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This study aims to provide a perspective which allows honorifics to be seen beyond the frame of politeness and/or formality in social structures. Korean school grammar explains honorifics as linguistic forms that reflect relative social positional difference (e.g., K-H. Lee, 2010), and has assumed that social structure and language use have a static relationship. However, in actual conversation, the use of honorific styles is more dynamic and people strategically make use of honorific forms to regulate their interpersonal relationships, not always passively following social conventions.

From the view of indexicality (e.g., Cook 1999a, 2008; Ochs 1990, 1993; Silverstein, 1976), which concerns how to relate linguistic form to social meanings in a given context, this study examines what each speech style means socially within given conversational contexts. This study explores speech style variation in four genres of television programs: news, debates, talk shows, and comedy shows. The occasions when speech style shifting occurs in the flow of a conversation will be identified and the situational meanings of the style shift will be discussed.

This study argues that the choice of a speech style is not simply bound by social status difference. This study shows that the deferential and the plain style are non-interactional styles, while the polite and the intimate styles are interactional styles. It also shows that the deferential and the polite style express psychological distance from the addressee(s), while the intimate and the plain style express psychological closeness.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most salient features of the Korean language is that it has a highly developed honorific system. Korean is said to have the most systematic grammatical pattern of all known languages (Sohn, 1999), and honorifics are manifested very extensively in the Korean linguistic system. There have been many studies in the field of Korean linguistics. However, the understanding of Korean honorifics has mostly focused on syntactic or morphological characteristics, and only a relatively small number of studies have dealt with the social functions and meanings of honorific forms.

A simple explanation of the social meanings of honorifics would be: The choice of the honorific forms depends on the degree of the speaker’s respect for the addressee(s) and the formality of the situation (e.g., K-H. Lee, 2010). However, honorific forms can be related to various social meanings and they cannot be adequately explained by the concepts of respect and formality. Even though using appropriate honorifics is crucial in social relationships, just using proper honorifics is not enough for showing a speaker’s respect to the addressee. Expressing one’s respect is not a simple process of just using a certain linguistic form, but requires appropriate actions and manners along with language.

In fact, the way that each honorific form is interpreted is heavily dependent on the social context, such that commanding the appropriate honorific form is a very difficult task even for Korean native speakers. Therefore, using an appropriate honorific form is often considered a barometer of one’s upbringing and plays an important role when judging people in Korean society. Also, learning honorifics is one of the biggest
challenges for Korean as a second/foreign language (KFL/KSL) learners, particularly since it cannot be accomplished appropriately simply by considering respect and formality. Additionally, even though the understanding of contextual information is crucial for using honorifics, Korean textbooks do not provide students with enough variety of situations reflecting the range of social contexts. As a result, there is little explanation of context relating to the use of appropriate honorifics in Korean textbooks and students have a hard time learning how to use honorifics appropriately in class.

Consequently, the purpose of this dissertation is to provide a view of honorifics which is not limited to only the frame of politeness and formality, but also sees honorifics as a linguistic tool for regulating and negotiating interpersonal relationships in a social context. For this purpose, I will investigate how honorific forms actually function and how they are interpreted in real conversations, and show that honorific forms have various social meanings which are not limited to honorification purposes. Among the honorific forms, this study will focus on speech style, which is the most important element for Korean addressee honorifics. Speech styles in the honorific system can be classified into six types: deferential, polite, blunt, familiar, intimate, and plain style. These have been thought to simply express different degrees of respect and formality. However, in actual conversations, their differences come from situational and personal factors far more frequently than from respect and formality. From the view of indexicality (e.g., Cook 1999a, 2008; Ochs 1990, 1993; Silverstein, 1976), this study will examine what each speech style means socially within given conversational contexts.
1.1 Indexicality

For discussing the contextual meanings of honorific endings, first I am going to discuss how the function of linguistic form is related to the society in which it is used. When a linguistic form is used for the purpose of communication, people not only exchange propositional meaning, but also there arise contextual meanings which can only be interpreted in the given situation. Cook (2008) explained that context is comprised of the setting, participants, language ideology, activity type, sequential organization of talk, and the state of knowledge of the interlocutors in the social interaction. Thus, in a conversation, people’s understanding of language is consciously or unconsciously related with those kinds of contextual information.

Even though language and social context are closely related, how they are related cannot be easily grasped since language and contextual meaning are not neatly mapped. Ochs (1990) mentioned that linguistic forms and contextual features do not exist in a one-to-one relationship because the relationship is so complex. To look into this relationship, we need to understand the indexical properties of language.

Indexicality concerns how to relate linguistic form to social meanings in a given context (Ochs 1990, 1993, 1996; Silverstein 1976). Silverstein (1976: 27) defined indexicality as the property of sign vehicle signaling contextual “existence” of an entity. A representative example of indexicality is deictics. For example, spatial adverbs such as here and there and personal pronouns such as I, he, she, etc. need a context for one to clearly understand what is being talked about at the moment. In addition to deitics, sociocultural information is also indexed by various grammatical and discourse structures (Ochs, 1990). Examples of sociocultural information which is indexed by linguistic signs
include social status, roles, relationships, settings, actions, activities, genres, topics, and affective and epistemic stances of participants (Ochs, 1990).

While the indexical meanings of deitics can be easily inferred from the context, those of sociocultural information are not always clearly perceived by even by members of that society. The way that linguistic forms index sociocultural dimension is very complicated: Sometimes a single linguistic form indexes some contextual dimension, or sometimes a set of linguistic forms indexes some contextual dimension (Ochs, 1990). Furthermore, even though there is conventional understanding of indexical meanings of some linguistic forms under certain contexts among the members of a society, each member’s understanding may not be exactly the same. Also, indexical meanings can be created, negotiated, and (re)evaluated among the interlocutors. Silverstein (2003) argues for the dialectic nature of indexical meaning. He explains that there is a presupposed indexical meaning and an entailed indexical meaning in the context, and they compete with each other dialectically. Ochs (1996: 414) notes that indexical knowledge is at the core of linguistic and cultural competence and is the locus where language acquisition and socialization interface. Thus, having indexical knowledge is an essential part of being a member of a society.

The social meaning of honorific forms has been associated with social rank (e.g., older vs. younger, employer vs. employee), however, linguistic form alone may not guarantee honorific meaning, depending on the context. For example, if we use the deferential (–supnita) ending to address our own teacher, who is much older than we, in a private conversation with a sincere voice tone, it might be thought that we are showing respect to the teacher. But if we use this ending with a close friend who is of a similar age,
it might be interpreted as a joke, sarcasm, performing a certain role, and so on, depending on the context. Thus, one sentence ending has the possibility of being interpreted in different ways, depending on the context. Therefore, we cannot simply tie a linguistic form to one specific social identity. Ochs (1990, 1996) explains that social identity is not grammaticalized through grammatical structure. She proposes that epistemic and affective stances are directly indexed by linguistic structures and they are the central meaning components of social acts and social identities. Affective stance refers to a mood, attitude, feeling, or disposition as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern. Epistemic stance refers to some property of participants’ beliefs or knowledge vis-à-vis some proposition, including degrees of certainty of knowledge, degrees of commitment to truth of propositions, and source of knowledge, among others (Ochs, 1990, 1996). Thus, various social meanings can be indirectly indexed from the affective/epistemic stance.

Cook (2008) mentions that the fuzzy boundary between linguistic form and context indicates that all linguistic forms are potentially indexical. In this approach, language cannot be understood separate from social context. From this perspective, this study will explore what sentence endings, which are generally thought to express differing honorific degrees, index in a given situation. By exploring their social meanings in the context, I will investigate what the most core meanings of each sentence ending are.

1.2 Speech Style Shifting

In order to investigate the indexical meanings of each speech style sentence ending, this dissertation will pay special attention to the speech style shifting
The Korean term for honorific language is *nophimmal*, which literally means elevating language. This term is used because native speakers of Korean generally believe that using honorific language is a way to elevate their language to show respect to a person of higher social status. Traditional views on honorifics explain that the use of those linguistic elements reflects (or indexes) the social relationship between the speakers. Thus, the honorific forms are thought of as being used by a person of lower social status to address socially superior interlocutors. In this way, honorifics have been understood as language devices which reflect differences of social status.

However, if we simply consider honorific features as a way of encoding such social relationships as social status difference, using honorific language within a single discourse should be very easy when those social factors are already set between interlocutors. Each participant could determine the social relationship of the conversation participants, and just follow the social rule of using appropriate honorific language. Contrary to the general belief, however, using appropriate honorifics is not that simple. In real conversations, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, honorific styles change dynamically within one discourse between the same people. It is common for a socially higher person to sometimes mix honorific speech styles to a socially lower person while talking mostly in non-honorific speech style (e.g., Sung, 2007b). In this case, he/she may not be using honorific styles because he/she respects or honors the addressee. Additionally, a socially lower person sometimes mixes non-honorific styles to speak to a socially higher addressee in ordinary conversation (see Chapter 4). Many such seemingly unconventional usages are not perceived as impolite, and the conversation goes on naturally. In summary,
Korean native speakers do not always use a consistent speech style, and often switch styles with the same person in the same conversation.

Studies on speech style shifting argue that the relationship between linguistic forms and social hierarchy is not static and the usage of honorific forms is not just limited to honoring, and that various kinds of social meanings can be interpreted from the context. When a speech shift takes place, two relevant speech styles’ indexical meanings create contrast, which makes it easy to examine their indexical meanings in the given context. This study will examine the phenomenon of speech style shifting, considering how people make use of each speech style in a given situation.

1.3 Data and Methods

This study will look into speech style variation in four genres of television programs: news, debates, talk shows, and comedy shows. For the selection of these genres, formality, seriousness of topic, and the interactional nature of the conversation were considered.

The purpose of news programs is to transfer news to the television viewers, and news anchors and reporters use a standardized format of reporting prescripted news content. The news programs for this study share the same format: There are two main anchors, one male and one female, and they take turns reading the news content. Some news is reported by reporters directly from the news scene. The main anchors rarely talk to each other, but there are a few cases of interaction when the main anchor calls a reporter and asks questions about the news. For this dissertation, Ahopsi nyusu ‘Nine o’clock News’ of KBS (Korea Broadcasting System) and Nyusu teysukhu ‘News Desk’ of
MBC (Munhwa Broadcasting Corporation), were selected for analysis. They are considered to be the most representative news programs in Korea and two episodes of each news program, respectively, were chosen and transcribed for analysis. Each episode is about an hour long, and about four hours of data were used for this study.

For debate programs, Paykpun tholon ‘One hundred minute debate’ of MBC and Simya tholon ‘Midnight debate’ of KBS were chosen. They deal with current social issues and participants for the debates were government ministers, members of the National Assembly, professors, and other topic experts. There was typically one host and 4-6 panelists for each program. Since the topics for debate were serious social issues and the participants were generally of a high social class, the participants generally used polite and formal language. The conversations in the debates were managed by a host, but the debate participants often interrupted and competed with each other for the right to speak. The host had the authority to initiate a topic, give panelists a chance to talk, limit panelists’ speech time, etc., but panelists often interrupted while others were talking. Two episodes of each program, respectively, were transcribed, and about twenty minutes of two additional episodes of Paykpun tholon ‘One hundred minute-debate’ were transcribed and used for the analysis. The total length of the debate programs was about 6 hours.

For talk show programs, one episode each of Te sutha syo ‘The Star Show,’ and Kim Jung-eun-uy chokholleys ‘Kim Jung-eun’s Chocolate,’ and two episodes of Park Joong-hoon syo ‘Park Joong-hoon show,’ were chosen and transcribed. In these programs, one or two hosts interviewed celebrities and talked with them about their lives and personal issues. The conversations in these shows were generally casual and friendly, but
they followed a question-answer format, where the hosts mostly asked questions, initiating most of the topics, and the guests answered. These shows were performed on stage before an audience. The topics of conversation seemed to have been pre-set, but the actual conversations went on spontaneously not following any prepared script. The data made for about 5 hours of the programming.

The comedy programs included in this study were two episodes of Myenglang hielo ‘Happy Hero,’ one episode of Hayphi thukeyte ‘Happy Together,’ and Phaymillika ttessta ‘Family Outing.’ In these programs, a group of hosts and invited guests talk very casually on various topics from social issues to their private lives. They also sometimes play games together. Unlike the above mentioned talk shows, these comedy shows were recorded without audiences. The conversations in these programs were sometimes similar to those of the talk shows, but more casual, and the participants were sometimes intentionally rude to each other to make the program fun. They did not always follow the question-answer format, but talked back and forth with a lot of interruptions. The data made for about 5 hours of programming as well.

The data were analyzed qualitatively. Once they were transcribed, the most dominant speech style in each genre of programs was examined first. Then occasions where speech style shift occurred were analysed, considering the effects of switching the speech style in that context. The indexical meanings of each speech style ending were examined not only from a macro perspective (i.e., functions and meanings in the whole discourse) but also from a micro perspective (i.e., functions and meanings at the moment of the conversation). A total of about 20 hours of televised talk was transcribed and used for the analysis. The example conversation data for this dissertation uses a Romanized
transcription based on the Yale system, word-for-word gloss, and a translation to English. Also, the abbreviations from Sohn (1999) were used.

1.4 Plan of This Dissertation

This chapter has outlined the general plan for this dissertation. It introduced the concept of indexicality and the phenomenon of speech style shifting followed by a brief description of the chapters.

Chapter 2 will present a brief description of the Korean honorific system in general terms. This description will include explanations of the honorific features of Korean and a review of earlier descriptions of Korean speech styles. Among the honorific features, speech style endings will be dealt with in detail. Even though speech style endings play the most important role for expressing honorific intention in a conversation, the combination of various honorific features and sentence endings can either increase or decrease the degree of honorification conveyed by one’s talk. Therefore, a speaker’s strategic use of honorific forms for regulating honorific meanings will also be discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 3 will outline the theoretical background for the discussions in this dissertation. It will first discuss the relationship between linguistic features and social context. Linguistic form and social structure are interdependent, in that use of language reflects social identity, and also because people make use of linguistic form to express themselves creatively. The discussion will then review the research on indexicality (Cook, 1999a, 2008; Ochs 1990, 1993; Silverstein, 1976 among others) which takes as given that
language is a social action and meaning does not come from language per se, but arises in relation to the social context.

In Chapter 4, previous studies on speech style shifting will be reviewed. While reviewing studies on Korean speech style shifting, this review will also include studies on Japanese speech level shifting for comparison. Many studies on speech style shifting emphasize that the relationship between language and social identity is not static. In reviewing studies on speech style shifting, many social and personal motivations for speech style shifting will be discussed.

Chapters 5 and 6 will explore how Korean speech style endings function in real conversations in ways other than just for showing social status differences. By examining social meanings of each speech style, the core meanings of each of them will be explored. In Chapter 5, the indexical meanings of the deferential and polite styles will be discussed. Speech style shifting is found among all speech styles, but these two styles are often used in similar situations and often provide a contrast in the data for this study. Therefore, while exploring speech style variations, the discussions will focus on these two forms first. In Chapter 6, non-honorific styles will be discussed. Non-honorific styles include the blunt, familiar, intimate, and plain styles. The blunt and the familiar styles are not often used in contemporary conversation and they were not found in the data for this study. Therefore, the discussion will focus on the intimate and the plain styles. These two styles are often used in similar situations, but each has unique characteristics.

Chapter 7 summarizes the main points of this study and presents implications for teaching honorifics to KFL/KSL students.
CHAPTER 2

ADDRESSEE HONORIFICS IN THE KOREAN LANGUAGE

Korean honorifics are manifested extensively in the Korean linguistic system. They appear in personal pronouns, address-referent terms, some case particles, some nouns and verbs, and most importantly, in sentence endings which are classified into different speech styles. Among these, the choice of a sentence ending contributes most to the honorific meaning of the whole utterance. The combination of a sentence ending with other honorific devices makes for variations in the degree of honorific meaning.

When using honorifics, Korean speakers not only consider the social relationship between the speaker and the addressee(s), but also the relationship between the conversation participants and the referent, when talking about other people. Sohn (1999: 408) defined honorifics as “grammatical and lexical forms encoding the speaker’s socio-culturally appropriate regard towards the addressee (i.e., addressee honorification) and the referent (i.e., referent honorification).” Thus, there are two aspects of honorifics, addressee honorifics and referent honorifics. Of these two aspects of honorifics, this chapter will focus on addressee honorifics because the form of a sentence ending, which is the main topic of this dissertation, is determined by addressee honorifics. However, when the referent and the addressee are the same, the use of the referent honorific verbal suffix –si plays an important role for honoring the addressee. Therefore, I will discuss referent honorifics when necessary.
2.1 Personal Pronouns

Korean people use different first person pronouns depending on the social context. The first person pronoun ce ‘I’ and its plural form cehuy ‘we’ are known as humble forms and they are used when the situation requires the speaker to use honorific expressions. Their plain forms are na ‘I’ and wuli ‘we’ and are generally used with non-honorific expressions. The function of the humble first person pronoun is to lower oneself, consequently showing respect to the addressee(s). Historically, there were more pronouns for humbling the first person, such as soin, or soynney ‘small person,’ but in contemporary Korean only ce ‘I’ and cehuy ‘we’ are found.

