, one can take the same approach to

developing cloze-type exercises using other media materials, such as dramas, films, and TV news. Consider the following sample exercises:

Sample [8]

- 친구 1: 순애씨, 배고프지요? 뭐로 하실래요/시겠습니까?
- 친구 2: 글썄요. 어떻게 맛 있대요/다고 합니까?
- 친구 1: 여기 음식은 모두 다 맛있어요/습니다. 순애씨는 어떤 음식을 좋아하세요/하십니까?
- 친구 2: 저는 매운 음식을 좋아하는데. 그래서 좀 맵게 먹는 편이거든요.
- 친구 1: 그래요? 난 순애씨가 매운 음식을 좋아하는 줄 몰랐네. 그럼 해물탕은 어때요/땡습니까? 이집 특선 해물탕 괜찮은데.
- 친구 2: 해물탕이요? 한번 먹어 보지요.
- Friend 1: *Sunay-ssi paykoph-ci-yo? Mwello ha-sil-layyo/ si-keyss-supnikka?*
Sunae Ms. hungry-SUP-POL? What-to do-SH-will-POL/ SH-intend-DEF
"Sunae, hungry, right? What will you eat?"
- Friend 2: *Kulssey-yo. Ettenkey mas iss-tayyo/ tako hapnikka?*
Well-POL what kind delicious they say-POL/they say-DEF
"Well, what are the delicious dishes, they say?"
- Friend 1: *Yeki umsik-un motwu ta mas-iss-eyo/supnita.*
Here food-TC all delicious-POL/-DEF
"All the dishes here are delicious."
- Sunay-ssi-nun etten umsik-ul cohaha-sey-yo/ha-si-pnikka?*
Sunae-Ms. TC what kind food-AC do you like-SH-POL/do-SH-DEF
"How about you Sunae, what kind of dishes do you like?"
- Friend 2: *Ce-nun maywun umsik-ul cohaha-nuntay, kulayse com maypkey meknun pyen-iketun-yo.*
I-TC spicy food-AC like-hedge so little spicy eat tendency-you know-hedge-POL
"I like spicy food, you know, so I tend to enjoy spicy taste, you know."

- Friend 1: *Kulayyo? Nan Sunay-ssi-ka maywun umsik-ul cohahanun cwul molla-ss-ney.*
 So-POL? I-TC Sunae-Ms-NM spicy food-AC like-whether didn't know-PST-AP
 "Is that so? I didn't know that you like spicy food."
Kulem haymwulttang-un ettay-yo/etteh-supnikka?
 Then, Seafood stew-TC how is it-POL/DEF
 Then, how about seafood stew?
I cip thuksen haymwulttang kwaynchanh-untey.
 This house special seafood stew good-hedge
 Special seafood stew here is good (you know)."
- Friend 2: *Haymwulthang-i-yo? Hanpen meke-po-ci-yo.*
 Seafood stew-be-POL Once eat-try-SUP-POL
 "Seafood stew? Let us try it."

Sample [8] is an activity handout for inductive teaching on speaking within an informal setting. In this context, the use of the polite speech level is expected. The teacher provides the contextual information to the student prior to distributing the handout. The teacher explains that the two persons in the context are colleagues or acquaintances who discuss what to order in a Korean restaurant. The teacher notes that there are linguistic cues in the conversation that indicate some degree of informality in the conversation. The cues include address-terms used (e.g., calling the other by her first name, such as Sunae, with *-ssi* "Ms." in the first line) and the use of elliptical sentences and hedges, such as *-nuntey* and *-ketun*.

Sample [9]

- 박과장: 안녕하_____? (십니까) 김실장님.
- 김실장: 아, 박과장님, 안 그래도 오늘 중으로 연락을 드리려던 참 이
 었_____ (습니다), 이쪽으로 앉으시지요.
- 박과장: 지난 번에 보내 드렸던 서류내용이 마음에 드시는지 결과를
 알고 싶어서 들렸_____ (습니다).
- 김실장: 회의 결과, 내용은 좋은데 가격이 좀 높다고 나왔_____
 (습니다).
- 박과장: 저희로서는 최선의 가격이었_____ (습니다만). 요즘 워낙
 불경기라서 저희도 가격을 낮추 면 도저히 회사 경영을 할
 수가 없_____ (습니다). 어떻게 다시 한번 검토해주시면
 안 될까요?
- 김실장: 곤란하지만, 제가 다시 한번 부장님께 말씀을 드려 보_____
 (겠습니다).