The use of second person pronouns is not extensive in Korean, and their usage is limited by context. There are second person pronouns such as ne, tangsin, and caki, etc., but they are generally used between close friends of a similar age or with younger close friends in casual situations. Instead of addressing someone with a second person pronoun, Korean has developed various ways of addressing others with job titles such as sensayng-nim ‘teacher,’ sacang-nim ‘president (of a company),’ and kinship terms, such as acessi ‘uncle,’ enni ‘older sister,’ etc. The usage of job titles and kinship terms will be discussed later in this chapter.

The third person pronoun tangsin\(^1\) is often used when one refers to a senior such as a parent, teacher, etc. As in the case of second person, various referent terms such as job titles, and kinship terms are often used for referring to a third person rather than using third person pronouns. Some examples of productively coined phrases for referring to a third person were found in the data for this study including ku-salam ‘that person,’ cepwun ‘that person,’ ku-pwun ‘that person,’ ku-namca ‘that man,’ and ku-yecapwun ‘that

\(^1\) The literal meaning of tangsin is ‘the present person’ and its usage is for second or third person.
woman,’ but there were far more cases when people were addressed with job titles or kinship terms.

2.2 Address-referent Terms

As stated above, the use of a second or third person pronoun is limited to those who are socially equal or those of lower status. Native speakers of Korean use all kinds of professional titles such as *sacang-nim* ‘company president,’ *kyoswu-nim* ‘professor,’ *uywen-nim* ‘congressman,’ and *sensayng-nim* ‘teacher’ for addressing or referring to those who are in higher status. In the data for this study, the formulas of full name + job title + *nim* (e.g., Kim Min-woong *kyoswu-nim* ‘Professor Kim Min-woong’) or last name + job title + *nim* (Kim *kyoswu-nim* ‘Professor Kim’) are common. There are no cases of first name + job title + *nim* (e.g., Min-woong *kyoswu-nim*) in the data for this study, even though this is sometimes found in everyday conversation. I will summarize how address-reference terms are generally used.

First, some job titles such as *sensayng-nim* ‘teacher’ and *sacang-nim* ‘president of a company’ are used as general address-referent terms for addressing or referring to people who are not actually teachers or company presidents. In the data for this study, there were cases in which *sensayng-nim* ‘teacher’ was used by TV show hosts to address guests (both male and female) who called in to give their opinions.

(2-1) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

1 host:  
yepo-sey-ya?
hello-SH-POL

여보세요.
‘Hello?’
2 guest:  
yepo-sey-yo?  
hello-SH-POL

여보세요  
‘Hello?’

3 host:  
yey, yey, nwukwu-si-nciyo?  
yes yes who-SH-POL

예, 누구신지요?  
‘Yes, Who is calling please?’

4 guest:  
yey, Pwusan-uy Pakyongswu-i-pni-ta  
yes, Pusan-GEN Pakyongswu-be-DEF-DC

예, 부산의 박용수입니다.  
‘Yes, I’m Pakyongswu from Pusan’

5 host:  
**Pak sensayng-nim**  
Park teacher-HT

박선생님?  
‘Pak sensayngnim?’

6 guest:  
yey?  
yes

예?  
‘Yes?’

7 host:  
malssumha-si-ciyo?  
speak-SH-POL

말씀하시죠?  
‘Why don’t you tell us (your opinion)?’

After hearing the guest’s name, the host addressed the caller by using the caller’s last name followed by *sensayngnim* ‘teacher.’ The host referred to this person in the same way when he mentioned him later in conversation:

(2-2) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

host:  
**Pwusan-uy Pak sensayng-nim-i malssumha-si-n nayyong-ey tayhayse ...**  
Pusan-GEN Pak teacher-HT-NM talk-SH-MD content-to about

부산의 박선생님이 말씀하신 내용에 대해서  
Regarding what Pak sensayngnim talked about a while ago …
Unlike Japanese, which allows a title to be used alone for addressing people when an honorific expression is required (e.g., shyatsyou ‘president’, kyoujyu ‘professor’), Korean does not allow lone titles for addressing people. It is actually impolite to address someone as sacang ‘president,’ kyoswu ‘professor,’ etc. without a suffix. In Korean, those job titles would be followed by the honorific title suffix –nim except when addressing social equals or those lower in status.

Second, another title suffix –ssi\(^2\) is often used after someone’s full name or first name for addressing that person or when referring to them in the third person. The situation where –ssi is used is less formal than that where titles are used, even though –ssi is found with both honorific and non-honorific expressions. For example, –ssi generally appears with a full name (e.g., Kim Min-woong ssi) in formal situations, but it also appears with a first name (e.g., Min-woong ssi) in casual situations. Putting –ssi after someone’s last name only (e.g., Kim-ssi) is not regarded as an honorific expression. Sohn (1999) mentioned that ‘Last name + ssi’ may be used toward adult males whose occupations are socially very low, and this type was not found in the data for this study unless one was making a joke.

Third, kinship terms such as hyeng ‘older brother,’ nwuna ‘older sister,’ acessi ‘uncle,’ and acwumma ‘aunt’ are often used for second or third person reference. Kinship terms are generally found in casual and informal situations. In the comedy show programs used for this study, people often address each other using ‘full name + ssi’ or ‘first name + ssi’ and sometimes with kinship terms such as hyeng, nwuna, etc. When they address someone with a full or first name + ssi, they tend to use honorific speech styles (deferential or polite). With kinship terms, they never used deferential style;

\(^2\) This suffix –ssi is a Sino-Korean word and its original Chinese character is 氏.
instead they generally used intimate (-e/a) style. Some kinship terms are sometimes used with honorific suffix -nim as in hyeng-nim ‘older brother’ and nwu-nim ‘older sister,’ which are more formal than general ones.

Fourth, in very friendly situations, people address others with their full name or with the first name with a vocative particle -a/-ya as in Minho-ya or Minsek-a. This way of addressing someone is generally used with non-honorific speech styles which are intimate (-e/a) and plain (-ta) style. Unlike in Japanese, in Korean people rarely address others with last name alone.

In sum, the way people address others involves the use of speech styles. Addressing with a job title is the most formal way and often used with the deferential style, while using -ssi is neutral and can be used in both formal and informal situations. Therefore, -ssi is often found not only in situations where deferential style and/or the polite style is used, but in a situation where non-honorific styles are used. In a very friendly situation, kinship terms such as hyeng ‘older brother for a male,’ oppa ‘older brother for a female,’ enni ‘older sister for a female,’ and nwuna ‘older sister for a male’ are used with an older person, while full name or first name + vocative particle (-a/-ya) are used with a younger friend.

2.3 Honorific Nouns, Verbs, and Case Particles

There are some nouns, verbs, and case particles which are used only for honorific purposes. Korean has the subject honorific suffix -(u)si with which a verb can be conjugated to express honorific meaning for the referent, or the subject of the sentence.
(2-3) Subject honorific suffix -si

a. na-nun ka-yo
   I-TC go-POL
   나는 가요.
   ‘I go.’

b. apeci-nun ka-si-eyo
   father-TC go-SH-POL
   아버지는 가세요.
   ‘Father goes.’

This way of conjugation is applied very productively to most verbs. However, some verbs are used in mostly honorific –(u)si conjugated form, which prohibits the use of such productive conjugation with other verbs of similar meaning. For example, for the verb ‘to eat,’ the most commonly used word is mek-ta, but other verbs such as tu-si-ta (< tul-ta), or capswu-si-ta (< capswu-ta) are generally used to describe the action of someone who deserves honorific expression instead of mek-usi-ta. Some other examples are: ca-ta (plain) vs. cwumusi-ta (hon.) ‘sleep,’ and iss-ta (plain) vs. kyeysi-ta (hon.) ‘to exist.’ There are also humble verbs for describing a speaker’s action to an honorable person: tulita (humble) vs. cwuta (plain) ‘give,’ and yeccwuta (humble) vs. mut.ta (plain) ‘ask.’ Also, there are some nouns used only for honorific purpose: mal (plain), vs. malssum (hon.) ‘words,’ and cip (plain) vs. tayk (hon.) ‘house,’ etc.

The subject particle –i/–ka and the dative particle –eykey/–hantey ‘to (a person)’ both have honorific forms –kkeyse and –kkey, respectively. These honorific particles work for referent honorifics, but the subject particle –kkeyse and subject honorific suffix –si are used for showing respect to the addressee when the referent and the addressee are
the same person. These honorific particles are generally found in formal conversations, but not often in a casual conversation.

Even though example (2-4 b) sounds a little more polite and formal, both of the above sentences are acceptable in most cases. The use of an honorific case particle is not grammatically bound with other elements in the sentence but is mostly dependent on the speaker’s choice.

The choice to use or not use honorific nouns and verbs with the addressee signals the speaker’s honorific intention to the addressee. The use of honorific particles raises the honorific meaning of interrogative and propositive sentences giving a more formal feeling to the statement as in (2-4 b).

2.4 Speech Styles

Among all honorific features in Korean, Korean speakers consider the sentence ending the most important. Korean sentence endings can be classified into different speech styles under four sentence types. The general classification of the six speech styles into four sentence types are summarized in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1 *The Korean Speech Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Propositive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Honorific</td>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>-(su)pnita</td>
<td>-(su)pnikka?</td>
<td>-sipsio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-(e/a)yo</td>
<td>-(e/a)yo?</td>
<td>-(e/a)yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Honorific</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>-(s)o/-(s)wu</td>
<td>-(s)o?/-(s)wu?</td>
<td>-(u)o/-wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>-ney</td>
<td>-na?/-nunka?</td>
<td>-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
<td>-e/a?</td>
<td>-e/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-ni?/-nu/nya?</td>
<td>-kela/ela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speech styles in the honorific system are often referred to as speech levels because they are thought to express different degrees of politeness and/or formality. However, this study will use the term *speech style* rather than *speech level* since they express not only politeness and/or formality, but many other situational meanings. However, when citing other studies, speech level will appear and it is understood to be interchangeable with speech style.

Among the six speech styles, the most frequently appearing styles in contemporary Korean are the deferential, polite, intimate, and plain styles. The use of the blunt and the familiar styles is very rare in contemporary Korean. According to Choi (2008), among 2000 cases of endings in his data from Korean soap operas, he found only 8 cases of blunt and 8 of familiar style, which account for only 0.4% of all endings used for each ending, respectively. These styles are not found at all in the data for this study. These styles are known to be used in more limited social environments than other styles.
The blunt style is used by an adult in a position of power addressing an adult in a position of less power, usually between males. The familiar style is used by a person of higher status speaking to a person of lower status, and between relatives and in-laws (Sohn, 1983). Choi (2008) mentioned that the use of these styles is limited to situations where the speaker is over forty and the addressee is over thirty, even though they used to be used by teenagers in the early 20th century. Since these styles are not found in the data for this study, I am not going to explore their social meanings in this study. However, they will be mentioned on occasion when I refer to those studies which deal with them.

Speech styles in the honorific system can be subdivided into honorific and non-honorific styles. Sohn (1999) mentioned that deferential and polite styles are used to address an equal or superior adult and they are intermixed by the same interlocutors in the same discourse (Sohn, 1999: 413). Thus, these two honorific speech styles are often used in similar situations. The non-honorific styles, the familiar, intimate, and plain styles are generally used when an adult is speaking to a younger adult, between close friends, and/or between children. As mentioned above, the blunt style is generally used by an adult to another adult who is lower in social position, so it is also classified as a non-honorific style.3 Sohn (1999) mentioned that the intimate, plain, and familiar levels are also intermixed with each other in the same discourse with the same person. While speech style shifting within honorific or non-honorific styles is a common phenomenon in Korean, it should also be noted that shifting between the honorific and non-honorific style is also common. More discussion about style shifting will be presented in Chapter 4.

3 Some scholars (e.g., Seo, 1984) classify the blunt style as an honorific style, in that it shows some respect to a socially lower addressee. However, since it is not a style used for a socially superior person, this study puts it in the non-honorific style.
To discuss speech styles, this study will basically follow the speech level classification in Table 2.1, but following Park (1976), this study will distinguish between simple \(-(e/a)yo\) style and subject honorific \(-seyyo\ (<-si-eyo)\) styles when necessary.

Even though \(-seyyo\) is one of the forms of the polite style ending with subject honorific marker \(-si\) combined with the polite ending \(-eyo\), \(-seyyo(<si-eyo)\) is used for a more polite connotation when it is used in a question, proposal, command or request to an addressee. In the following example, (2-5 b) sounds more polite than (2-5 a).

(2-5)

a. anc-ayo  
sit-POL

\(\text{앉아여}\)  
‘Have a seat.’

b. anc-usey-yo  
sit-SH-POL

\(\text{앉앉여여}\)  
‘Have a seat.’

A failure to use \(-si\) is sometimes regarded as lacking in politeness or may even sound challenging to the addressee. Park (1976) points out that while the \(-seyyo\) ending can be interchangeable with the deferential form, \(-eyo/ayo\) cannot be used directly with a person of higher social status. In the following example, a person who was born and raised in the US and not fluent in Korean, is trying to make a joke, but fails to get other people to laugh; instead, he gets exclamatory responses from the other conversation participants:

(2-6) From ‘Family Outing’ (comedy show)

1 Brian:  
\(\text{ce-lul}\ \text{iky-ess-canhayo}\)  
I-AC \(\text{win-PST-POL}\)
The above example is from a comedy show, and the 20-year-old guest on the program, Brian, is talking to the host, who is about 40 years old. The host was complaining because he lost the game. Brian said that the host should be satisfied because the host had beaten Brain in the previous game. It was obviously a joke from the context, but his remark sounded challenging and blaming, so other people expressed surprise. In the case of orders, requests, suggestions, etc., there is a difference in politeness and/or formality between simple –(e/a)yo and –si-eyo styles. This study will consider this difference in its analysis.

2.5 Newly Innovated Endings

Among the six speech styles mentioned above, the most widely used is the polite style which is the –yo ending style. In actual conversations, the use of –yo is so extensive that it often follows non-verbal elements (e.g., noun, sentence connective) and functions as a sentence ending. Sohn (2007) classified some sentence endings with –yo as newly innovated sentence endings and explained that they have the common pragmatic feature of mitigated illocutionary force.
(2-7)

(1)  
\( a. \) \( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-nun-ten} \ \text{yo} \ ~ \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-R-place POL} \]
'\( \text{It's raining. [What shall we/I do?]} \)'

\( b. \) \( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-nun-ka} \ \text{yo} \ ? \ / \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-R-whether POL} \]
'[\( \text{Do you think} \) it\( \text{'s raining?} \)'

\( c. \) \( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-nun-ci} \ \text{yo} \ ? \ \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-R-if POL} \]
'[\( \text{I wonder if} \) it\( \text{'s raining.} \)'

(2)  
\( a. \) \( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-ketun} \ \text{yo} \ ~ \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-since/if POL} \]
'\( \text{It's raining, [that's why.]} \)'

\( b. \) \( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-na} \ \text{yo} \ ? \ / \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-or POL} \]
'\( \text{Is it raining? [I wonder.]} \)'

(3)  
\( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-n-ta-nikka} \ \text{yo} \ / \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-IN-DC-because POL} \]
'[\( \text{I told you that} \) it\( \text{'s raining.} \)'

(4)  
\( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-te-la-ko} \ \text{yo} \ \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-RT-DC-QT POL} \]
'\( \text{It was raining, [you know.]} \)'

(5)  
\( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-ci} \ \text{yo} \ ? \ ~ \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-NOM POL} \]
'\( \text{It's raining, [isn't it?]} \)'

(6)  
\( \text{pi} \ \text{ka} \ \text{o-l-ke-l} \ \text{yo} \ / \) 
\[ \text{rain NM come-PRS-fact-AC POL} \]
'\( \text{It will probably rain, [I suppose.]} \)'

(Sohn, 2007: 1)

The innovation of these endings is due to the productive use of –yo, which can be attached to any type of sentence and any major constituent of a sentence if politeness is intended (Sohn, 2007). These endings followed by –yo have been derived by omitting the main clause and attaching –yo after the subordinate clause.
This structure allows only –yo for honorific expression; such expression in deferential style is impossible. If –yo is dropped, the utterance is regarded as intimate style. Thus, this structure is expressed in only two speech styles, and Sohn (2007) distinguished them as marked (polite style) and unmarked (intimate style). Since these endings cannot be expressed in other styles, for analysis in this study, these endings will be treated separately in a later discussion.

2.6 Combinations of Sentence Endings and Other Honorific Elements

The use of certain speech style endings is often correlated with the choice of other honorific devices in the sentence or discourse. For example, as mentioned above, when addressing someone with the honorific title suffix –nim, as in sensayng-nim ‘teacher,’ the intimate or the plain style generally does not follow. Likewise, if someone addresses another with the vocative suffix –a/-ya as in Minswu-ya ‘Hey, Minswu,’ he/she may not use the deferential or polite style. If address terms and sentence endings do not match well, the utterance is perceived as being a pragmatic failure or having a non-conventional meaning. For example, if a father asks his son in the deferential style, as in wuli atul, annyenghi cwumusi-ess-supnikka? ‘My son, did you sleep well?’, he may be saying this in a playful way to demonstrate his affection for his son, or to sarcastically criticize his getting up late.

Various combinations of honorific elements and sentence endings sometimes emphasize or reduce a speaker’s honorific attitude in a finely tuned way. For example,
one politeness strategy in Korean is the use of humble expressions. For the purpose of humbling oneself, there are first person pronouns, and some verbs or nouns to describe the speaker’s action or possession. The most commonly used humbling method is to use the first person pronoun ce ‘I’. The choice of the first person pronoun also affects the speech style. For example, the humble first pronoun ce ‘I’ is not generally followed by a non-honorific sentence ending.

(2-8)

a.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-TC</th>
<th>student-be-INT/PLN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ce-nun</td>
<td>haksayng-i-ya/ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-TC</th>
<th>student-be-DEF-DC/POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na-nun</td>
<td>haksayng-i-pni-ta/eyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-TC</th>
<th>student-be-DEF-DC/POL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ce-nun</td>
<td>haksayng-i-pni-ya/ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A person of lower social status generally uses ce ‘I’ when referring to oneself, but sometimes, when the honorific speech style is used, referring to oneself with na ‘I’ is regarded as acceptable. However, a failure to use the humble pronoun ce is sometimes perceived as not entirely appropriate. Consequently, using the plain first person pronoun na ‘I’ and an honorific ending makes the statement less polite.
Thus, the use of the first person pronoun affects the choice of sentence ending and the combination of them regulates the politeness or formality of the speech in slightly different ways. In this way, the honorific attitude of the speaker can be expressed creatively in many different ways even though there are a limited number of speech styles in Korean.

2.7 Conclusion

Korean has a very complex and systematic honorific system. Korean honorifics are manifested by combining many honorific features such as first person humble pronouns, address-referent terms, honorific particles, nouns and verbs and, most importantly, the six speech styles. Among the six speech styles, the deferential and the polite styles are regarded as honorific in that they are often used when one talks to people of a higher social rank. The rest of the styles (blunt, familiar, intimate, and plain) are thought to be non-honorific styles in that they are used to address social equals or people of lower social status. The blunt and the familiar styles are not commonly used, and the intimate and the plain styles are the most commonly used non-honorific styles in contemporary Korean.

Speech styles are sometimes referred to as speech levels because each speech style is thought to express a different degree of politeness. However, the differences among speech styles cannot be simply explained using only degree of politeness or
formality because they are often intermixed while talking to the same person in the same context. This speech level shifting is often found within honorific and non-honorific styles, but it is also found crossing between honorific and non-honorific styles. Chapter 4 will review studies on speech style shifts.

Korean honorifics can be expressed very creatively by combining several honorific features. The degree of politeness cannot be judged simply by sentence style, and sometimes a polite style expression sounds more polite than a deferential one, depending on the presence other honorific elements. Additionally, some newly invented sentence endings for mitigating illocutionary force (Sohn, 2007) do not have a deferential form (e.g., nun-tey, nunka, ketun), so we cannot compare the degree of politeness when such sentence endings are used.

Analysis of the above mentioned characteristics of Korean honorifics suggests that Korean honorifics involve more than social convention. It is more appropriate to say that people use them creatively and actively to express a range of social meanings, not just politeness. Chapter 3 will discuss the relationship between the Korean language and society.
Korean honorifics have been one of the most popular topics in the field of Korean linguistics. Even though there have been many studies on the syntactic and morphological characteristics of Korean honorifics, few studies discuss their social meanings and discourse functions in actual conversations. As can be easily inferred from the term *honorifics*, the social meanings of honorifics have been simply thought to express the speaker’s respect for the addressee or for a referent (e.g., K-H. Lee, 2010). It has also been thought that, as discussed in the Chapter 2, use of honorifics is related to the formality of a situation. However, in real conversations, there are many occasions where honorific forms are used for reasons other than showing respect or being polite. For example, when Korean adults of a similar age meet for the first time, honorific speech styles are expected to be used regardless of their intention of honoring each other. Even when strangers fight on the street, honorific speech styles might be used, at least in the initial stage of the fight. In such cases, the use of honorific forms is not intended to show respect or formality.

Conventionally, there are occasions when a Korean native speaker would speak in an honorific style to follow social conventions. Han (2002) discussed the characteristics of Korean honorifics in general and summarized that Korean speakers choose speech style considering six social factors: social status, gender, intimacy, kinship relationship, and the scene in which the speech act is taking place (Han, 2002: 225). From this explanation, we can infer that there are occasions when one should use honorific speech
styles regardless of one’s intention of being respectful. For this reason, Hwang (1990) argued that honorifics are used to express the social norm of deference which reflects social positional difference, and that deference should be distinguished from politeness, which can be expressed strategically with various linguistic features in Korean. However, the social conventions for using honorific features are not limited to expressing relative social positional differences. Various social meanings can be interpreted from the context. In fact, there are even occasions when a person of higher social status uses an honorific form with a person of lower social status, and vice versa (see Chapter 4). Therefore, Agha (1998) pointed out that the term honorific is misleading in that honorific speech is not used only for paying respect or conferring honor. He explained that honorific speech serves many other interactional agendas, such as control and domination, irony, innuendo, and masked aggression, as well as other types of socially meaningful behaviors that native ideologies of honor or respect do not describe (Agha 1998: 153). In short, there have been many discussions that show that honorific forms are not used only for honoring purposes, and they can have various other meanings, depending on the context. Studies on speech style shiftings, which will be discussed in Chapter 4, will show that honorific forms are not simply used to express the honoring of others.

There are situations where the honorific forms are supposed to be used, not dependent on the relationship with the addressee(s), but upon the role the speaker is playing at the moment. Some studies on Japanese honorifics give good examples. In many situations people know that they are supposed to speak in honorific forms even when the addressee(s) is not in a socially higher position. Examples include giving a speech in front of many people, having an interview (Cook, 1999a), teaching a class
(Cook, 1996), presenting in a classroom (Cook, 1996), and talking to a customer. In such cases, using a certain honorific style indicates that the person is performing a role (e.g., announcer, interviewer/interviewee, presenter, clerk, etc.) and changing the speech style may indicate that the person is finished with or temporally out of the role. Cook (1996) found that a Japanese elementary school student used –desu style, which is a polite style, in class when he was presenting. According to Cook, –desu style is a presenter’s speech style and using this form indicates that the speaker is performing the role of a presenter. However, the presenter often switched his speech style to –da style, which is a non-polite style, when he asked questions to the teacher. Cook explained that the occasions when the presenter changed the speech style indicated that he had stepped out of his role at that moment.

Similarly, there are many social conventions that a Korean speaker should follow when choosing honorific speech styles. However, choice of linguistic forms does not depend only on social conventions. When one speaks with sincere respect to an addressee, for example, the choice of honorific forms may be different from addressing a stranger. In such cases, one may combine several honorific forms at one time with a more sincere voice tone. Sometimes, the language use may not look conventionally polite when non-honorific forms are used to express sincere respect. For example, one may talk in non-honorific form to one’s mother, yet still be full of respect. Therefore, honorific forms are not always in agreement with conventional understanding of them.

In short, the use of Korean honorifics appears to express various social conventions and personal motivations simultaneously. However, how Korean honorific forms are chosen by a speaker and how they are interpreted by interlocutors in a given
situation have yet to be examined in detail. This chapter will discuss how linguistic forms and society are related and how honorific forms can be interpreted in actual conversation. The discussion will focus on various factors for choosing honorific speech styles including social conventions and personal motivation. A speaker’s speech style choice may depend on what social or personal factor(s) is being concerned in the moment of conversation. The speaker’s speech style may change, even within the same discourse with the same person. By reviewing social constructivists’ arguments and the indexical nature of language, I will discuss the relationship between speech styles and social structure.

3.1 Politeness and the Social Norm

One of the key issues of studies of honorific speech style shifting has been the argument that honorific forms are not merely devices that reflect pre-existing social relationships. Scholars with traditional views have explained that the choice of honorific form depends on social norms, and one’s task is to figure out one’s relative position in the situation and then use appropriate speech styles. This kind of normative honorific use was emphasized by some scholars of Chinese and Japanese (e.g., Gu, 1990; Ide, 1989; Mao, 1994; Matsumoto, 1988) who criticized politeness theories that argued for universality in politeness (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Ide (1989) claimed that Brown & Levinson neglected the linguistic aspect of choice of formal linguistic forms among varieties with different degrees of formality. According to her, the neglected aspect of usage is *discernment* which is the speaker’s use of polite expressions according to social conventions rather than interactional strategies.
between individuals. This term discernment came from the Japanese word *wakimae* and she explained that “to behave according to *wakimae* is to show verbally and non-verbally one’s sense of place or role in a given situation according to social conventions” (1989: 230). Thus, her argument is that for Japanese people, an individual’s want is not an important factor of politeness, but what is crucial is to know one’s position in a group and use appropriate language to the position.

Hwang (1990) also viewed Korean honorifics as linguistic realizations of the social norm. He distinguished the concept of deference from that of politeness in the Korean language. Following the definition by Treichler, et al., (1984), deference is ‘power as a social fact, established *a priori* by the differential *positions* of individuals or groups within the social structure (italics added),’ Hwang (1990) explained that the use of honorifics is a device for expressing deference in Korean. His argument is that, in short, while Korean politeness is expressed in a strategic way as in Western languages, Korean has an additional device to indicate a priori social structure, which is the use of honorifics.

Even though Brown and Levinson have been criticized for not considering the normative side of politeness in Asian culture, they had actually already defined honorifics as “direct grammatical encodings of relative social status between participants, or between participants and persons or things referred to in the communicative event” (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 276), which presupposes the normative use of honorifics. Thus, in spite of the differences in perspectives on universality of politeness between Brown and Levinson and their critics, there has been a consensus that honorific forms are linguistic realizations of social relationships.
As to why languages in Asian society develop honorifics, it has been generally agreed that it is due to characteristics of East Asian societies, which differ from Western societies (Leech, 2007). East Asian countries, such as China, Japan and Korea are described as collectivist societies contrasting with individualistic Western societies, and this difference has been regarded as a factor that causes different language strategies and structures for expressing one’s politeness. A dichotomized distinction between Asian and Western societies, however, is problematic in some ways. Although the way that the politeness is realized in these cultures is different, it is too extreme to say that in choosing their language style people in Asian society do not care about individual wants and simply try to figure out their relative social position. In the same way, it is not true that people in Western society do not care about relative social position and only care about individual wants. Lakoff (1972) explained that honorifics are not unique to languages such as Japanese and Korean, but can be found in other languages. She explained that, for example, the use of English modals and sentence types can parallel the use of honorifics in other languages.

The notion of collectivism and individualism is a matter of degree, and is not able to be simply dichotomized. Leech (2007: 170) mentioned that “all polite communication implies that the speaker is taking account of both individual and group values.” Thus, even though there are differences among polite linguistic behaviors in different societies, there should be a common pragmatic and behavioral basis for expressing politeness and respect through linguistic devices. Pizziconi (2010) argues that users of honorific-rich language are not necessarily more socially sensitive, but they are likely to be more sensitive to the way in which social relations and social reality are created and
transformed by linguistic signs. Thus, we cannot simply say Korean people are very sensitive to social relationships, while Americans are not.

Furthermore, if the choice of speech style is solely dependent on a priori social context, it seems like there is not much room for one to change speech styles with the same person in the same situation. However, research dealing with speech style switching has found that people often change speech styles although the social context is fixed. Research on style shifting will be reviewed in Chapter 4.

Undoubtedly, there is a normative side to using Korean honorifics. The usage of honorifics is bound to differences in social position between the speaker and the addressee(s), but the relationship between the linguistic forms and the social position does not appear to be static (e.g., Ochs 1990, 1996). The following section will discuss the relationship between linguistic forms and social identity in society in order to provide for a deeper understanding of use of Korean honorifics.

### 3.2 Indexicality

Indexicality concerns the situational meanings of linguistic form in context. Once an utterance is made for the purpose of communication, we not only exchange propositional meanings, but also there arise many contextual meanings beyond it. Silverstein (1976: 27) defined indexicality as the property of a sign vehicle signaling contextual “existence” of an entity. Cook (2008: 21) also defined indexicality as a phenomenon associated with the situatedness of human experience in the creation of meaning. Thus, understanding indexical meaning is an essential part in communication.
For example, when someone says *The weather is nice today!* to a stranger in an elevator, he may not just be giving information on the weather. He may also be trying to build rapport with the person. Meaning in context has been a focus of sociocultural theories such as speech act and language socialization theories. Speech act theory concerns the function of an utterance in communication. In this theory, meaning is classified into three types: propositional or locutionary meaning, illocutionary meaning, and perlocutionary force. Illocutionary meaning refers to the social function that the utterance or written text has, and the perlocutionary force is the result or effect that is produced by the utterance in a given context (Cohen, 1996). Thus, speech act theory explains that language is not just a tool for conveying information, but people also accomplish certain actions by making use of language.

The pragmatic meaning of an utterance should be interpreted in context and a single linguistic form may have various meanings depending on the context. The process by which an utterance’s meanings are interpreted in context is a very complicated cognitive process. American philosopher Charles Pierce hypothesized that the meaning of every thought is established by a triadic relation among object, sign and interpretation. According to Pierce, meaning is an interpretation of the thought as a sign of a determining object (Hoopes, 1991). Pierce classified signs into three types which are icon, index, and symbol. Icons are signs that exhibit a similarity or analogy to the subject. Indices are signs that represent their objects by being actually connected to them, and symbols are arbitrary signs that represent their object essentially because they cannot be interpreted.
To understand contextual meaning, the indexical property of language should be examined. An index requires a context in order to have a meaning. The most representative examples of indices are deitics. We can understand what deitics like here, there, this, that, you, he, and she exactly mean only within context, not outside of it. The indexical meaning of deitics is easily inferred from context, but sociocultural meanings are not so easily understood. Silverstein (1976) subdivided index into a referential index and a non-referential index. According to him, referential indices contribute to the semantic meaning, while non-referential indices, or pure indices, are features of speech which, independent of any referential speech events that may be occurring, signal some particular value of one or more contextual variables (Silverstein, 1976: 29). Non-referential indexical meanings of sociocultural information are not concrete and their interpretation may vary depending on the context and the conversation participants. The next section will further discuss understanding those vague indexical meanings in context.

3.3 Structure of Indexical Meanings

Ochs (1996) explained that members of a society conceptualize social situations using cultural forms which include linguistic forms. According to her, socio-cultural information which can be indexed though linguistic signs includes the temporal and spatial locus of the communicative situation, the social identities of participants, the social acts and activities taking place, and participants’ affective and epistemic stances (Ochs, 1990: 294). The relationship between linguistic form and socio-cultural context is not simple in that it is possible that a single linguistic form may index some contextual dimension or a set of co-occurring linguistic forms may index some contextual dimension
(Ochs, 1990). Simply put, we cannot neatly put linguistic forms and contextual features in one-to-one relationships.

For the relationship between linguistic form and contextual information, Ochs proposed that a distinction be made between what is directly and indirectly indexed. According to her, affective and epistemological dispositions are directly indexed. Ochs (1990: 296) explains that affective dispositions include feelings, moods, and attitudes of participants toward some proposition, and epistemological dispositions refer to some property of the participants’ beliefs or knowledge vis-à-vis some proposition—for example, the source of their knowledge or the degree of certainty of their knowledge. She further explains that other socio-cultural dimensions (e.g., social identities of participants, social relationships among participants) are indirectly indexed from the direct indexical meanings. As an example, she explains that Japanese sentence-final particles ze and wa directly index affective stances of coarse versus delicate intensity, and such affective stances in turn indirectly index gender and gender images of masculinity and femininity.

Hasegawa (2005) supports Ochs’s idea and argues that so-called gendered speech is far less common when speaking to oneself. Hasegawa (2005: 2) explained that “the sentence-final particle zo is commonly attributed to male speech in dialogues, but in soliloquy, women can use it without exerting masculinity, e.g., gambaru zo! ‘I’ll make it!’” In soliloquy, this sentence-final particle zo indexes only coarse intensity, as Ochs contends, not masculinity, as commonly believed.”

The creation and understanding of indexical meaning is a very complex process. Silverstein (2003) proposed a hierarchical structure of indexical meaning to explain this process. He introduced the concept of an indexical order which generally follows a
dialectical schema. He explained that the indexical meaning is composed of two aspects. One is indexical presupposition which is based on metapragmatic knowledge among the members of the society (n-th order indexicality). The other one is indexical entailment which is temporally and/or casually entailed in the context (n+1st order indexicality). Silverstein (2003) explains that these two aspects of indexical meanings are competing with each other dialectically and constitute cultural categories of identity.