- 박과장: 감사_____ (합니다). 그럼 좋은 소식을 기대 하_____ (겠습니다).
- Park: *Annyeng ha _____ (si-pnikka), Kim silcang-nim?*
Peace do-(SH-DEF) Kim manager-HT
"How are you, Manager Kim?"
- Kim: *Ah, Park kwacang-nim, an kulayto onul cwung-ulo yenlak-ul tulilyeten cham i-ess _____ (supnita)*
Oh, Park manger-HT no so also today during contact-AC give-try on the way-PST (DEF)
"Oh, Manager Park, as a matter of fact, I was on my way to contact you."
- Park: *Cinan pen-ey ponay-tulye-ss-ten selywu nanyong-i maum-ey tu-si-nun-ci kyelkwa-lul alko siphe-se tull-ess _____ (supnita).*
Last time-at send-give-PST document content-NM heart-at whether-SH like result-AC know want so stop-PST (DEF)
"I stopped by because I wanted to find out whether you liked the contents of the documents, which I sent you last time."
- Kim: *Hoyuy kyelkwa, nanyong-un coh-untey kakyek-i com nophtako nawa-ss _____ (supnita).*
Meeting result, content-TC good-but price-NM little high come-PST (DEF)
"As a result of the meeting, we concluded that the content was good but it was a bit expensive."
- Park: *Cehuy-lose-nun choysen-uy kakyek i-ess _____ (supnita)*
We-as-TC the best price-GN is-PST (DEF)
"From our standpoint, it was the best offer.
- Yocum wuenak pwulkyengki lase cehuy-to kakyek-ul nacchumyen tocehi hoysa kyengyeng-ul hal swu-ka eps _____ (supnita)*
Nowadays very economic recession so we-too price-AC lower-if at all cost company management-AC cannot _____ (DEF)
Because of the recent severe economic recession, we won't be able to manage our company with any lower cost.
- Ettehkey tasi hanpen kemtho hay cwu-si-myen an toylkka-yo?*
How again once more consideration do give-SH-if no become wonder-POL
I wonder if it is possible to reconsider it?"

- Kim: *Konlan haciman, cey-ka tasi hanpen pwucang-nim-kkey malssum-ul tulye po-keyss _____ (supnita).*
 Trouble do-but, I-NM again once more Department chief-HT-to talk-AC give try-intent (DEF)
 "It is difficult, but I will try to talk to the department chief once again."
- Park: *Kamsa _____ (ha-pnita). Kulem cohun sosik-ul kitay ha-kyess _____ (supnita).*
 Gratitude _____ (do-DEF) then good news-AC expectation do-intend (DEF)
 "Thank you. Then, I look forward to the good news."

Sample [9] is a cloze-type exercise for a formal setting, where the use of the deferential speech level is preferred. The teacher provides the contextual information to the students before having them complete the handout. For instance, the teacher explains that the use of deferential speech level is expected during business negotiations.

Sample [10]

- 손님: 여보세요? 한국호텔 _____? (이지요) 포론트 데스크 좀 부탁
 _____ (합니다).
- 직원: 네 프론트 데스크 _____ (입니다).
- 손님: 제가 어젯밤에 그 호텔에서 묵은 투숙객 _____ (인데요). 화
 장대 서랍에 옷을 넣어 놓은 채로 check out 을 했
 _____ (습니다). 어떻게 해야 _____? (하지요).
- 직원: 저희가 먼저 물건이 있는지 확인해 보 _____ (겠습니다). 30 분 쯤 후에 다시 연락을 주십시오.
- 손님: 제가 지금 공항에 있는데 _____ (요). 30 분 후에 도쿄로 떠날 예
 정 _____ (이거든요). 금방은 다시 전화하기가 어려울 것
 같은데 셔츠를 우편으로 좀 부쳐 주시겠 _____? (어요) 물론 그
 비용은 제가 부담 _____ (하겠습니다).
- 직원: 그런데 셔츠가 방에 있는지 저희가 먼저 확인을 해 봐야 알
 겠 _____ (습니다). 확인해 보고 만약에 있으면 물론 보내
 _____ (드리겠습니다). 성함이 어떻게 _____? (되십니
 까) 그리고 투숙하셨던 방은 몇 호 _____ (이지요)?

- Guest: *Yeposeyyo? Hankwuk Hotel _____ (i-ci-yo). Front desk com
pwuthak _____ (ha- pnita).*
Hello Hankwuk Hotel (be-SUP-POL). Front Desk please favor
(do-DEF)
"Hello? It is Hankwuk Hotel, right? Front desk please."
- Employee: *Ney Front desk _____ (i-pnita).*
Yes front desk (be-DEF)
"Yes, this is the front desk."
- Guest: *Cey-ka eceyspam-ey ku hotel-eyse mwukun thwuswukkayk
_____ (intey-yo).*
I-NM last night-at that hotel-at stayed guest (hedge-POL)
"This is a guest who stayed there last night (you know).

*Hwacangtay selap-ey os-ul nehenohun chaylo check out hay-ss
_____ (supnita).*
Dressing table drawer-at cloth-AC place as it is check out do-PST
(DEF)
I checked out, and I left my shirt in the drawer of the dresser.

Ettehkey hay-ya _____ (ha-ci-yo)?
How do-must (do-SUP-POL)
What should I do?"
- Employee: *Cehuy-ka mence mwulken-i iss-nunci hwakin hay po _____
(keyss-supnita).*
We-NM first item-NM exist-whether confirm do try (intend-DEF)
"First, we will confirm whether it is here.

30 pwun ccum hwu-ey tasi yenlak-ul cwu-sipsio.
30 minutes about after-at again contact-AC give-DEF
Please give us a call again in 30 minutes."
- Guest: *Cey-ka cikum konghang-ey iss-nuntay _____ (yo).*
I-NM now airport-at stay-but (POL)
"I am at the airport now, but

30 pwun hwu-ey Tokyo-lo ttenal yeyceng _____ (i-ketun-yo).
30 minutes after-at Tokyo-to leave plan (be-hedge-POL)
In 30 minutes, I will be leaving for Tokyo.

Kumpang-un tasi cenhwa haki-ka elyewul-kes kath-untey shirt-lul wupyen-ulo com pwuchey cwu-si-kyess _____ (eyo)?