In this way, many socio-cultural aspects are indexed though complicated procedures. From this view, we cannot directly connect a linguistic form with a social identity. However, traditionally, use of honorific forms has been understood to reflect the hierarchy of social structures and we need to reconsider how honorific forms can be related to social identity. The next section will discuss how indexical meanings of Korean honorific endings can be understood in relation to social structure.

3.4 Indexicality and Honorific Endings

As discussed above, sentence endings are most significant when honorifics are used. There is not a specific propositional meaning for each speech ending, therefore even if we use an inappropriate sentence ending, there is no difference in the information transferred by the utterance. From the view of indexicality, an honorific sentence ending has non-referential indexical meanings which may vary in contextual meanings (e.g., politeness, intimacy, formality, elegance). Therefore, a speaker’s use of honorific endings should be interpreted in context and the intended meaning can be interpreted differently in another context. For example, the use of the polite ending -(e/a)yo with someone a
speaker is meeting for the first time may be regarded as showing respect and intimacy, but use of this form between close friends may be interpreted in the opposite way.

The sentence endings of each speech style are not strongly bound by grammatical rules either. They do not have grammatically functional meanings. The choice of an honorific speech style is a matter of pragmatics, not syntax or morphology; therefore we cannot simply say whether the choice of an honorific ending is grammatically correct, but only whether it is pragmatically appropriate. It has been argued that the honorific suffix –(u)si must grammatically agree with the subject of the sentence. However, the occurrence of –(u)si is very context dependent and it cannot be regarded only as a matter of grammar. In the example below, the use of –(u)si depends on the speaker’s intention, if ‘teacher Kim’ is absent in the context (Choe, 2004).

(3-1)

a.  Kim-sensayngnim-i  o-si-ess-ta  
    Kim-teacher-NM   come-HS-PST-DC  
    김 선생님 이 오셨다  
    Teacher Kim came.

b.  Kim-sensayngnim-i  o-ass-ta  
    Kim-teacher-NM   come-PST-DC  
    김 선생님이 왔다  
    ‘Teacher Kim came.’

In this regard, the honorific suffix –(u)si should be considered a suffix with honorific meaning rather than an element in grammatical agreement with another element in the sentence.

From the view of indexicality, honorific forms do not directly index relative social position among conversation participants. Concerning honorific forms, Cook (2006:
273) argued that “most linguistic structures do not directly index politeness. Most linguistic structures that index politeness in certain social contexts may index different social meaning in other contexts. Honorifics are no exception because their meanings are not fixed across varying social contexts. Thus, not all honorifics are direct encodings of social status.” Since indexical meanings arise from situations, it is possible to interpret them in various ways. Studies on speech style shifting propose or assume various indexical meanings of honorific forms in every social context. The following section will discuss how social identities are indexed in context.

3.5 Indexicality and Social Identity

The correlation between use of language and identity in society has been discussed by many sociolinguists. The most famous study may be Labov’s (1972), which analyzed the correlation between socio-economic status and the pronunciation of postvocalic /r/ in New York City. Labovian perspective presumes a static relationship between linguistic features and social identity. For example, Trudgill (1974) investigated the correlation between realizations of phonological variables of (ng) and social class, social context, and sex in Norwich, England. He examined the pronunciation of (ng) among people from five different social classes (lower working class, middle working class, upper working class, lower middle class, and middle middle class) in four different contextual styles (word list style, reading passage style, formal speech, and casual speech). In looking at two phonological variations of (ng), [ŋ] and [n], he found a very consistent tendency in which [ŋ] is found most frequently in the highest social class in the word list style, which is the most careful style, and as [n] is most frequently found in the
lowest social class in the most casual situations. Thus, the higher the social level is, and the more careful the speech style is, the more [ŋ] is used, while the lower the social level is, and the less careful the speech style is, and the more (ng) is pronounced [n]. He also pointed out that women in each social class used [ŋ] more often than [n] and concluded that women are more status-conscious than men, generally speaking, and are therefore more aware of the social significance of linguistic variation.

Even though social identity and language use exist in an inseparable relationship, assuming a static relationship between them can problematic. First of all, the social class (upper, middle, lower, etc.) in Trudgill’s (1974) study is only one of the classifications of social class adopted by the author. There can be various ways of classifying socio-economic class and the test results may vary depending on the researcher’s classification. Social identity and language use are interrelated too complexly for a single classification of social identity to be able to adequately explain language use. Secondly, his study assumed that a person who belongs to a certain social category would consistently speak as expected of that social identity. In other words, this study expected that an upper working class person would always speak as an upper working class person. However, it is too simplistic to classify a group of people with only one social variable, since a member of any society has multiple social identities at one time. We cannot expect “upper working class” people to always use “upper working class” language patterns regardless of the context.

The problem of assuming static relationships between linguistic forms and social identities has been discussed by social constructivists who claim that there are no static relationships between language and social structure. They explain that an individual
creates his/her identity by co-constructing meaning within a social context. Ochs (1993) argued that social identity is rarely grammaticalized or otherwise explicitly encoded across world languages. Thus, even though a linguistic form is often socially interpreted in relation to a certain identity (i.e., man/woman, socially high/mid/low class) by the members of the society, the linguistic form *per se* is not directly related to that social identity.

The constructivist’s perspective also assumes that people actively create and change their social identities in context, language is the most crucial tool for doing this. For example, Goffman (1981) explained that each individual acts on their social roles by constructing them creatively. According to him, people often change the frame during conversation to express different identities, for which he used the term *footing* (Goffman, 1981). He defines footing as a participant’s alignment or stance in a conversation and over the course of speaking. He claims that people constantly change footing while having a conversation, and that a change in footing implies a change in the alignment between one’s self and the others present as expressed in the way one manages the production or reception of an utterance.

From a similar point of view, Agha (1993) presented the example that honorific expressions in Lhasa Tibetan do not just show difference in social status. He argued that honorific register šesa items do not encode social status but index *deference entitlement*. According to him, deference entitlement is one’s positioning of self in a specific interaction with other people which changes moment by moment. Thus, the use of honorific register, according to him, does not depend on monadic social status, but on a
dyadic (or sometimes polyadic) concept establishing the relationship of a given interactionally positioned individual to others.

Conversation analysis (CA) does not consider relationships between language and social identity to be static either. For CA, social classifications only matter when they are relevant to an interaction within a conversation. Even though CA does not ignore conventional social classification for its analysis, it is only concerned with how social classifications are relevant to an ongoing conversation moment by moment, not presuming them before analysis. Schegloff (1991) mentioned that CA concerns how parties embody for one another the relevancies of the interaction and thereby produce the social structure.

In short, a social constructivist perspective emphasizes a speaker’s autonomous and creative use of language. They argue that the relationship between language and society is not static but actively created by the conversation participants. However, speakers do not make linguistic choices randomly, changing speech styles arbitrarily. Most of the time, linguistic choices are made as a result of the speaker’s overall consideration of social conventions and the speaker’s psychological attitude in the given context. Consequently, speech style is subject to change depending on what aspect is being emphasized in any moment of the conversation. The next section will further discuss the relationship between social convention and language use.

3.6 Social Convention and Language Use

Constructivists argue that people create and negotiate their identities while interacting with each other. However, this does not mean that they simply create and
change their identities anytime they want to, without basis. Neither does it mean that conventional classification of social identity does not work as a factor affecting one’s language use. It is true that there are many social conventions that have been created by members of a society, and there is a general consensus about the way a linguistic form is interpreted among the members of that society. Nevertheless, the relationships between linguistic form and social identity cannot be static.

For example, a certain linguistic feature might often be used by women because one of its properties is preferred by them. Once this form is stereotyped as women’s style by members of the society, this stereotype affects the use of language. As a result, there can be a tendency for women to use this form to emphasize their femininity, while men avoid using it. However, we cannot simply say this is women’s language because it does not intrinsically have the feature of women. Actually, there is a possibility that this women’s language could be used by men as the society changes. In this way, many stereotypes in language arise and change as a society changes.

Agha (1998) explained that native stereotypes about language structure and use play a critical role in formulating the pragmatic values of register systems. Stereotyped social conventions may cause language users to use a certain form, especially when they are conscious of the conventional value of the form. However, they don’t always follow conventional usage and, in actual conversation, certain linguistic forms are used for social meanings beyond the conventional meanings. For example, the term *honorifics* reflect paralinguistic interpretation of some linguistic forms, and people use honorific forms to show respect or to be polite. However, in actual conversation, non-conventional use of honorifics is often found in very normal situations and it is not regarded as an
inappropriate use of honorifics (see Chapter 4). Thus, the function of honorific forms is not limited to politeness or deference. Okamoto (1997) showed that actual language use is not always consistent with normative language use because of the complexity of the specific social contexts and also because of the diversity of the linguistic ideologies that mediate it.

I assume that there are several sources of motivation for choosing speech styles working together. First, people’s meta-pragmatic knowledge of linguistic forms affects their language use, especially when they are conscious of the conventional usage of them. The meta-pragmatic knowledge is a stereotyped interpretation of the linguistic forms shared by the members of a society. For example, for a person who is older than another Korean speaker, sentence endings such as –supnita, -eyo/ayo are supposed to be used. These forms are also supposed to be used when a person gives a speech in front of a group of people. In this case, it doesn’t matter if the speaker really respects the addressee. Using these forms is the minimum obligation for a speaker to maintain the social relationship in a socially acceptable way. Even in this case, the process of selecting a speech style is not simple. The speaker must consider many social factors in a very short period of time. For example, a speaker simultaneously considers the nature of the discourse and the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Therefore, even when a person speaks according to conventionalized social norms, his/her speech style may change depending on what norm the speaker is most concerned about.

Along with social factors, there are personal factors influencing the choice of a sentence ending. For example, a speaker’s psychological state or attitude, such as surprise, exclamation, intimacy, avoidance, and being neutral etc. is often expressed with different
honorific sentence endings. Maynard (1991) explained that such psychological meanings are expressed by discourse modals, and honorific sentence endings function as discourse modals. Discourse modality conveys the subjective emotional, mental or psychological attitude of the speaker toward the message content, to the speech act itself or toward his or her interlocutor (Maynard, 1991: 579).

These social and personal factors work together for a speaker to choose and change speech style. A discussion of how sentence endings function as discourse modals will be presented in Chapters 5 and 6.

3.7 Conclusion

As can be inferred from the term, honorifics have been generally explained as being used for showing respect/deference, or being formal. Such traditional understandings of honorifics have assumed that there are static relationships between honorific forms and the social structure, and therefore, the use of honorifics mainly depends on relative differences in social status. There have been arguments that in Asian societies, characterized by collectivism, an individual’s role is to figure out his/her relative position in the social structure and choose appropriate honorific forms in the moment of a conversation. Such explanations have limitations and fail to explain honorific usage when an honorific speech style changes within one discourse or unconventional honorific usages are found in real conversations.

In actual conversation, honorific forms have various social meanings and functions. The meaning of honorifics other than politeness and/or deference has been explained in some studies. Seo (1984) claimed that one reason people use honorifics in
Korean is to show the speaker’s elegance. Ide (2005) mentioned that the use of Japanese honorifics sometimes indexes dignity and elegance. Anderson (1993) argued that in Sudanese, the honorific speech style Lemes is used to express thanks, discuss bad news, and deflect anger regardless of the relative statuses of the interlocutors (cited in Cook, 1999). These studies mentioned these as additional meanings, but more recent studies on speech level shifting support the argument that honorific forms do not merely show social positional differences, but also various social meanings (see Chapter 4).

According to constructivists, language and society do not have a static relationship. Each person’s social identity and role are negotiated and redefined moment by moment, and language styles, including speech styles in the honorific system, can change accordingly. The interpretation of a linguistic form in context is a several step process. Ochs (1990, 1996) explains that a linguistic form has direct and indirect indexical meanings. According to Ochs (1990), direct indexical meaning is related to affective or epistemological dispositions, which are related to one’s direct psychological feeling or basic belief. From the direct indexical meanings, they indirectly index various social meanings such as formal/informal, respect, and elegance. Silverstein (2003) further explained a dialectic process of indexical meaning between presupposed indexical meaning (n-th order indexicality) and entailed indexical meaning (n+1-st indexicality). He explained that these two aspects of indexicality dialectically affect each other to create indexical meaning in a given context.

Chapter 4 will review how honorifics have been understood, how studies on speech style shifting have explained the motivation of switching speech levels, and the social meaning of each speech style.
This chapter will review the studies on speech style shifting in Korean and Japanese. Studies on the speech style shifting phenomenon support the argument that the relationship between language and social structure is not static (see Chapter 3). As discussed, motivations for style shifting include various social and personal factors. Some studies about speech style shifting focus on a speaker’s personal motivation, particularly their psychological state at the moment. These studies suggest that people sometimes switch speech styles as their psychological state changes in a context. Some other studies focused on social factors, especially the speaker’s roles or social identities which can be constructed and negotiated during conversation. Some studies even found that speech style shifting indicates the change of discourse structure (Ikuta, 1983, 2008). In reviewing studies on honorific speech style shifting in Korean and Japanese, this chapter will examine what kinds of things have been discussed for this phenomenon.

4.1 Traditional Views of Speech Style Shifting

The speech style shifting phenomenon has not received much attention in the field of Korean linguistics. Some traditional studies on honorifics briefly mention speech style shifting between adjacent politeness levels, but they do not discuss the phenomenon in depth. For example, Martin (1964: 41) simply mentioned style shifts between deferential and polite styles “a Korean may open up a conversation with the deferential style, slip into the polite style, and then occasionally throw in a deferential form.” Martin may have
thought change between these styles to be a stylistic variation since he did not go on to explain why people change speech styles.

Some other traditional studies simply describe speech style shifting as a temporal and/or abnormal phenomenon. Sung (1984), for example, analyzed conversations from some contemporary novels and said that speech level alternation is an abnormal phenomenon and that it could not be found in real conversation. One example he gave was a situation in which a character mixed the plain and familiar styles. The example was as follows:

(4-1)

1

\begin{verbatim}
na-to oylop-ta
\end{verbatim}

I also lonely-PLN

나도 외롭다

“I’m also lonely”

2

\begin{verbatim}
oylop-ci.anh-ki wyhayse masi-nuney,
lonely-not-in-order.to drink-but
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
caney-nun oylop-ko na-nun kotokha-kwuna.
you-TC lonely-and I-TC lonely-FM
\end{verbatim}

외롭지 않기 위해서 마시는데 자네는 외롭고 나는 고독하구나

“I’m drinking in order not to be lonely, but you are lonely and I’m solitary.”

Sung (1984: 442)

He explained that the statement was made while “the character in the novel was drinking and this kind of usage is impossible in real and normal situations (Sung, 1984: 442).”

However, as J-B Lee (2002) pointed out, Sung’s (1984) example does not sound impossible even though the example was from a novel rather than a real conversation.

While traditional studies generally viewed speech style shifts as stylistic variation or a non-canonical language use, some recent studies regard style shifting as a speaker’s
strategic choice and try to explain motivation for style shifting. The most common explanation for speech style shifting is change of formality in a discourse. Han (2002), who discussed Korean honorifics in general, explained that speech levels can be classified into formal (deferential, blunt, familiar, and plain) and informal (polite and intimate) styles, and that style shifting is possible between formal and informal if the degree of politeness is similar. For example, he explained that the deferential and the polite styles express similar degree of politeness and based on the formality of the situation, people choose one of them. The same explanation can be applied to the plain (formal) and the intimate (informal) styles. Han (2002) also mentioned that style shifts may depend on a speaker’s psychological state or a change in the situation of something other than formality, but speech style shifting is only possible within honorific styles or non-honorific styles. He argued that it is impossible to change the speech styles if their degree of politeness is different.

The honorific speech style sometimes shifts between honorific styles (deferential, polite) and non-honorific style (blunt, familiar, intimate, plain) with the same person in the same discourse. This will be discussed later in this chapter. Also, even though Han argued that the use of the non-honorific style is very rare when honorific forms are dominant, except when talking to oneself (Han, 2002: 189), in actual conversation, style shifting between honorific and non-honorific styles is not rare (e.g., J-B. Lee, 2002). Also, even when the target of speech is the speaker’s own self, an utterance seeming to be talking to oneself may have various intentions. Sometimes it may be an indirect strategy to give a message to another listener. The following part of this chapter will review more
recent studies on speech style shifting, and present a variety of social and personal factors for speech style shifting.

4.2 Korean and Japanese Speech Styles in Honorific Systems

There have been various attempts to explain Japanese speech style shifting focusing on its pragmatic meanings and functions (e.g., Jones & Ono, 2008). Even though Korean and Japanese have a different number of honorific speech styles and their usages cannot be matched exactly, the motivations for speech style shifting are comparable. For examining switching speech styles, therefore, studies on Japanese will be referred to while discussing Korean speech styles. Additionally, in the course of the discussion, some differences between the two languages will be pointed out. An approximate comparison between Korean and Japanese speech levels is shown in Table 4-1.