Soon-TC again telephone do-NM difficult-thing seems-hedge shirt-AC mail-by please send Give-SH-intend (POL)

I think that it may be difficult to give you a call then but can you send the shirt to me by mail?

Mwulon ku piyong-un cey-ka pwutam _____ (ha-keyss-supnita).

Of course that expenses-TC I-NM pay (do-intend-DEF)

Of course, I will pay for the expense."

Employee: *Kulentey shirt-ka pang-ey issnun-ci cehuy-ka mence hwakin-ul hay pwaya al-keyss _____ (supnita).*

But shirt-NM room-at exist-whether we-NM first confirmation-AC do try then know-intend (DEF)

"But, first we must confirm whether the shirt is here.

Hwakin hay-poko banyak-ey iss-umyen mwulon ponay _____ (tuli-keyss-supnita).

Confirmation do-try if exist-if of course send (give-intend-DEF)

After we check, if it is here, we will of course send it to you.

Sengham-i ettehkey toy-si _____ (pnikka)?

Name-NM how become-SH (DEF)

What is your name?

Kuliko thwuswuk ha-sy-ess-ten pang-un meych ho i _____ (ci-yo)?

And stay do-SH-PST room-TC what number be (SUP-POL)

And what was your room number?"

Sample [10] is a cloze-type exercise for the mixed use of speech levels in the context of a service encounter. The teacher provides the contextual information to the student prior to distributing the handout. The teacher explains that the dialog on the handout is a conversation between a hotel guest and a front desk agent. The teacher further adds that the use of the deferential speech level is expected for the service agent, while both the informal speech level and the deferential speech level can be expected for the guest.

Notice that these three sample exercises deal with interactions that are regular parts of the lives of Koreans (e.g., colleagues, travelers, and/or business people). The interactions are unremarkable in that anyone in a similar situation might behave in a similar manner, and these models are readily available in media materials such as films and/or dramas.

Concluding remarks

This study addressed teaching pragmatic elements using television and other media materials. The focus of discussion was on teaching the polite speech level, the deferential speech level, and the alternation between the speech levels. The study also explored various classroom assessment tools that can be used to evaluate and enhance the efficiency of the activities. The activities developed and presented in this paper are by no means the only pedagogical applications one can draw from media materials. They are just part of an initial attempt to explore the potential instructional benefits of media materials for teaching pragmatic elements. More studies are certainly needed to consider further the pedagogical implications of using media materials as the basis for the development of instructional materials. However, it is hoped that this study will stimulate KFL teachers' and researchers' interests and awareness regarding the use of media materials in teaching pragmatic elements.

The following topics are subject to further study. First, the implementation of the aforementioned activities in actual KFL classroom settings is worth pursuing. Reports on the reactions of teachers and/or students regarding the effectiveness of the activities, including the difficulties and/or benefits they report while adopting and executing the activities, may help others become aware of the shortcomings and merits of the activities. Second, studies that investigate the use of multi-media materials in teaching other speech levels (e.g., the plain and intimate speech levels) are worth pursuing. Finally, teaching discourse-pragmatic elements using media materials appears to be more adaptable and appropriate for advanced KFL learners. A certain level of proficiency is required to participate in and/or carry out some of the aforementioned activities. However, the instructional application of media materials is by no means limited to advanced students. One should be able to find media materials that may suit lower level students as well (e.g., those media programs that have less specialized lexical use with more non-verbal communication). Studies that investigate how one can teach pragmatic elements with media materials in other proficiency levels (e.g., elementary or intermediate) are worth pursuing.

Notes

1. This is a revised and expanded version of my manuscript, presented at the 15th Annual Japanese/Korean Linguistics Pre-Conference Workshop in October, 2005 at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.
2. The Yale romanization system was used to transliterate the Korean utterances in this paper.
3. The video clips are from the Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research (CALPER) at Penn State University. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Susan Strauss and CALPER for their permission to use the data.

4. Deriving instructional points from the given materials by conducting a discourse analysis of these materials may not be a feasible task for those KFL teachers who are inexperienced or untrained in discourse analysis. Conducting a literature review is essential in that the findings of previous studies may assist the KFL teachers in analyzing the corpus and thereby better appreciating the instructional value of given materials.

5. Some indexical meanings of these clause-endings are as follows: *hay-se* [reason/cause], *hanikka* [reason], *hayss-kwu* [exclamation/realization], *hayss-nuntey* [hedge], *hayss-ketun* [hedge], *inka* [wonder/questions], *ul-kka* [wonder/question].

6. The following abbreviations are used to label the linguistic terms employed in this paper:

| | |
|-----|---|
| AC | Accusative case particle (e.g., <i>-(l)ul</i>) |
| AP | Apperceptive (e.g., <i>-ney</i>) |
| DC | Declarative sentence-type suffix (e.g., <i>-ta</i>) |
| DEF | Informal speech level (e.g., <i>-supnita</i>) |
| GN | Genitive case particle (e.g., <i>-uy</i>) |
| HT | Honorific title (e.g., <i>-nim</i>) |
| NM | Nominative case particle (e.g., <i>-ka/i</i>) |
| POL | Polite speech level, suffix, or particle (e.g., <i>-yo</i>) |
| PST | Past tense and perfect aspect suffix (e.g., <i>-ess/ass</i>) |
| SH | Subject honorific suffix (e.g., <i>-usi/si</i>) |
| SUP | Suppositive (e.g., <i>a-ci</i>) |
| TC | Topic contrast particle (e.g., <i>-un/nun</i>) |

7. The target proficiency level of KFL students has to be above the advanced intermediate (e.g., beyond the second year level), considering the scope of these learning points as well as the fact that students must be able to understand the content of the materials to a certain degree in order to benefit from the instruction.

8. Students may find participating in the productive skill activities more challenging than in the receptive skill activities. Consequently, receptive skill activities should precede cloze-type practices.

References

- Ahn, K. (2001). Kwuechey textuy ungkyel cangchi yenkwu [A study about spoken texts]. *Journal of Korean Language Education*, 12(2), 137-157.
- Aston, G. (1995). Say "thank you": Some pragmatic restraints in conversational closing. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 57-86.
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, 139-144.

- Brinton, D. (1991). The use of media in language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 454-471). New York: Newbury House.
- Byon, A. (2000). Teaching Korean honorifics. In S. Sohn (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 5* (pp. 275-289). UCLA: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Byon, A. (2004). Learning linguistic politeness. *Applied Language Learning, 14*(1), 37-62.
- Byon, A. (2005). Teaching pragmatic competence through speech acts: American KFL instructional settings. *Teaching Korean as a Foreign Language, 30*, 77-112.
- Byon, A. (2006). Developing KFL students' pragmatic awareness of Korean speech acts: The use of Discourse Completion Tasks. *Language Awareness, 15*(4), 244 -263.
- Carduner, J. (2002). Using classroom assessment techniques to improve foreign language composition courses. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 545-553.
- Cho, Y., Lee, H., Schulz, C., Sohn, H., & Sohn, S. (2000). *Integrated Korean: Beginning 1*. Honolulu: University Hawaii Press.
- Choi, E., Chang, E., Kim, E., & Chai, S. (2005). Hankwuke kyoyukyong TV program-uy hyenhwang-kwa kwacey [Current status and issues of Korean language education programs on television]. *Journal of Korean Language Education, 16*(1), 277-298.
- Choo, M. (1999). Teaching language styles of Korean. In S. Kang (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 3* (pp. 77-95). Monterey, CA: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Eun, J., & Strauss, S. (2004). The primacy of information status in the alternation between deferential and polite forms in Korean public discourse. *Language Sciences, 26*, 251-272.
- Holmes, J., & Brown, D. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(4), 523-546.
- Hwang, J. R. (1975). *Role of sociolinguistics in foreign language education with reference to Korean and English terms of address and levels of deference*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.
- Judd, E. (1999). Some issues in the teaching of pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 152-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, H. (1970). *A study of Korean syntax*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Brown University.

- Lee, H. S. (1991). Tense, aspect, and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal affixes in Korean. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California at Los Angeles.
- Lee, I., & Ramsey, R. (2000). *The Korean language*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Lee, K. (1999). Yenghwa-lul thonghan hankwuke swuep pangan yenkwu [Using movies for teaching Korean language]. *Journal of Korean Language Education*, 10(1), 221-240.
- Lee, M. (1997). Acquisition of Korean referent honorifics by adult learners of Korean as a second language. In Y. Kim (Ed.), *The Korean Language in America Vol. 2* (pp. 99-110). University of Hawaii: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Lukoff, F. (1982). *An introductory course in Korean*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.
- Martin, S. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 407-415). New York: Harper & Row.
- Pathfinder in Korean: High Intermediate. (2000). Seoul: The Institute of Language Education. Ewha Women's University Press.
- Park, Y. (1997). Teaching authentic conversation: How to incorporate discourse into teaching. In Y.-H. Kim (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 2* (pp. 27-37). University of Hawaii: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Sohn, H-M. (1988). Linguistic devices of Korean politeness. In E. Baek (Ed.), *Papers from the sixth international conference on Korean linguistics* (pp. 655-669). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company.
- Sohn, H-M. (1994). *Korean*. London: Routledge.
- Sohn, H-M. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sohn, H-M. (2001). Teaching politeness routines in Korean. In J. Ree (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 6* (pp. 25-36). University of Hawaii: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century (1996). Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.
- Strauss, S. (1999). Using television commercials as aids for teaching language, grammar, and culture. In S. Kang (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 3* (pp. 235-252). Monterey, CA: Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey CA.

- Strauss, S., & Eun, J. (2005). Indexicality and speech level choice in Korean. *Linguistics*, 43(3), 611-651.
- Suh, J. S. (1984). *Studies of politeness*. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, H. S. (1995). The impact of family background on the acquisition of Korean honorifics. In H. Sohn (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 1* (pp. 197-214). University of Hawaii: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Wang, H. S. (1999a). Pragmatic errors and teaching for pragmatic competence. In S. Kang (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 3* (pp. 127-143). Monterey, CA: American Association of Teachers of Korean.
- Wang, H. S. (1999b). Speech acts in Korean language textbooks: Representations and authenticity. *Journal of Korean Language Education*, 10(1), 195-220.
- Wang, H. S. (2000). Culture, commercials and teaching Korean. *Journal of Korean Language Education*, 11(1), 85-109.

Appendix A

Korean Data 1: Lecture/Presentation

Ask Us Anything: Laughter (01/03/05)

(This is an excerpt from a morning show entitled "Ask Us Anything". The topic of this segment is "Laughter.")