As can be seen in Table 4-1, Korean has more speech styles than Japanese. In Japanese, the desu/masu form is a commonly used honorific style, while the -de gozaimasu form is limited in use to highly ritualized contexts. However, both Korean honorific styles, the deferential and the polite, are extensively used in contemporary Korean. Martin (1964) stated that the Korean deferential style corresponds to the Japanese –de gozaimasu style and he anticipated that the deferential form would eventually be replaced by the polite style, except for formal clichés. However, more than 40 years after his prediction, the deferential style is still extensively used in many situations in Korean society, and it seems more comparable to the Japanese -desu/masu style.
Table 4.1 *Comparison between Korean and Japanese Speech Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferential style</td>
<td><em>de gozaimasu</em> form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite style</td>
<td><em>desu/masu</em> form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain style</td>
<td><em>plain form</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most commonly used speech style in Korean is the –*yo* ending (polite) style. It can be used in very formal situations with the deferential style, as well as in quite casual situations with the intimate and/or plain style. The situations where Korean polite style can be used are varied and it seems sometimes comparable to the Japanese -*desu/masu* style, but it is also used in casual situations where the Japanese plain form can be used.

There are four non-honorific speech styles in Korean as can be seen in Table 4.1, but, as discussed earlier, the blunt and the familiar styles have become obsolete. The most
frequently found non-honorific styles in Korean are now the intimate and the plain styles. These two styles will be discussed in Chapter 6 in detail.

4.3 Speech styles and Power and Solidarity

Honorifics are one of the most important tools for regulating power and solidarity relationships in Korean society (Sohn, 1999). Korean honorific forms have been thought to be used mostly to express the power relationship in the social hierarchy, but they are also used extensively to express various solidarity factors in the conversation. Sohn (1981: 431) explained honorifics as “a complex lexical, morphological, and syntactic system for marking the speaker’s power and solidarity relationship with the addressee or a third-person referent.” Sohn (1983) further mentioned that power variables, such as kinship, age, sex, and achieved or ascribed status function as sociocultural constraints about which individuals have little choice, whereas solidarity variables such as intimacy, ingroupness, and informality may be manipulated as part of speaker’s communicative strategies. This view suggests that Korean honorifics are not only intricate with normative (i.e., power related) factors, but also with strategic (i.e., solidarity related) factors.

In an effort to explain speech style shifting related to power and solidarity, Yu (1996) argued that the Korean speech level is a dynamic system which depends on the power/solidarity relationship. He explained that power and solidarity have a seesaw relationship (i.e., when one goes up, the other must go down) and each speaker regulates the degree of power and solidarity with their intention, and consequently, speech level
switches accordingly. In this respect, he concluded that the deferential level is the most power oriented and the plain level is the most solidarity oriented.

However, there are too many exceptions to this explanation. Even though it is true that speech style choice is motivated by regulating power (e.g., social status) and solidarity factors (e.g., psychological stance), at the same time, the one-to-one relationship between speech style and degree of power and solidarity does not always work. For example, Yu’s (1996) hypothesis does not explain why the plain and intimate styles, which are the most solidarity prone styles, are sometimes used for very authoritative commands (i.e., in the military) or public declarations. Neither does it explain why a socially more powerful person sometimes speaks in a higher speech level to a socially lower person. Thus, each speech style has not only power and solidarity related aspects but also various social meaning functions that go beyond power and solidarity mechanisms.

4.4 Speech Style Shifting and Direction of Speech

Some approaches have claimed that speech style shifting is dependent on how much a speaker is concerned about a listener while communicating. Makino (2002) analyzed Japanese discourse and found that when a speaker changes style from formal to informal, this signals the moment when the speaker/writer turns her/his communicative direction inward. That is, there are cases when a speaker is giving a message to the hearer(s), but one speaks in a form as if one is talking to one’s self (e.g., It hurts!; Oh! It’s late!).
From a similar perspective, Hasegawa (2002) discussed soliloquy for expressing intimacy. She tried to explain a Japanese speech style shift in relation to talking to one's self. Citing Hirose (1995), Hasegawa argued that there are two different aspects of self which are the public and the private self. She explained that the public self speaks facing a specific addressee or at least having one in mind, while the private self speaks as the subject of thinking/consciousness, with no addressee in mind (Hasegawa, 2002: 10). She argued that the Japanese desu/masu style is one of the devices for expressing the public self. On the other hand, the private self is expressed when a speaker has no intention of communicating, but is just expressing the speaker’s mental state. She concluded that insertion of soliloquy, which is in the plain style and expresses the private self, can express intimacy and exultation simultaneously. Because such parenthetical soliloquy is detached from the major flow of a conversation, the speaker is able to avoid the risk of changing speech styles from polite to plain, which might be considered disrespectful.

Maynard (1991, 1993) also argued that change of the direction of speech can cause a shift in speech style. She analyzed speech style shifts in three genres of modern Japanese: i.e., conversation, prose, and dialogue in fiction and argued that speech style change depends on the level of thou awareness. According to her, there are two types of utterances: (a) foregrounded utterances directly addressing the listener with full awareness of the listener and (b) background utterances that provide subordinate information and that do not directly addressee the listener, but are rather almost self-addressed. Depending on the awareness of thou, she concluded that the da style (plain

---

4 Other devices include (a) certain sentence-final particles (e.g., yo ‘I tell you’, ne ‘you know’), (b) directives (e.g., commands, requests, questions), (c) vocative expressions (e.g., oi ‘hey’), (d) responses (e.g., hai ‘yes’, iie ‘no’), (e) pragmatic adverbials of various sorts (e.g., sumimasen ga ‘Excuse me, but’, kokodake no hanasi dakedo ‘it’s between you and me’), and (f) hearsay expressions (e.g., (da)sooda/(da)tte ‘I hear’) (Hasegawa 2002: 10).
style) is more likely to be used when this thou awareness is low, e.g., (a) when a speaker exclaims, or suddenly recalls something; (b) when a speaker vividly expresses events scene-internally as if the speaker is right there and then, (c) when a speaker expresses internal thought self-reflexively, including almost self-addressed utterances and monologues; (d) when a speaker jointly creates utterances whose ownership is shared; (e) when a speaker presents information that is semantically subordinate in nature or background information; (f) when a speaker is in an intimate relationship with thou, where the speaker does not consider thou as opposed to self. This expresses social familiarity and closeness. She also mentioned that the desu/masu style (polite style) is more likely to be used in high awareness situations, e.g., (a) when a speaker expresses a thought which directly addresses a partner perceived as thou with expressions appropriate in terms of sociolinguistic variables—a marker for social relationships; expressing formality; (b) when a speaker communicates main information directly addressed to a listener—especially when the desu/masu ending appears in the da style discourse. She explained that these verbal endings –da and –desu/masu are discourse modality. According to her, “Discourse Modality refers to information that does not or only minimally conveys objective propositional message content. Discourse Modality conveys the subjective emotional, mental or psychological attitude of the speaker toward the message content, to the speech act itself or toward his or her interlocutor” (Maynard, 1991: 579).

However, the direction of the speech and the actual awareness of the addressee do not always have to go together. When a speaker shifts speech styles depending on the direction of the speech, the choice of a speech style sometimes can be strategically made.
regardless of the speaker’s actual degree of thou awareness. In fact, it is common that one pretends to not be aware of the addressee and talks to oneself while carefully watching for the addressee’s reaction. For example, one may intentionally express one’s complaints as if talking to one’s self to let the other person hear. In this case, the speaker’s awareness of the addressee might be very strong, carefully watching the reaction of the addressee. Thus, this type of speech style shift can be also made as a result of the speaker’s strategic choice while the sentence endings are functioning as discourse modals.

4.5 Co-constructing Interpersonal Relationships

The social relationship between people in a conversation is not absolute in that how each interlocutor perceives the interpersonal relationship is very subjective matter (Sung, 2007b). Even when there is a big difference in social status, the relationship between the interlocutors is constantly regulated and honorific usage may change accordingly. Thus, the lower person does not consistently use honorific forms nor does the higher person consistently use non honorific forms. Lee (1996) showed that a person of higher social status may sometimes switch speech styles to the honorific style when speaking to a person of lower social status in order to regulate the interpersonal relationship. He analyzed telephone conversations between chief officers of the Korean army. According to Lee (1996), their honorific usage was basically determined by several social factors such as their military rank, the year they were commissioned as officers, and their appointed position in the army hierarchy. The conversation participants regulated the status imbalance, which is caused by inconsistency among the above
mentioned factors, by switching speech styles either to emphasize or mitigate their
difference in status. For example, in the following conversation the officers’ military rank
and year of commission were the same, but C11 is in a higher position in the command
system than C12. In this conversation, C11 strategically managed speech styles, which
caused C12 to use the honorific speech style in the conversation.

(4-2)

1. C11: sewul-ey com pwulmyengha-n sanghwang-i hana sayngki-ess-e
       Seoul-at little not.clear-MD situation-NM one arise-PST-INT
       서울에 좀 불명한 상황이 하나 생겼어.
       ‘There arises an unclear situation in Seoul.’

2. C12: mwe i-ntey
       what be-INT
       뭐인데?
       ‘What is that?’

3. C11: ilpwu nwukwu-hanthey chongcang-nim-i eti
       somewhere somebody-to chief.of.staff-HT-NM somewhere
       cayulop-ci.mosha-n cangso-ey ka iss-eyo
       free-cannot-MD place-at go stay-POL
       일부 누구한테 총장님이 어디 자유롭지 못한 장소에 가 있어요.
       ‘The Chief of staff is confined by someone.’

4. C12: kul-ay?
       so-INT?
       그래?
       ‘Really?’

5. C11: ung
       yes
       응
       ‘Yes.’

6. kuliko wuli cihwikwan-i myech salam-i pi-eyo cikum
and our commander-NM a.few people-NM empty-POL now
       그리고 우리 지휘관이 몇 사람이 비어있어 지금.
       ‘And, some of our commanders are missing now.’
7. C12: yey?
   yes

에?
‘Yes?’

8. C11: wuli kwun cihwikwan-i mal-i-ya swuto kwuntancang-hako
   our military commander-NM say-be-INT capital commander-and

ilkwuntancang-i cikum epsta-n mal-i-ya
   first.military.commander-NM now not.exist-MD say-be-INT

우리 군 지휘관이 말이야, 수도군단장하고 1 군단장이 지금 없다고 말이야.
‘I mean, our commanders, the commanders of the capital army and the first army are missing.’

9. C12: kuleh-supni-kka?
   so-DEF-Q

그럼슈니까?
Is it so?

10. C11: ung
    yes

응.
Yes.

12. C12: yey
    yes

예.
Yes.

13. C11: kulayse keki swuto kikyehwa satan wumciki-nun ke-l
   so there capital mechanized unit move-MD thing-AC

mal-i-eyyo hwaksilhi cangak-ul hay kaciko ike cikum
   say-be-POL definitely control-AC do and.then this now

sangthay-ka mwenci-to molu-ko naka-ss-taka
   situation-NM what.also not.know-and go.out-PST-then

ay-tal-kkili tachi-l wulye-ka iss-ki ttaymun-ey
   kid-PL.each.other get.hurt-MD concern-NM exist-NOM reason-at

thukpyelhi mwe-l ha-ki cen-ey pwutay itong-ul
   especially what-MD do-NOM before-at troop moving-AC

sikhi-ci.anh-tolok thukpyelhi tantanhi mwe-l com
   let.not.in.order.to especially firmly what-MD a.little

hay-cwu-ko, cangak-ul com cal-ha-ko cenpang
   do-give-and control-AC a.little well-do-and front.line
They appear to be in a close personal relationship because they both spoke in the intimate style at the beginning of the conversation. The conversation began as equals, but as the conversation went on, the higher positioned person (C11) started using the honorific style (Line 3) while the lower position person (C12) kept using a non-honorific style. According to Lee (1996), C11 might have intentionally started speaking in the honorific style to remind C12 of the difference in their position and make C12 use the
As a result, in Line 7, C12 answered yey ‘yes’ which is a polite way of answering, and it contrasts with C11’s ung ‘yes’ in Line 5. C12’s speech style changes to the deferential style in kuleh-supni-kka? ‘Is it so?’ and alkess-supni-ta ‘I get it.’ which sound very formal and polite. Also interesting is that after C12 started using an honorific style, C11 mixed honorific and non-honorific styles, while C12 kept using the polite style, and, even higher in speech level, the deferential style. The ending Line 14 –ha-sey-yo ‘Please do -’ is noteworthy, it is structurally very direct and it sounded like he was issuing a command to his subordinate. It could have been said with –hay-cwu-sey-yo ‘Please try doing -’ the style in Line 13, which is used more in equal relationships. Lee (1996) also pointed out that C11 used the polite style while delivering his command to his ‘friend’ to mitigate illocutionary force (Line 13). According to Lee, C11’s effort of mitigating illocutionary force can be also seen by frequent using of an adverb com ‘a little.’

We can also see a change of footing (Goffman, 1981) in the above conversation. In the initial stage of the conversation, C11 is giving information about the current situation to C12 on a personal level. However, the conversation develops into C11 commanding C12 to cope with the current situation, and the footing changes from a personal conversation into an official command situation.

In another conversation between different officers with large rank and position differences, the higher ranking officer switched between the intimate and polite styles, while the lower ranking officer used only the deferential style in commanding to not move the troops.
아, 나 3 군 사령관이야. 거기 1 군단장 가 있나?
I'm commander-in-chief. Is the commander of the first corps there?

여기 안 계십니다.
He is not here.

군단장이 30 사단에 없어?
The commander is not in the 30th division?

거기 군단장이 안 가있어?
The commander didn’t go there?

내가 박말 불 번 주부저 주나거학.
I'm warning you again.

그러면 저, 부대는 확실히 내가 얘기한대로 험부로 동원하지 말아.
If so, then, don’t mobilize the troop without any permission, as I said.

내가 다시 한 번 주의를 주는거야.
I’m warning you again.

알겠습니까.
Yes, sir.
   I-NM directly tell-before-TC move-not-POL

   내가 직접 얘기하기 전에는 움직이지 말아요.
   Don’t move the troop before I say directly.

10. B01: al-kess-supni-ta
    know-will-DEF-DC

    알겠습니다.
    Yes, sir!

11. C11: ollais
    all right

    올라잇
    All right.

12. kaliko ce satancang-un eti TOP na tuleka iss-ulako
    and well division.commaner-TC somewhere TOP or enter be-INT

    그리고 저 사단장은 어디 TOP 나 들어가 있다고.
    And, you can stay in TOP [or somewhere like that].

13. B01: cikum ce samwusil-ey iss-supni-ta
    now I office-at stay-DEF-DC

    지금 저 사무실에 있습니다.
    I’m staying at the office now.

14. C11: a samwusil-ey iss-e?
    ah office-at be-INT

    아, 사무실에 있어?
    Oh, are you in office [now]?

15. B01: yey
    yes

    예.
    Yes.

16. C11: al-keyss-eyo okheyi
    know-will-POL ok

    알겠어요. 오케이.
    I got you. OK.

   (Lee, 1996: 76)
In this conversation, C11 generally spoke in an authoritative tone, but switched speech style to the polite style in Line 9 and 16. Lee (1996) explained that the reason the high positioned person switched speech level from the plain into the polite style was to soften the illocutionary force of his command. According to Lee, the higher person commanded very strongly at the initial stage of the conversation. But he raised his speech level to soothe the illocutionary force while he checked the contents of his command. There is a rank difference between these people and C11 didn’t have to show more respect to B01. In the Korean military hierarchy, in fact, it is regarded as proper for a higher office to use a non-honorific style with his subordinate. To explain why C11 used the honorific style here, Lee (1996) stated that by making the atmosphere of the conversation more hospitable, C11 might have expected his subordinate to follow his command more sincerely. This example showed how a person of higher social status did not use speech style depending only on status difference, but made use of honorifics strategically according to his intentions (i.e., to treat a person with more or less regard) toward a person of lower social status.

While Lee’s (1996) study just showed that a person of higher social status’ strategic usage of speech style may change, in Cook’s (2006) study, not only a socially higher person but also a person in a socially subordinate position regulated status difference by shifting speech styles. Cook (2006) showed that in an academic consultation session between a professor and a student, both the professor and the student shift between the masu and the plain forms.
According to her, in this context, reciprocal *masu* form exchanges index a mutual professional relationship between the two. However, the student sometimes used plain forms when co-constructing an idea with the professor by embedding the professor’s plain form utterance or by using an incomplete sentence, which avoids marking either the *masu* or plain form. Cook (2006) argued that these strategies kept the student from constantly playing the subordinate role and obscured the institutional hierarchy expected in the academic setting. In Korean, too, I have observed such co-constructing or omitting the main verb strategy, used often by a person of lower social status while using honorific forms.
The studies above showed how conversation participants regulate interpersonal relationships by switching honorific speech styles even when there is a clear difference in social status. Switching was not limited to within honorific speech styles but goes over the honorific/non-honorific boundary. Also, a person of higher social status as well as a person of lower social status tried to regulate the interpersonal relationship by co-constructing the relationship in the moment. These studies also provide evidence that people do not simply follow social rules for choosing speech styles, but actively redefine social relationships in conversation.