Host names: 김인석 (M), 신윤주 (F)

Guest names: 이요셉 (M) (President of Korean Laughter Research Institute)

1. 요셉: 행복을 여는 키가 있다는 거죠.
2. 청중: 아
3. 요셉: 위대한 심리학자 윌리엄 제임스는 이런 말을 했습니다. 따라 해 보실래요?
5. 요셉: 행복한 사람이.

6. 청중: 행복한 사람이.
7. 요셉: 웃는 것이 아니라.
8. 청중: 웃는 것이 아니라.
9. 요셉: 웃는 사람이.
10. 청중: 웃는 사람이.
11. 요셉: 행복하다.
12. 청중: 행복하다.
13. 요셉: 실제로요 웃음이 행복을 여는 키와 같습니다.
14. 청중: 아
15. 요셉: 그래 우리가 사람이 하루에 이렇게 많이 웃지 않는데 웃음이라는 건 행복의키와 같다는 거죠. 오늘 그래서 우리 한번 그런 의미에서 한번 웃어보실까요?
18. 연주: 네
22. 요셉: 우리가 삼십대가 넘어가게 되면요 웃음 우리얼굴이 웃을때 쓰는 근육을 소근 웃음 근육이라고 합니다.
25. 인식: 에
26. 요셉: 웃음 근육이라고 하는데 웃지않으면요. 웃음 근육이 없어진 데요.
28. 청중: 아
29. 요셉: 서른이 넘어 가면서부터 웃음근육이 없어지기 시작한데요.
31. 청중: 아
32. 요셉: 사십이 되면서는 어떠냐면 두가지 근육만 남는데 한가지는 밥 먹는 근육과 수다떠는 근육만 남는데요.
41. 요셉: 오늘 최고의 배려 웃음입니다.

42. 인식: 음
43. 요셉: 어, 제가 오늘 배려에 대해서 얘길 하면서 과연 배려가 무엇 일까에 대해서 한번 생각해 본적이 있습니다. 얼마전에 제가 어떤 분의 이야기를 들었어요. 어떤 앞을 보지 못하는 시각 장애인이 길을 가고 있었습니다. 가고 있는데 이 사람이 등불을 들고 걷고 있는 거예요.
48. 청중: 아
49. 요셉: 앞을 보지 못하는 사람이 지나가는 나그네가 말합니다. 보니까 기가 막혀요.
51. 요셉: 보지도 못하는 사람이 등불을 들고 있으니까.
53. 청중: 어
54. 요셉: 아니 당신 지금 제정신이요?
56. 요셉: 아니 당신 미친 사람 아니요?
57. 청중: 아
58. 요셉: 보지 못하면서 왜 등불을 들고 있는 거요 라고 말을 꺼냈더니 이 시각 장애인이 하는 말이 이 등불은 나를 위해서가 아니라 당신을 위해서 들고 있습니다.
62. 청중: 어
63. 요셉: 웃음이요. 실제로 배려입니다. 왜냐하면 웃음은 애한테 웃., 애기 좋아하는 애기를 볼때 웃지요.
65. 청중: 예
66. 요셉: 나는 너를 좋아한다.
67. 청중: 어
68. 요셉: 난 널 인정하고 난 너한테 관심이 있어 라는 말이 바로 웃음 이예요.

70. 청중: 그래요.
71. 요셉: 웃음이 실제로 배려한다는 최고의 방법이라는 거지요.
78. 인식: 뭐 배려하고 싶어하잖요. 우리는 누가나.
79. 요셉: 네, 네.
80. 인식: 그런데 그럴 때.
81. 요셉: 그렇죠.
82. 인식: 충분한 배려가 된다는 얘기입니까?
84. 요셉: 웃음이라는 부분이 굉장히 중요한데 캘리포니아 대학에서.
86. 인식: 예
87. 요셉: 그로버트 멜럽피안 박사가 재미있는 이야기를 했습니다. 우리가 얘기를 할때 말 있지요? 이 말은 대화내용 중에 말의 내용 중에 칠프로 밖에 되지 않습니다.
91. 청중: 어
92. 요셉: 표정이 55%를 차지 합니다.
93. 청중: 아
94. 요셉: 그 다음에 어조가 38%를 차지 한다는 거죠.
96. 인식: 어조.
97. 은주: 네
99. 요셉: 이게 무슨 말이나면은 제가 우리 신 은주 엠씨님께 그 어떤 분이 사랑한다고 말한다는 거에요.
102. 인식: 네
103. 요셉: 근데 이 분이 인상쓰면서 이렇게 말하는 거죠. 인상 꼭 쓰면서 에이씨 사랑해.