4.6 Interpersonal Functions and Discourse Organization of Speech Style Shifts

Some studies on speech style shifting exemplify functions of honorific speech styles in interactions other than politeness or formality. Geyer (2008) analyzed conversations of faculty meetings at a Japanese secondary school and examined speech style shifting. She found that even though the polite (masu) form was the main style of the meetings, there were occasional shifts between the masu form and the plain form. She showed cases when the plain form was used to express solidarity among the speakers, and to mitigate face-threatening acts. She also showed that the masu form has the functions of impersonalizing, setting an official frame, and showing solidarity in addition to expressing deference.

Strauss & Eun (2005) explain that the speech level shifting between the deferential and polite styles of Korean is due to the interlocutor’s psychological boundary. In fact, these two speech styles are regarded as honorific styles so mixing them in the same discourse is common (Sohn, 1999). It is generally thought that the deferential style
expresses higher politeness than the polite level, but Strauss & Eun (2005) proposed that the deferential and polite styles show different semantic features of +/- boundary.

According to them, when speakers use the deferential -(s)upnita form, it indexes a stance of exclusion with the interlocutor (+ boundary), such that the interlocutor is positioned as outside the sphere of the speaker’s cognitive and/or experiential domain. In their data, the host of the talk-show used the deferential style when he took the role of host and made remarks about the procedures of the show. The host took the stance of excluding the guests at that moment and gave information to the audience. In contrast, when the host used the polite form, it indexed a stance of inclusion (- boundary). The host of the television show mostly used the –yo ending (polite style) when he was sharing his emotions and experiences with the guests. In sum, what they argue is that alternation between these two forms is not just a result of stylistic differences or expressing different degree of politeness, but that people regulate psychological boundaries with these forms.

Strauss & Eun’s (2005) discussion of speech style shifting is limited to shifts between the two honorific styles. However, when non-honorific styles are mixed with the honorific styles, the indexical meanings of the “+/– boundary” stance needs more elaboration. For example, in a conversation where the intimate style and the polite style are mixed, the polite style may index + boundary stance, while the intimate style indexes – boundary. Also, there is a possibility that the + boundary stance could be indexed by the host’s body posture or tone of voice rather than by choice of speech style. Such indexing by the body posture or tone of voice of the host could take place with the host facing the audience and talking with a sincere voice tone may indexing + boundary, even if the polite style is used. More discussion of this will be found in Chapter 5.
There is another study that explains Japanese speech style shifts with the notion of distance. Ikuta (1983) explained the basic meaning of the Japanese honorific style \textit{desu/masu} to be social, attitudinal, or cohesional distance. She argued that while social conditions are the main determinants of the appropriate level in a particular social situation, there are other factors involved in choosing a speech style, which cause speech style shifting when there is no change in social conditions. These factors are, according to her, flow of empathy and/or coherence in a discourse. She explained that flow of empathy between speakers is often signaled by a level shift during conversation: the use of a [- distance] level (i.e., non-\textit{des/mas} forms) coincides with a speaker’s attitudinal closeness to her/his interlocutor, whereas a [+ distance] level (i.e., \textit{des/mas} form) represents a speaker’s attitudinal distance.

Ikuta further explained that style shifting between the use and non-use of \textit{desu/masu} is related to discourse organization (Ikuta, 1983, 2008). According to Ikuta (2008), speech style shifting sometimes works as a type of discourse marker to indicate the shifting of the interactional role of the participants at a given moment of an utterance. In her earlier study (Ikuta, 1983), she discussed that a shift from [+distance] to [-distance] may indicate change from a more general (e.g., main topic) to a more specific illustrative subspace (e.g., illustrative instances) in a discourse, while [-distance] to [+distance] corresponds to a shift from a more specific subspace to a more general, inclusive space. In her later study (Ikuta, 2008) of interview conversations, she further discussed how such functions occur across exchanges. She argued that a shift from the \textit{desu/masu} and non-\textit{desu/masu} styles can mark the embedding of a subspace to the ongoing context space. According to her, the embedded subspace does not interrupt the ongoing flow of
the talk, but merely functions to make the discourse more comprehensible and coherent. An interviewer and interviewee organize a discourse where the interviewer is the emcee and prompter and the interviewee is the information provider. The interviewers create embedded subspace to support and subsidize the interviewees’ turn, not competing for the floor.

Studies mentioned in this section deal with various social and psychological motivations for speech style shifting. In addition, as exemplified in Ikuta (1983, 2008), speech style shifting can organize discourse structure to clarify the speaker’s role. The next section will discuss further speech style shifting and the speaker’s role in conversation.

4.7 Momentary Shifting of Social Identity and Role

Some studies pointed out that the choice of speech style sometimes depends on the speaker’s role, or social identity, which is being performed by the speaker in a given moment. There are cases where a speaker uses an honorific style with a socially lower addressee and vice versa. As a speaker starts conducting or stepping out of a role, speech styles may change.

Cook (1999a, b) found that a parent or a teacher would use the *masu* form (polite form) with a child or a student when he/she is acting in a role. Cook (1999b) explained that a mother may use the *masu* form (polite form) with her child to teach social norms by indicating her social norm as *mother* by momentarily distancing her mother role from her role as teacher of social rules of behavior. Cook (1999a) also showed a case where an interviewer on a television program used the *masu* form especially when he was acting
the role of an interviewer. Sung (2007b) also mentioned that Korean mothers often use the –yo style, which is an honorific style, with their children while they are teaching them manners to be used at home. I also often observe that many Korean parents use the polite style when talking to children, their own or others’, especially when teaching social norms.

The Japanese addressee honorific style –masu form is often observed as indexing self-presentation. Cook (1996) found that elementary school students used the –masu form when making presentations in front of class. Teachers also used the –masu form when talking to students while in the role of teacher (e.g., managing class, disseminating important information for the lesson, giving meta comments about activities). Students and teachers switched speech styles when they stepped out of the role (i.e., presenter, teacher) and were not making a public presentation. Similarly, Dunn (2005) found that speakers in the wedding reception Japan do not use a consistent speech style within one discourse. According to Dunn, speakers in the wedding reception are generally expected use the humble form while they congratulate, introduce the couple to a guest, etc. However, she found that they shift to non-humble verb forms when they shift out of the wedding speaker role to comment on the role from a different, more personal and informal perspective. Thus, some social roles of making public presentation require an honorific style regardless of the social relationship between the conversation participants. The motivation for choosing an honorific style in these cases is not relative social status, but the role being played at the moment.

There are social roles which are thought to require the use of honorific styles when performing them, but the choice sometimes depends on a speaker’s strategy. For
example, a clerk is generally expected to speak in an honorific style to customers in Korea, but some clerks intentionally use a non-honorific style to give an intimate feeling or unexpected effect. It is not uncommon today for some clerks to use intimate style when they talk to customers in Korea. In Korea, there are some restaurant owners (generally old women) who are famous for swearing at customers, which is intended to present a friendly image to customers. Okamoto (1997) reported that the use of honorifics by department store clerks is different from their use by vendors in a traditional market in Japan. She found that the clerks at department stores mostly used formal forms, while some vendors in traditional markets used non-honorific forms. In this case, the role as sales person is similar but the choice of an honorific form depends on a speaker’s strategy in a given situation. Cook (1999 a) also found that an interviewer on a Japanese TV program mostly used the polite form but sometimes used a plain form. She explained that the use of a plain form is intended to give a fresh image to TV viewers. Thus, even though the polite form is the interviewer’s conventional speech style, announcers may use a non-conventional style strategically.

The studies mentioned in this section show that people’s choice of certain speech styles depends not on relative social relationships, but on the role a speaker is taking at the moment. As a speaker takes or leaves a role, the speech style changes accordingly. Even though there are general conventions for certain roles in society, people do not always passively follow those conventions, but sometimes make creative use of non-conventional speech styles strategically.
4.8 Conclusion

Studies on speech style shifting show that honorific forms, especially speech styles, are not just devices indexing differences in social position. Rather, each speech style can have various indexical meanings which depend on the nature of the conversation, participants, context, etc. Okamoto (1997) emphasized an agent role by a speaker when choosing a speech style. She argued that the choice of speech style is a strategy based on a speaker’s consideration of multiple social aspects of the context (e.g., gender, age, intimacy, genre, domain, speech-act type) as well as on the speaker’s linguistic ideology, or beliefs and attitudes concerning language use. She also argued that the relationship between social context and forms of speaking is construed through the filter of one’s beliefs about language use. Studies reviewed in this chapter show that speech style can shift while various contextual factors work together.

Korean speech styles are generally divided into addressee honorific styles (i.e., deferential, polite) and non-honorific styles (i.e., blunt, familiar, intimate, plain), and we have to consider that there is switching both within as well as between these categories. Traditional studies of Korean honorifics only mentioned speech style shifts within honorific or non-honorific categories and explained that stylistic or formality level change caused the speech style to shift. It had been generally thought that speech style shifting between honorific and non-honorific style was rare except for talking to oneself. However, it is very common for a person of higher social status to use either a non-polite or the polite style depending on his/her attitude toward the addressee. On the other side, a person of lower social status may have to use honorific styles most of the time, but he/she may use strategies like omitting the main clause in which the honorific style is expressed.
or co-constructing a sentence with a non-honorific style. In this way, people of higher and lower social status negotiate and regulate social relationships while having conversations.

Social conventions dictate that people speak in certain speech styles when performing certain role, and that speech style shifts signal a role change during the conversation. For example, while performing such social roles as mother as home educator (Cook, 1999b), presenter in a classroom (Cook, 1996), and interviewer (Cook, 1999a), people are expected to speak in an honorific speech style and these role factors play a greater role in speech style choice than social position difference.

Social factors generally work together with personal factors for style shifting. Strauss and Eun (2005) argued that the difference between two honorific styles, the deferential and the polite, depends on whether or not a speaker includes the listener in the psychological boundary. Ikuta (1983, 2007) also asserted that the basic meaning of the Japanese honorific style desu/masu is social, attitudinal, or cohesional distance. These studies emphasized aspects of a speaker’s strategic speech style choice that extend beyond considerations of social positional difference.

As seen in the above studies, there are social and/or personal factors along with contextual factors that affect the choice of speech style. A speech style choice may take into account all of these factors, which is a very complicated process. In the following chapters, I will discuss the Korean speech style shifting phenomenon and core meanings of honorific sentence endings.
CHAPTER 5
INDEXICAL MEANINGS OF THE DEFERENTIAL AND POLITE STYLES

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the deferential and polite styles are regarded as honorific styles which are thought to be used to show respect to the addressee. It has been generally regarded that the deferential style is a little higher in the degree of politeness than the polite style. Additionally, some scholars (e.g., Seo, 1984; Sung, 1985) distinguished them by the feature of formality where the deferential style is formal and the polite style is casual or non-formal.\(^5\) However, in actual conversations, these two styles are often intermixed in the same discourse with the same addressee, and it does not appear that their differences can be explained simply by degree of politeness or formality. Especially, since the use of the polite style (-eyo/ayo) is more extensive than before, it is often found in very formal situations where before the deferential style was more commonly used (Seo, 1980). Also, although it used to be said that female speakers prefer to use the polite style, while men prefer the deferential form (Sohn, 1999), a preference between these two forms based on gender is fading as male speakers of the younger generation use the polite style more often than before.

In short, the difference between these two styles cannot be clearly explained with formality, gender, or degree of politeness. Rather, each style seems to be chosen based on a combination of the above mentioned social factors, and other social conventions, in combination with the speaker’s personal psychological state. Actually, as discussed in Chapter 4, these two honorific styles are often mixed with non-honorific speech styles in the same situation with the same person. When different speech styles are used in the

\(^5\) The discussion on classifying honorific speech styles based on formality is in Chapter 6.
same discourse, various social meanings arise from the choice of a speech style and the shift from it. However, there have not been many studies dealing with the social meanings of the sentence endings of speech styles. This chapter will discuss the meanings of the two honorific styles from an indexical perspective and the next chapter will explore the non-honorific speech styles.

5.1 The Deferential Style

According to Ko (1997), the deferential style is used in the following situations: (a) by lower status family members with their seniors, (b) by people of a lower social class with people of a higher social class, (c) by younger people with older people, (d) between people of similar status who are not close and (e) in specific situations that require this style. Ko (1997) mentions that the “deferential style” has been called with various terms by many scholars in the history of Korean linguistic research. Some examples include nop.um ‘highness’ (Cwu, 1910), sangtay ‘treating highly’ (H-S. Kim, 1910), cengcwung ‘courtesy’(Yamamoto, 1922), conkyeng ‘respect’ (W-U. Lee, 1929), acwu nophhim ‘highly elevating’ (Choy, 1934), yewu ‘respectful treatment’ (S-B. Park, 1931), polite or honorific (Ramstedt, 1939), formal (Martin, 1954), deferential (Martin, 1964), polite formal (Vandesande, 1968), and formal polite (Park, 1968). As is obvious from these terms, the deferential style has been regarded as expressing respect to the addressee and/or formality of the situation.

In this section, I examine the use of deferential styles in actual conversation. In particular, I will investigate occasions where the deferential style is used for purposes
other than politeness or formality. By investigating various social meanings of this style, I will discuss its core meaning.

5.1.1 Deferential style statement -supnita—Ritualized self-presentation

Among the data for this study, news programs show the least variation in speech style and most commonly use the deferential style. News anchors or reporters mostly spoke in this style when they presented news to the public. However, when anchors talked to each other or anchors talked to the reporters, they sometimes switched to the polite style.

(5-1) From ‘News Desk’ (news)

1 Anchor: onul nao-n cengpwu taychayk-ey tayha-n today come out-MD government counter.plan-to toward-MD

phyengka-lul Se Minswu kica-wa hamkkey alapo-tolok evaluation-AC Se Minswu reporter-with together check-in.order.to

ha-keyss-supnita do-will-DEF-DC

오늘 나온 정부 대책에 대한 평가를 시민수 기자와 함께 알아보도록 하겠습니다
‘Let us know more about the evaluations of the government’s counter plan that was reported today.’

2

Se kica
Se-reporter

서기자
‘Reporter Se!’

3

onul cengpwu-uy mokphyochi-lul po-nikka manhi today government-GN target figure-AC see-now that much

nacchw-ess-kunyo lower-PST-POL

오늘 정부의 목표치를 보니께 많이 낮췄군요.
‘I see that the government lowered their target figure a lot.’
'What are the evaluations by specialists?'

Many specialists think it is a little late, but the government is going the right way.

‘Even though this situation had been expected, the money market fluctuated as the government actually lowered the forecast a lot.’

‘Yes, the money market was extremely chaotic today.’
‘The government announced a lot of things, but it seems like the cost of living is the most important thing.’

물가가 과연 잡릴까요?
‘Do you think the living cost will be controlled?’

강 장관이 직접 밝혔듯이유가가 변수입니다.
‘As minister Kang said, oil price is the

일자리 관련해서 중소기업 인턴제나 해외취업제. 잘 좋은 아이디어인데 문제는 실현 가능성 아니겠습니까?
‘Regarding the job market, internships, foreign jobs are good ideas, but isn’t the problem feasibility of the plan?’

정부가 청년 인턴제를 위해 투입할 돈은 400억원인데,
1 인당 월 80 만원씩 1 년 정도 잡을때 5 천명 분기에 언제나.
‘The government will invest forty billion won, but it will be only for 5000 people if we calculate 800 thousand won per year per person.’
Then, when will the economy finally start to get better?

Currently, there is an uphill called ‘high gas price’ (for economy), so it is hard to step on the accelerator in this situation. What the government analyzed is that there will be energy for development when the gas price calms down by around the middle of next year.

As the Metal Industry Labor Union starts a partial strike, the Democratic Labor Union started a full strike.
News anchors and reporters almost always used the deferential style (–supnita) when addressing the audience. The news anchor’s remark in Line 1 was directed toward the audience and the questions following that were to the reporter. While asking questions to the reporter, the anchor mainly used the polite style, but the anchor switched back to the deferential style as he finished the conversation with the reporter and began addressing the audience. The reporter here is being asked questions by the anchor, but the answer is to the audience and his answer is delivered in all deferential endings. Strauss & Eun (2004) argued that new information tended to be expressed in the deferential style and that was why it was the default speech style in news programs. The anchors used the deferential style not only when they delivered the news content but also when announcing to the audience what was coming next in the show. However, they often switch to the polite style while talking to reporters.

In other genres of TV programs, people often changed their speech style to the deferential form when reporting or making announcements as well. Even in talk shows or comedy programs, where the polite and the intimate styles are most often used, people switched their speech style to the deferential style for reporting or making announcements directly to the audience. Especially for announcements for managing the show (e.g., for starting or ending the program, introducing a guest, etc.), people generally used the deferential style. In the following example, while the host was introducing guests, she changed her speech style from the polite to the deferential style for announcing their names (Tongpangsinki) to the audience.

(5-2) From Kim Jung-eun’s Chocolate (Talk show)

1  cikum  o-si-l  pwun-tul-un-yo  
now    come-SH   person-PL-TC-POL
지금 오실 분들은.
‘The guests who will be on the stage’

2 pangkum cey-ka malssum tuly-ess-ten kitalim-kwa
just.now I-NM words give-PST-R waiting-with

방금 제가 말씀 드렸던 기다림과
‘With the word ‘waiting’ that I said just now’

3 onul koyngcanghi cal ewullil-kes.kath-un pwun-tul-i-n-tey-yo
today extremely well match-seems-MD person-PL-be-MD-place-POL

오늘 굉장히 잘 어울릴 것 같은 분들인데요.
‘It seems like this word matches very well with the people today’

4 yelepwuntul-i il nyen chil-kaywel tong.an manhi kitali-si-ess-ciyo?
everyone-NM one year seven-month during much wait-SH-PST-POL

여러분들이 일년 칠개월동안 많이 기다리셨나요?
‘You have waited for them for one year and seven months?’

⇒ 5 mesci-n namca-tul-i tway-se tolawa-ss-tako sayngkak-i toy-pni-ta
cool-MD man-PL-NM become-and come.back-PST-so think-NM come-DEF-DC

멋진 남자들이 와서 돌아왔다고 생각이 됩니다.
‘I think they came back as splendid guys.’

⇒ 6 tong.pangsinki-i-pni-ta
Tongpangsinki-be-DEF-DC

동방신기를.
‘It is Dong Bang Shin Ki!’

The hosts of the show programs analyzed here generally used the polite style most
frequently\textsuperscript{6}, but when they made announcements to the audience (e.g., introducing the
guest, announcing beginning or closing of the program) they mostly used the deferential
style. The following examples are from several different programs.

\textsuperscript{6} In about one hour of this talk show program, 245 sentence endings could be identified and 176 times
(72\%) were the polite ending. The next frequent style was the deferential style (15\%), intimate style
(10\%) and the plain style (3\%), respectively.
These examples are from talk shows or comedy shows where the hosts changed the speech style to the deferential style from the polite or the intimate styles. A sudden change to the deferential style in these examples indicates that the particular remark is an announcement to the audience and it often marks a change of topic or a conclusion of the conversation. In particular, the expression *alkesssupnita* ‘I understand.’ is often used for
signaling the closing of the current conversation or change of the topic as shown in the following example (5-4).

(5-4) From ‘Kim Jeng-un’s Chocolate’ (Talk show, Kim 36 years old, Yun 24 years old)

1 Kim:  
    a\_a   caymiss-nun eyphisotu iss-ess-nayo?  
    ah   funny-MD episode  have-PST-POL  

아야? 재미있는 에피소드 있나요?  
‘Were there any funny episodes?’

2 Yun:  
    a     ollaka-ss-eyo mutay-ey  
    ah   go.up-PST-POL   stage-at  

아 올라갔어요 무대에  
‘Ah, we went up on the stage.’

3 ollaka-ss-nuntey phayn yelepwun-tul-to manhi wacwu-si-n kes-to  
    go.up-PST-and.then   fan   many.people-PL-also  many come-SH-MD thing-also  

kamsaha-yss-nuntey  
thank-PST-but  

올라갔는데 팬 여러분들도 많이 와 주신 것도 감사했는데  
‘We went up on the stage and were thankful that many fans came, but’

4 cincca wuski-n-key cwuwi-ey kyengchal acessi-tul-i kyeysi-canhayo  
    reall   funny-MD-thing    around-at  policemen uncle-PL-NM stay-POL  

전짜 웃긴게 주위에 경찰 아주씨들이 게시같아요  
what was really funny was, you know there are policemen around the stage’

5 Kim: kyengchal  
    policeman  

경찰  
‘Policeman’

6 Yun: kyengchal hyeng-nim pwun-tul-i cehuy nolay-lul cheum-ey  
    policemen older.brother-HT person-PL-NM our song-AC first-at  

    tul-usi-l   tstay-nun cinhakey po-si-te-lakwuyo  
    listen-SH-MD   time-TC seriously see-SH-RT-POL  

경찰 형님 분들이 저희 노래를 처음에 들으실 때는 진지하게 보시더라고요  
‘The policemen looked at us seriously when they first listened to our songs’

7 amulayto namca-ta po-nikka  
    after.all   man-DC   as-because  
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‘because they are men’

(with a gesture) *ilehkey* _po-si-teni_  
like this see-SH-and.then

‘they looked at us like this’

*caki-to* *mollay* *hung-i* *na-sy-ess-napw-ayo*  
self-also not.knowing excitement-NM appear-SH-PST-seem-POL

‘Maybe they were more interested then they wanted to let on.’

*ku* *cem-i* *toykey* *sinkiha-yss-ess-eyo*  
that thing-NM very interesting-PST-PST-POL

‘That was very interesting’

‘They had to do their job, but they got into the rhythm unconsciously.’

‘They had to protect (the stage), but they didn’t know what to do because they got excited’

‘It is funny.’
In this conversation, the host asked the guests to talk about interesting episodes that took place while they were performing in concert. The conversation went on in the polite style, but as the guest’s description of their interesting episode ended, the host said *alkesssupnita* ‘I see.’ which signaled the end of the current topic. Following this remark, there is a little pause, she turns to the audience and goes on to introduce the next scheduled show. This expression *alkesssupnita* ‘I see.’ stands out here since it is the only use of the deferential style in about 5 minutes of their conversation. The deferential form here signals that the host is making a remark which is related to the procedure of the show.
In Cook (1999a), the use of the Japanese honorific _masu_ form by the host of a show showed that the person is *acting the role*. Therefore, it is comparable to the Korean deferential form in this situation. However, Korean hosts may be able to use the polite form with the deferential form while Japanese prefer to use only the _masu_ form in such situations.

(5-5) From ‘Kim Jung-eun’s Chocolate’ (Talk Show)

1. *Kim Jung-eun-uy Chokholis-ey o-si-n kes-ul hwanyengha-pnita*
   
   김정은의 초콜릿에 오신 것을 환영합니다.
   ‘Welcome to Kim Jung-eun’s Chocolate.’

2. *Kim Jung-en-i-eyyo*
   
   김정은이에요.
   ‘I’m Kim Jung-eun.’

3. *pangkum nwuka yeyppu-tako::?
   just.now someone pretty-QT*

   발급 누가 예쁘다고::?
   ‘Someone just said (I’m) pretty…’

4. *salangha-pni-ta*
   
   사랑합니다.
   ‘I love you.’

5. *ese o-sey-yo
   quickly come-SH-POL*

   이세 오세요.
   ‘Welcome!’

6. *cengmal pankap-supni-ta
   really glad-DEF-DC*

   정말 반갑습니다.
   ‘I’m glad to see you.’
In this example, the speaker is acting in her role as the host of this show by giving the opening remarks, but she does not consistently use the deferential style. She uses the deferential style in the very first remark and mixes the polite level in her following statements. In this way, the polite style is also often used for presenting to the public. The difference between the deferential and the polite style is, as will be discussed later, that the polite style expresses a more interactive and friendlier image to the audience. Therefore, it seems that the function of the masu style, as discussed by Cook (1999 a), is shared by the deferential and the polite style in Korean. The indexical meanings of the polite style sentence endings will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

5.1.2 Self-presentation in phatic expressions

One of the distinctive occasions in which the deferential style is often found is when people present things such as their own feelings, judgments, or ideas, in a ritualized way. The use of the deferential style for this purpose is well exemplified in phatic expressions in everyday conversations. In casual conversations in television programs, people mainly use the polite and the intimate styles, but often change their speech style to the deferential style when they greet, express gratitude, apologize, ask after one’s well being, etc. Most of the phatic expressions found in this data were expressed either in the deferential or the polite styles. However, each expression has a tendency to be expressed in a specific style. For example, in the show programs, the expression equivalent to ‘I’m glad to see you.’ is expressed most often in the deferential style, ‘pankap-supnita,’ instead of in the polite style ‘pankaw-eyo.’ In the above example (5-4), the host used some phatic expressions like hwanyenguinpnita (Line 1) ‘Welcome,’ salangha-pnita
(Line 4) ‘I love you,’ pankapsu-pnita (Line 6) ‘I’m glad to see you,’ and ese o-sey-yo (Line 5) ‘Welcome.’ While the first three are in deferential style, the last one is in polite style, which is quite consistent with other data. Considering that the polite ending – (e/a)yo is the most prominent ending in these television programs, the use of the deferential style only for some expressions is very unusual. In the example below, only the expression pankapsupnita ‘welcome’ is in the deferential style, while other phatic expressions such as ese oseyyo ‘Welcome,’ anynyeng haseyyo? ‘Hello!’ are most often expressed with the polite ending.

(5-6) From ‘Happy Hero’ (comedy show)

1 Host 1: amuthun, onul Kim C-ka o-si-ess-eyo
anyway, today Kim C-NM come-SH-PST-POL

아무튼 오늘 김씨가 오셨어요.
‘Anyway, Kim C came to our show today.’

2 Host 2: ese o-si-eyo
quickly come-SH-POL

어서 오세요.
‘Welcome!’

→ 3 Host 3: pankapsupnita
glad-DEF-DC

방갑습니다.
‘Nice to see you.’

4 Host 2: anc-usi-eyo
sit-SH-POL

앉으세요.
‘Have a seat!’

5 Host 1: cincca mosi-ko.siph-ess-ketun-yo
really invite-want to-PST-you.know-POL

진짜 모시고 싶였거든요.
‘We really wanted to invite you.’

→ 6 Host 2: a:: Kim C pankapsupnita
ah Kim C glad-DEF-DC
In this example, several hosts are welcoming the guest, Kim C, as he appeared on stage. Phatic expressions like *annyengha-seyo?* ‘Hello,’ *ese-o-seyo* ‘Welcome,’ *pankap-supnita* ‘Nice to see you.’ are used by each host. It does not appear that there should be any changes in deference, or formality, because, in this situation, the hosts are simply welcoming this guest by saying welcoming remarks using different expressions. However, the expression *pankap-supnita* is without exception expressed in the deferential style by all the hosts while all the other expressions are in the polite style ending. Table 5-1 shows how different phatic expressions tend to be used in different speech styles.
Table 5.1 Phatic Expressions in Each Speech Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deferential style</th>
<th>Def or Pol style</th>
<th>Polite style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coysongha-pnita ‘I’m sorry.’</td>
<td>koma-we-yokomap-supnita ‘Thank you.’</td>
<td>annyenghi ka-si-eyo ‘Good bye. (lit. Go in peace, please.)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punkap-supnita ‘I’m glad (to meet you).’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-keyss-supnita ‘I understand (what you are saying)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamsaha-pnita ‘Thank you.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cal putak tuli-pnita ‘I’m asking you a good favor’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwanyengha-pnita ‘Welcome.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look into the literal meanings and sentence types of the expressions in each category carefully, expressions that prefer deferential styles are declarative, while those that prefer the polite style are interrogative or imperative form. For example, the literal meaning of ese o-si-eyo, whose English equivalent expression is ‘Welcome,’ is ‘Come quickly.’ and this is in the imperative form. In Korean, there are occasions when direct imperative speech is regarded as being polite. Sohn (1999: 417) mentioned that “if a speech act is performed for the benefit of the addressee, the utterance is usually direct, often utilizing the imperative sentence type, as strong assertion is frequently needed for politeness: this is particularly true in Korean, as in ese o-si-p-si-o ‘Welcome (lit., ‘Come quickly’) and annyenghi cwumu-sey-yo ‘Good night’ (lit., ‘Sleep peacefully.’).”

In the example (5-6), the expression equivalent to ‘Welcome!’ is expressed in the polite style. One may expect ese o-si-p-si-o in a shop from a sales person, but not in a casual conversation. It seems that when a speech act requires immediate response from the addressee (e.g., a request, command) in a casual situation, the polite style sounds smoother than the deferential style. I assume that it is because, as will be discussed later, the polite style is compatible with interactive situations.
On the other hand, expressions like *pankap-supnita* literally mean ‘I’m glad (to see you),’ and it states the speaker’s feeling about the meeting the addressee. This statement presents one’s feelings, and does not require an immediate response from the addressee. Its polite style form, *pankaw-ayo*, in the above situation, does not sound appropriate because it sounds like the speaker is anticipating an immediate response, something like *ceto pankaw-ayo* ‘I am also glad to see you.’ from the addressee.

Examples of other expressions which prefer the deferential forms are *coysongha-pnita* ‘I’m sorry,’ *alkeyss-supnita* ‘I see.’ *kamsaha-pnita* ‘Thank you.’ *cal pwuthak tuli-pnita* ‘I’m asking you a good favor,’ all statements for presenting the speaker’s feelings.

The differences between the deferential and the polite styles appearing in the phatic expressions above do not seem to depend on formality or degree of politeness. Rather, the choice seems to be depending on if the situation is interactive or not. The deferential style expression is preferred when a speaker just expresses his/her feelings or thoughts. The polite style is more often used when an immediate response from the addressee is expected. The polite style has very interactive characteristics, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

### 5.1.3 Indexing authority

A sudden use of the deferential style in a casual situation can make a statement sound serious and authoritative. As discussed above, the deferential style ending –*supnita* is often used to deliver objective facts in an official manner. Usually, even in casual situations, when a speaker tries to speak with authority, the deferential form is used.
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the following example, the deferential statement sounds authoritative, the speaker is trying to make his argument more convincing.

(5-7) From Happy Hero (Comedy Show)

1 Shin: kuliko cip-eys-to namca susulo-to casinkam-ul com and house-atalso man oneselfalso confidence-AC a.little

kacye-ya.toy-l kess kath-ayo have-have.to-MD thing seems-POL

그리고 집에서도 남자 스스로도 자신감을 좀 가져야 될 것 같아요 ‘And, I think a man should have confidence in himself.’

⇒ 2 ce-nun welkup pongthuw-lul tasi pwuhwalsikhy-eya.ha-ntako I-TC salary envelop-AC again restore-have to-as

sayngkakha-pni-ta think-DEC-DC

지난 월급 봉투를 다시 부활시켜야 된다고 생각합니다. ‘I think we have to go back to salary envelopes.’

3 icye-nun ta kyeycwa ichey-lo hay-se waiphu thongcang-ey now-TC all account.transfer-by do-by wife account-to

o-canhayayo come-POL

이제는 다 계좌 이체로 해서 와이프 통장에 오갔어요. ‘Now, everything goes to the wife’s account by wire transfer.’

⇒ 4 yecen-chelem tangtanghakey nolan pongthwu-eytaka past-as confidently yellow envelop-at

예전처럼 당당하게 노력봉투에다가 ‘Like it used to be, (men should bring salary) proudly in a yellow envelop…’

⇒ 5 Lee: mac-supni-ta correct-DEF-DC

맞습니까 ‘You’re right.’

⇒ 6 Shin: yepo na han-tal tongan ilehkey cip-ul kacok-ul honey I one-month during like.this home-AC family-AC

wihay yelsimhi ilhaye pataw-ass-e in.favor deligently work receive-PST-INT
여보 나 한달 동안 이렇게 집을 가족을 위해 열심히 일해서 받아봤어
‘Honey, I received this by working for one month for my home and my family’

7 Yoon: apeci son-ul thonghayse centalhay-yaha-nta ike-ci
father hand-AC through transfer-have.to-PLN this.thing-INT

아빠지 손을 통해서 전달해야 한다 이거지
‘You mean it should be transferred by the father’s hand.’

➔ 8 Kim: 100 phesynthu swaip-ul cey-ka 100 phesynthu cey-ka
100 percent income-AC I-NM 100 percent I-NM

kwanliha-pni-ta
manage-DEF-DC

100 퍼센트 수입을 제가 100 퍼센트 제가 관리합니다
‘I am 100 percent in charge of my income.’

9 100 phesynthu
100 percent

100 퍼센트
‘100 percent’

10 Park: amwu-to mos mit-usi-canhayo
anyone-also cannot believe-SH-POL

아무도 못 믿으시잖아요
‘You don’t believe in anyone.’

11 Yoon: saynghwalpi cwu-si-nun ke-yey-ya?
living expense give-SH-MD thing-be-POL

생활비 주시는 거예요?
‘Do you just give the living expenses to your wife?’

12 Shin: hyengswunim-i ammal an-hay-yo?
sister.in.law-NM any.word not-do-POL

형수님이 알말 안해요?
‘Doesn’t your wife say anything?’

13 kaman iss-eyo?
quietly exist-POL

가만 있어요?
‘Doesn’t she complain about it?’