107. 청중: 하하하
108. 요셉: 근데 이말은 사랑해란 말이었어요.
109. 청중: 예
110. 요셉: 근데 표정은.
111. 인석: 음
112. 은주: 무서워요.
113. 요셉: 어조는 사랑해가 아니라는 거죠.
114. 청중: 예
115. 요셉: 구십삼프로는 사른 내용을 갖고 있다는 거죠.
116. 청중: 예
117. 요셉: 이해가 돼지요.
118. 청중: 예
119. 요셉: 근데 예를 들면 이렇게 할 수 있다는 거죠. 말은 하지 않아 사랑한단 말하지 않고 이쁘다고 말하지 않으면서도 이렇게 말하 "와".
123. 청중: 하하
124. 인석: 어
125. 요셉: 이빠요 라고 말하지 않아도 안다는 거죠.
126. 청중: 예
127. 인석: 표정으로 읽으니까.
128. 요셉: 표정으로만.
129. 인석: 아
130. 근데 우리 전인석 엠씨께서 말도 아된다는 표정 짓고 하하.
132. 청중: 하하
133. 인석: 더 속마음까지 알고 계시네요. 하하

Appendix B**Korean Data 2: Multiparty Conversation**

CJ Homeshopping (04/26/02)

((The program is advertising 3 styles of the R.ss England brand of men's shoes: William 1, William 2, and William 3. This excerpt begins as the hosts introduce the William 2 style))

Host names: 김효석 (M), 김선희 (F)

Guest names: 이정길 (M), 박정수 (F) – TV actor/actress

1. 효석: 네 저희가 무 방송중에 계속 자세하게 안내를 해 드리겠습니다. 지금 뭐 약간 맞배기로만.
2. 선희: 예
5. 효석: 보여드리겠는데요. 두번째루 소개해드리.
6. 선희: 그렇지요.
7. 효석: 잉글랜드의 그 두번째 윌리엄 두꺼형 같은.
8. 선희: 끈형이에요. 네.
9. 효석: 경우에는 올스퍼드 스타일이라 그래서 이십대의.
10. 선희: 네
11. 효석: 대학생부터 시작을 해서 성공한 사십대.
12. 선희: 예
13. 효석: 오십대 분들까지 신을 수 있는 폭넓은.
14. 선희: 예
15. 효석: 이 구두같은 경우에는 정말 삼대가 신을 수 있는.
17. 선희: 예
18. 효석: 그런 아주 그 보편적인 그런 스타일 같아요.
19. 선희: 그렇죠.
20. 효석: 옥스포드 스타일.
21. 정수: 이건 유행을 안타는 스타일 아니에요? 선배님?

23. 정길: 음 본래 예 뭐...
24. 선희: 유행을 안타죠.
25. 정수: **별로 유행 안타지요.**
26. 효석: 네
27. 선희: 그리구 요즘 또 그 바지가 그 양복도 그렇구 약간 좀 그 짧아졌어요. 남성 분들 그럴 때 끈이 슬쩍.
29. 효석: 그렇죠.
30. 선희: 슬쩍 들어 나면요. 어머 어쩜 그렇게 경쾌해 보이세요.
32. 효석: 네 그리고 이 말목이 좀 그 또 말등이 좀 굽은.
33. 선희: 예
34. 효석: 분들도 끈을 딱 졸라 매게 되면는 또.
35. 선희: 네 그렇죠.
36. 효석: 날렵해지고 알아보이는 그런 특징이 있구요.
37. 선희: 예
39. 효석: 또 밀창 부분도 굉장히 또 견고 하게 되어 있습니다. 미끄러짐 없이.
42. 선희: 그렇죠.
43. 효석: 방지할 수 있는 그런 RSS England.
45. 정길: 아까 아까 아까두 좀 무게 말씀 잠깐 했지만은 우리가 이거 구두.
47. 효석: 네
48. 선희: 네
49. 정길: 쪽 신다 보면.
50. 효석: 네

51. 선희: 네
52. 정길: 다소의 무게 차이래도 상당히 그 많이 느낌이.
54. 선희: 네
55. 정수: 부담이 되.
57. 선희: 그렇습니다.
58. 정길: 아까 저 잉그랜드 제화 무게얘기듣구 깜짝 놀랐어요.
60. 선희: 예 인제 보통 그 저희가 비교를.
61. 정길: 정말.
62. 선희: 네
63. 선희: 했을 때 구두마다 약간은 다른데요. 우유 2 백미리 리터인가요? 한백당 이백오십.
65. 효석: 음 이백오십 네.
66. 선희: 그 오렌지 뭐 한두개 정도 하구 저희가 이렇게 들구 비교를 했을 정도 거든요.
68. 효석: 윌리엄 원같은.
69. 선희: 예
70. 효석: 경우는 이백십그램입니다. 하하
71. 선희: 하하
72. 효석: 보통 구두가.
73. 선희: 네
74. 효석: 오백 그램이라 그러죠.
75. 선희: 그렇죠.
76. 효석: 근데 210 그램은 반두 안되는 정말 가벼운.
77. 선희: 반두 안돼지요.
78. 효석: 거고.

79. 선희: 예
80. 효석: 윌리엄 투쓰리 같은 경우에 300 그램 내외기 때문에 정말 신은 듯 안 신은듯 편안한.
82. 선희: 네.
83. 효석: 신발이 되겠습니다.
84. 선희: 그렇습니다.
85. 효석: 그리고 그 이정길씨두 계속 만지작 하셨던 게 오늘 윌리엄 쓰리입니다.
87. 선희: 쓰리이에요.
88. 정길: 네 그 쓰리.
89. 정수: 하하
90. 효석: 하하
91. 선희: 지금 쓰리가 뭐 연령때를 막론하구요.
93. 효석: 눈에 확 들어오시지요.
94. 선희: 여러분 지금 주문 전화 쓰리는 너무 너무.
95. 효석: 네
96. 전화: 많아요.
97. 효석: 좀 이 걱정이 좀 되네요. 벌써부터.
98. 선희: 예 걱정이 많이 되거든요.
99. 효석: 네
100. 선희: 근데 지금 빨리 주문하지 않으시면 양해를 좀 해주셔야 될게 이 주후 배송밖에는 약속을 못 드리는 데요.
103. 효석: 지금 주문하시면은 빨리 받아보싶니다만은 나중에.
104. 선희: 예
105. 효석: 예약을 받겠습니다. 이게 수제화기 때문에.
106. 선희: 그렇죠. 바루 이거예요.

108. 정길: 아니 근데 저는 신어봐서 알지만 확실합니다.
 109. 효석: 네
 110. 선희: 네
 111. 정길: 확실해요.
 112. 선희: 확실하세요. 예.
 113. 효석: 확실하 가볍고 편하시죠.
 114. 선희: 예. 자 지금 그 부라운과 블랙이 마련이 되 있는데요.

Appendix C: Sample presentation handouts for deductive teaching approach

Presentation 1

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: New information.
2. The 요 form: Politeness marker that appear after an affect marker (-지), particle (e.g., -로), and the sentence ending structure (-VS + 을래?).

1. 요셉: 행복을 여는 키가 있다는 거죠.
 2. 청중: 아
 3. 요셉: 위대한 심리학자 윌리엄 제임스는 이런 말을 했습니다. 따라
해 보실래요?
 5. 요셉: 행복한 사람이.
 6. 청중: 행복한 사람이.
 7. 요셉: 웃는 것이 아니라.
 8. 청중: 웃는 것이 아니라.
 9. 요셉: 웃는 사람이.
 10. 청중: 웃는 사람이.
 11. 요셉: 행복하다.
 12. 청중: 행복하다.
 13. 요셉: 실제로요 웃음이 행복을 여는 키와 같습니다.

14. 청중: 아
15. 요셉: 그래 우리가 사람이 하루에 이렇게 많이 웃지 않는데 웃음이라는 건 행복의 키와 같다는 거죠. 오늘 그래서 우리 한번 그런 의미에서 한번 웃어보실까요?

Presentation 2

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: : Formal politeness marker/ New information.
2. The 요 form: Politeness marker with affect markers (e.g., -지) & informality marker.

78. 인식: 뭐 배려하고 싶어하잖아요. 우리는 누가나.
79. 요셉: 네, 네.
80. 인식: 그런데 그럴 때.
81. 요셉: 그렇죠.
82. 인식: 충분한 배려가 된다는 얘기입니까?
84. 요셉: 웃음이라는 부분이 굉장히 중요한데 캘리포니아 대학에서.
86. 인식: 예
87. 요셉: 그로버트 멜럽피안 박사가 재미있는 이야기를 했습니다. 우리가 얘기를 할때 말 있지요? 이 말은 대화내용 중에 말의 내용 중에 칠프로 밖에 되지 않습니다.
91. 청중: 어
92. 요셉: 표정이 55%를 차지 합니다.
93. 청중: 아
94. 요셉: 그 다음에 어조가 38%를 차지 한다는 거죠.
96. 인식: 어조.
97. 은주: 네

Presentation 3*Teaching Points:*

1. *The 습니다 form: Formal politeness marker & New information.*
2. *The 요 form: Informal politeness marker after clause-endings (e.g., -는데요 / -지요 / -면요 / -에요? / -구요).*

1. 효석: 네 저희가 무 방송중에 계속 자세하게 안내를 해 드리겠습니다. 지금 뭐 약간 맛배기로만.
2. 선희: 예
5. 효석: 보여드리겠습니다요. 두번째루 소개해드리.
6. 선희: 그렇지요.
7. 효석: 잉글랜드의 그 두번째 윌리엄 두꺼번 같은.
8. 선희: 끈형이예요. 네.
9. 효석: 경우에는 올스퍼드 스타일이라 그래서 이십대의.
10. 선희: 네
11. 효석: 대학생부터 시작을 해서 성공한 사십대.
12. 선희: 예
13. 효석: 오십대 분들까지 신을 수 있는 폭넓은.
14. 선희: 예
15. 효석: 이 구두같은 경우에는 정말 삼대가 신을 수 있는.
17. 선희: 예
18. 효석: 그런 아주 그 보편적인 그런 스타일 같아요.
19. 선희: 그렇죠.
20. 효석: 옥스포드 스타일.
21. 정수: 이건 유행을 안타는 스타일 아니예요? 선배님?
23. 정길: 음 본래 예 뭐...
24. 선희: 유행을 안타죠.

25. 정수: 별로 유행 안타지요.
26. 효석: 네
27. 선희: 그리구 요즘 또 그 바지가 그 양복도 그렇구 약간 좀 그 짧아졌어요. 남성 분들 그럴 때 끈이 슬쩍.
29. 효석: 그렇죠.
30. 선희: 슬쩍 들어 나면요. 어머 어쩜 그렇게 경쾌해 보이세요.
32. 효석: 네 그리고 이 말목이 좀 그 또 말등이 좀 굽은.
33. 선희: 예
34. 효석: 분들도 끈을 딱 졸라 매게 되면는 또.
35. 선희: 네 그렇죠.
36. 효석: 날렵해지고 알아보이는 그런 특징이 있구요.
37. 선희: 예
39. 효석: 또 밑창 부분도 굉장히 또 견고 하게 되어 있습니다. 미끄러짐 없이.
42. 선희: 그렇죠.

Presentation 4

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: Formal politeness marker/ New information.
 2. The 요 form: Informal politeness marker after clause-endings (e.g., -ㄴ 데요 / -ㄴ 가요 / -거든요 / -지요).
63. 선희: 했을 때 구두마다 약간은 다른데요. 우유 2 백미리 리터인가 요? 한백당 이백오십.
65. 효석: 음 이백오십 네.

66. 선희: 그 오렌지 뭐 한두개 정도 하구 저희가 이렇게 들구 비교를 했을 정도 거든요.
68. 효석: 윌리엄 원같은.
69. 선희: 예
70. 효석: 경우는 이백십그램입니다. 하하
71. 선희: 하하
72. 효석: 보통 구두가.
73. 선희: 네
74. 효석: 오백 그램이라 그러죠.
75. 선희: 그렇죠.
76. 효석: 근데 210 그램은 반두 안되는 정말 가벼운.
77. 선희: 반두 안되지요.

Presentation 5

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: Formal politeness marker / New information.
2. The 요 form: Informal politeness marker / Old or shared information.
3. The shift the style to emphasize the meaning.

103. 효석: 지금 주문하시면은 빨리 받아보싶니다만은 나중에.
104. 선희: 예
105. 효석: 예약을 받겠습니다. 이게 수제화기 때문에.
106. 선희: 그렇죠. 바루 이거예요.
108. 정길: 아니 근데 저는 신어봐서 알지만 확실합니다.
109. 효석: 네
110. 선희: 네
111. 정길: 확실해요.
112. 선희: 확실하세요. 예.

113. 효석: 확실히 가볍고 편하시죠.
114. 선희: 예. 자 지금 그 부라운과 블랙이 마련이 되 있는데요.

Appendix D: Sample activities for inductive teaching

Sample 1

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: New information / Introducing topics and people / sequence framing.
 2. The 요 form: Politeness marker with affect markers (e.g., -어 "assertion") or informal politeness marker.
22. 요셉: 우리가 삼십대가 넘어가게 되면요 / (none) 웃음 우리얼굴이 웃을때 쓰는 근육을 소근 웃음 근육이라고 합니다 / 해요.
25. 인식: 에
26. 요셉: 웃음 근육이라고 하는데 웃지않으면요. 웃음 근육이 없어진 데요 / 없어진 다고 합니다.
28. 청중: 아
29. 요셉: 서른이 넘어 가면서부터 웃음근육이 없어지기 시작한데요 / 다고 합니다.
31. 청중: 아
32. 요셉: 사십이 되면서는 어떠냐면 두가지 근육만 남는데 한가지는 밥 먹는 근육과 수다떠는 근육만 남는데요 / 다고 합니다.

Sample 2

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: Formal politeness marker/ New information.
2. The 요 form: Politeness marker with affect markers (e.g., -지 / -네) & informal politeness marker.

99. 요셉: 이게 무슨 말이나면은 제가 우리 신 은주 엠씨님께 그 어떤 분이 사랑한다고 말한다는 거예요/ 겁니다.
102. 인석: 네.
103. 요셉: 근데 이 분이 인상쓰면서 이렇게 말하는 거죠 / 겁니다. 인상 팍 쓰면서 에이씨 사랑해.
107. 청중: 하하하
108. 요셉: 근데 이말은 사랑해란 말이었어요/ 이었습니다.
109. 청중: 예
110. 요셉: 근데 표정은.
111. 인석: 음
112. 은주: 무서워요/ 무섭습니다.
113. 요셉: 어조는 사랑해가 아니라는 거죠 / 겁니다.
114. 청중: 예
115. 요셉: 구십삼프로는 사른 내용을 갖고 있다는 거죠 / 겁니다.
116. 청중: 예
117. 요셉: 이해가 되지요? / 웁니까?
118. 청중: 예
119. 요셉: 근데 예를 들면 이렇게 할 수 있다는 거죠/ 겁니다. 말은 하지 않아 사랑한단 말하지 않고 이쁘다고 말하지 않으면서도 이렇게 말하 "와".
123. 청중: 하하
124. 인석: 어
125. 요셉: 이빠요 라고 말하지 않아도 안다는 거죠/ 겁니다.
126. 청중: 예
127. 인석: 표정으로 읽으니까.
128. 요셉: 표정으로만.
129. 인석: 아

130. 근데 우리 전인석 엠씨께서 말도 아된다는 표정 짓고 하하.
132. 청중: 하하
133. 인석: 더 속마음까지 알고 계시네요/ 계십니다. 하하

Sample 3

Teaching Points:

1. The 습니다 form: Formal politeness marker/New information.
 2. The 요 form: Politeness marker for shared or otherwise known information to the interlocutor.
80. 효석: 윌리엄 투쓰리 같은 경우에 300 그램 내외기 때문에 정말 신은 듯 안 신은듯 편안한.
82. 선희: 네.
83. 효석: 신발이 되겠습니다/ 되겠어요.
84. 선희: 그렇습니다/ 그래요.
85. 효석: 그리고 그 이정길씨두 계속 만지작 하셨던 게 오늘 윌리엄 쓰리입니다/ 이에요.
87. 선희: 쓰리이에요/입니다.
88. 정길: 네 그 쓰리.
89. 정수: 하하