14 Kim: myech pen ce-hanthey silswu-ha-n ke-y iss-eyo
a.few times I-to mistake-do-MD thing-NM be-POL

몇 번 잘못한게 있었어요.
‘She made a few mistakes.’
The overall conversation actually took place mainly using the polite and the intimate styles and the overall atmosphere of the conversation is mildly humorous. However, occasional uses of the deferential style make some utterances sound somewhat more sincere in moments. For example, in Line 2, Shin used the humble first person pronoun ce ‘I’ and the –supnita ending. It sounds like he is expressing his opinion seriously, not joking. This kind of usage of the deferential style sounds authoritative in the moment.

This statement was followed by Lee’s agreement in Line 5, which is also in the deferential style. Upon Shin’s comment that revival of the salary envelope will help enhance men’s positions at home, Lee expresses his agreement with a sincere tone of voice in the deferential style. In Line 8, Kim is trying to emphasize the fact that he manages all of his earnings by himself. Other conversation participants showed surprise because it is generally a wife’s job to manage her husband’s earnings.

When the deferential form is used for emphasizing a certain truth, it sounds that the speaker psychologically steps a little bit aside from the situation and informs it from an objective stance and consequently gives some authority to the statement. In the following example, Lee is trying to objectify his statement by using the deferential style.

(5-8) From Happy Hero (Comedy Show)
In this conversation, they are talking about the education problem in Korea. Lee is arguing that decreasing the number of tests being taken is not a fundamental solution for the problem, since the test itself is like hell for the students, whether it is taken only once or ten times. The word “hell” is often used as a metaphor for test in Korean society, and by using this term, the speaker is arguing that tests are hell regardless of how many times students take them. By using a metaphor generally accepted by society, the statement sounds objective and his statement appears more authoritative.
In casual conversation, the deferential style is often chosen in this manner when a speaker wants to appear objective and give authority to a statement. This use of the deferential style is a strategic choice, and is not dependent on the degree of politeness. Also, such authoritative statements in the deferential are not interactive in that they do not induce an immediate response from the addressee.

5.1.4 The core meaning of the deferential style

Examples discussed above showed that the deferential style is often used for delivering news content, and making public announcements. Thus, it is often found when a speaker speaks to the public in a ritualized way. This ritualized characteristic is also maintained in private conversations. For example, some phatic expressions, which do not require immediate response from the listeners, were mainly found in this style. Also, the deferential style was often found when a speaker expressed his/her opinion or idea with authority, in a ritualized way. The most basic function of the deferential form can be summarized as ritualized self-presentation.

The social situation when this form is used is generally not very interactional. This form is found in situations in which the speaker does not expect an immediate response from the listener. The speaker is psychologically distant from himself/herself, and expresses a ritualized self at that moment. The deferential style is compatible with the factual information in the news content and announcements dealing with facts.

As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the plain style is also thought to be used for delivering information or explaining one’s belief and indexes a self-presentation stance. However, the deferential style is used when a speaker actively considers the existence of
the addressee and cares for the social restrictions of a situation. Thus, there is a distance between the speaker and the addressed. This differs from situations in which a speaker uses the plain style, where a speaker does not consider how to treat the addressee or how to behave appropriately in the situation. The indexical meaning of the plain style will be presented in Chapter 6.

5.2 The Polite Style

5.2.1 Functions of –yo in discourse: Soft affective stance

The key element of the polite style utterance is –yo. The polite style is the most frequently used speech style of the six speech styles found in conversation in the data. -Yo appears prevalently, even after non-predicate elements. For example, –yo appears after sentence connectives, such as –ko ‘and,’ –ese ‘so,’ –nunty ‘and/but/so.’ In the example below, no semantic meaning is added by putting –yo after a connective.

(5-9) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

1 simin-tul-un twu kay-uy kwangcang-ey moi-ko iss-supni-ta
citizen-PL-TC two kind-GEN square-at gather-being-DEF-DC
시민들은 두 개의 광장에 모이고 있습니다.
‘Citizens are gathering in two squares.’

→ 2 hana-nun inthenes kwangcang-i-ko-yo
one-TC internet square-be-and-POL
하나는 인터넷 광장이고요.
‘One of them is an on-line square’

3 hana-nun sicheng aph-uy Sewul kwangcang-i-pni-ta
one-TC City Hall front-GEN Seoul square-be-DEF-DC
하나는 시청 앞의 서울광장입니다.
‘the other one is Seoul square in front of City Hall.’
This example is from a reporter’s description of a street demonstration in a debate program. As mentioned above, the deferential style is the basic speech style for reporting, but the reporter often added –yo after connectives where the main verbs were in the deferential style. Regarding this type of –yo, Yoon (1996) explained that –yo after a non-verbal element is a redundancy whose function is to create a pause and a feeling of closeness between the interlocutors. In this example, this usage of –yo among deferential endings makes the whole discourse sound friendlier and a little less formal.

In the news program, the deferential style is the most dominant speech style, but this kind of usage of –yo is often found in weather forecasts.

(5-10) From ‘News Desk’ (news)

1 hyencay Kangwen pwukpu cipang-ey howu cwwypo-ka naylyeci-n
   now Kangwon northern place-at heavy.rain warning-NM issue-MD

kawunty i ciyeck-ul cwungsim-ulो sikan-tang 10 mm anphakk-uy
   middle this area-AC center-as hour-per 10 mm about-GEN

taso kwulk-un pi-ka nayli-ko.iss-supni-ta
   somewhat coarse-MD rain-NM fall-being-DEF-DC

‘Currently, it is raining heavily, at about 10 mm per hour, while a heavy rain advisory is in effect in the Northern part of the Kangwon area.’

2 tto namhayan-ul cwungsim-ulо kyeysok pi-ka
   also south.coast-AC center-as continuously rain-NM

ieci-ko.iss-nuntey-yo
   continue-being-so-POL

‘Also, centering around the South Coast, rain is continuing.’

3 cangmacensen-i pwuktongcin-ha-m-ey ttala pam-sai
   seasonal.rain.front-NM North.East.process-do NOM-to follow night-during

Kyengnam-cipang-eyse kulk-un pi-ka nayli-l kanungseng-i
   South.of.Kyengsang-area-at coarse-MD rain NM fall-MD possibility-NM
'As a seasonal rain front is advancing north-east, there is a possibility of heavy rain in Kyengnam area.'

오늘 장마전선은 남부지방까지 올라왔다가 지금은 남해에 머물고 있습니다.
'Today, a seasonal rain front has come up to the southern area, and it is staying around the south coast area.'

'It will last until midday, and will go back gradually.'

'It will come up again around the weekend.'

While a weather forecaster reports the weather in the deferential style, she often uses –yo after sentence connectives such as –nuntey ‘and then’, –ko ‘and.’ The main news anchors primarily deliver only news content, but weather forecasters often make additional personal comments such as ‘Take care of your health.’ or ‘Bring your umbrella,’ which sounds caring to the audience. In Korean news programs, weather forecasters are generally young women and they try to present a friendly image to TV viewers. The use of –yo after sentence connectives presents a softer image than sentence connectives alone, even though the sentence endings are still in the deferential style.
Elaborating on the meanings of the polite ending –yo, Yoon (1996) found that in addition to the [+ respect] meaning of –yo there are additional meanings: –Yo used to be regarded as a woman’s style and was found more in women’s speech and its usage sometimes expresses elegance. Lee & Im (1983) also mentioned that the meaning of –yo is [+ intimacy]. Actually, the Korean polite ending –yo used to be used mainly by women and was recognized as a feminine style ending, but it has become widely used by both men and women in contemporary Korean. From the perspective of indexicality, I assume that the soft affective stance of this ending made it a feminine style in earlier times, and as society changed to favor such an affective stance regardless of gender, it has become widely used by both genders.

5.2.2 Interactive presentation

The polite ending is the most prevalently used speech style in both formal and informal situations, and it is often mixed with the deferential style. The polite style is often used for self-presentation purpose, as is the deferential style. I have discussed use of the deferential style for presenting propositional information such as news content and show procedures. In such cases, the presenter delivers the information simply and clearly, not exhibiting much emotion. However, a polite style presentation is more interactive and contains many affective features. The following example is an opening remark from a debate program delivered in the deferential style. Here, the host simply states the topic of the discussion for the day, and the sentence endings are generally in the deferential style.
(5-11) Simya Tholon (Debate program)

1. *annyenghasi-pni-kka?*  
   hello-DEF-Q

   안녕하십니까  
   ‘Hello’

2. *Chung KwanYong-i-pni-ta*  
   Chung KwanYong-be-DEF-DC

   정관용입니다.  
   ‘I’m Chung, Kwan-Yong.’

3. *twu tal isang wuli-nala-lul ttukepkey talkwu-k o.iss-nun*  
   two month more our-country-AC hot heat-being-MD

   *chospwul cengkwuk ku hanpokphan-ey inthenes-i issum-ul*  
   candle.light political.situation that center-at Internet-NM being-AC

   *motwu-ka ta a-nun sasil-i-pnita*  
   everyone-NM all know-MD truth-be-DEF

   두 달 이상 우리나라를 떠잡고 다니고 있는 충분한 귀한 한국 인터넷이 있음을 모두가 다 아는 사실입니다  
   ‘Everybody knows that the Internet plays a central role for this candlelight protest which has been heating up Korea for two months.’

4. *kuntey i inthenes kongkan inthenes yelon-ul*  
   but this Internet space Internet public.opinion-AC

   *palapo-nun twu kaci sikak-i concayha-pni-ta*  
   see-MD two kind view-NM exist-DEF-DC

   근데 이 인터넷 공간 인터넷 여론을 바라보는 두 가지 시각이 존재합니다  
   ‘But, there are two different points of views on the Internet.’

5. *hana-nun neythicun-tul-uy mincwucek-i-n wysasothong*  
   one-TC netizen-PL-GEN democratic-be-MD communication

   *kuliko ku kes-uy hwaksan-i-la-n kongkan-i-ta*  
   and that-thing-GEN expansion-be-MD space-be-PLN

   하나는 네티즌들의 민주적인 의사소통 그리고 건강한 토론에 의한 의견수렴 그리고 그것의 확산이란 공간이다  
   ‘One is that it is a space where netizens gather and expand opinions through democratic communication and healthy discussions.’

6. *tto hana-uy sikak-un ilpwu neticun-tul-uy hewi sasil*  
   also one-GEN view-TC some netizen-PL-GEN false truth

   *yupho-lo inhaye yelon waykok tto sentong-i*  
   spread-by resulted public.opinion distortion also instigation-NM
또 하나의 사례는 일부 네티즌들의 허위사실 유포로 인해서 여론 왜곡 또 선동이 이루어지는 공간이다.

‘The other one is that it is a space where some netizens are spreading false information and distorting public opinion.’

7. ilwueci-nun kongkan-i-ta
be.done-MD space-be-PLN

또한 두 가지 사례인데 여기서 어떻게 생각하십니까?

‘There are two points of view and what is your opinion?’

8. mwullon twu mosup-ul ta kac-ko.iss-nun kes-i
of.course two shape-AC all have-being-MD thing-NM

물론 두 모습을 다 갖고 있는 것이 인터넷 공간입니다.

‘Of course, Internet space has these two aspects.’

9. kulentey ku kawuntey mwues-ul te cwungyosihay-se
but tkat middle what-AC more prioritize-and

그런데 그 가운데 무엇을 더 중요시해서 보는가에 따라서 인터넷 규제

‘But, depending on what is seen as more important, there are also pros and cons on controlling Internet.’

10. hewi sasil yupho mengyey hwueyson tung-ey.tayhan photel-uy
false truth spread honor harm etc.-about portal-GEN

kiwucey kywucey
regulation regulation

phyohyen-uy cayu-lul ekapha-l ppwun-i-n pi-mincwueck
expression-GEN freedom-AC suppress-MD only-MD not-democratic

kywucey-i-l ppwun-i-n kes-i-nci onul yelepwyn-kwa
regulation-be-MD only-MD thing-be-or today you-with
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This opening remark sounds very unidirectional and there is little expression of the speaker’s emotion. The polite style, on the other hand, is used for not only delivering propositional meanings, but also to share the speaker’s emotions with the interlocutor(s) more directly. As has seen in (5-2) and (5-5) above, the host of the program mixed the deferential style and the polite style while she is making the opening remarks and introducing the guests. While the host is making these remarks, the audience laughs, cheers and applauds, interacting with the host. The example below is also a part of an opening remark by a group of singers who introduce the emcees of the show. These five singers are temporarily taking the role of introducing the hosts of the show. They use both the deferential and the polite styles.

(5-12) The Star Show (Talk show)

1 Sunye:  

\textit{ney onul-un te suthasyo palo cehuy wontekelsu-ka}  
\textit{yes today-TC The Star Show exactly we Wonder Girls-MN}

cwunpiha-yss-nunkeyyo
prepare-PST-POL

네, 오늘은 더 스타쇼 바로 저희 원더걸스가 준비했는데요.  
Yes, today, we, Wonder Girls, prepared The Star Show

2 Ye-eun:  

\textit{ney saylowu-n-ke cengmal manh.i cwunpi hay-ss-cyo}  
\textit{yes new-MD-thing relly much prepare do-PST-POL}

dne, 새로운 거 정말 많이 준비했죠.  
Yes, we prepared a lot of new things, you know.
3  ney  kitay  manh.i  hay  cwu-sey-yo
yes  expectation  much  do  give-SH-POL

네 기대 많이 해 주세요.
Yes, please expect a lot.

4 Sun-mi:

kunhey-yo  saylow-un-key  mwe-yey-yo?
by.the.way-POL  new-MD-thing  what-be-POL

근데요 새로운 게 뭐예요?
By the way, what are the new things?

5 Yubin:

ney  Senmi-ssi  po-si-myen  a-pni-ta
yes  Sunmi-HT  see-SH-if  know-DEF-DC

네 선미씨 보시면 알니다.
All right, Sunmi, You will see.

6 ceheytyl-uy  solcikha-n  mosup  ta  thelthel
our-GEN  frank-MD  apperance  all  completely

thelenoh-ul.they-nikka-yo
dispose-will-because-POL

지회들의 솔직한 모습 다 털털 털어놓을 테니까지요.
Because, we will reveal ourselves completely.

7 So-hee:

ney  kulem  yelepwn  chaynel  koceng  ha-sey-yo
yes  then  everyone  channel  fix-SH-POL

네 그럼 여러분 채널 고정하세요.
Yes. Then please stay tuned.

8 Sun-ye:

mal-i  kil-eci-l.swulok  te  kitayha-si-l.swu.iss-unikka-yo
talk-SM  long-become-the more  more  expect-SH-can-because-POL

말이 길어질수록 더 기대하실 수 있으니까요.
Because, as we talk more, you may expect more.

9 ellun  onul  cehuy-lul  towacwu-si-l  twu  emssi-pwun-ul
quickly  today  us-AC  help-SH-MD  two  MC-person-AC

mosi-tolok  ha-kess-supni-ta
take-so.that  do-will-DEF-DC

얼른 오늘 저희를 도와주실 두 엑스분을 모시도록 하겠습니다.
Let’s welcome two MCs who will help us.

10 Everyone:

i sung-hwan  pak swu-hong  ssi-i-pni-ta
Lee Seunghwan  Park Su-hong  HT-be-DEF-DC

이승환 박수홍씨입니다.
Lee, Seunghwan and Park Su-hong!
In this example, the five singers are introducing the hosts of the show after they finished opening the show. They are talking facing the audience, but they sometimes talk to each other and to the audience, which makes the atmosphere very friendly and interactive as if they are having a conversation with the audience. Use of the polite style in this way creates an interactive atmosphere even as they make presentations to the audience. However, it should be noted that the actual announcements for welcoming and introducing the emcees are in the deferential style.

5.2.3 Polite ending –(e/a)yo for expressing emotional attitude

As mentioned above, one of the salient differences between the deferential and the polite style is that the deferential style is often used in unidirectional discourse, while the polite style is more often used in interactive situations. When there are active interactions, people naturally share and exchange emotions and use linguistic features that express emotional attitude. For example, there are verbal suffixes that have the function of expressing a speaker’s emotional attitude. Examples of such suffixes are -kwun, -ci, and -ney, and they can only be followed by –yo in the honorific style. These kinds of suffixes function to express a speaker’s psychological attitude or judgment about his/her utterance, or probe a listener for his/her intentions or reactions (Ihm et al., 2001). These suffixes are not compatible with a deferential style ending, and only allow –yo to be used for honorific expression. Sohn (2007) pointed out that these kinds of interactive endings
occur in only two speech levels, polite (marked) and intimate (unmarked), which take only one sentence type, declarative or interrogative, and share a common pragmatic feature of mitigated illocutionary force. In the data from TV news programs and debate programs, most of the polite style endings are of this type.

Ihm et al., (2001) explained that –kwunyo endings show a sudden or first realization, confirmation, interest, delight, surprise, astonishment or insistence. In Line 3 of the above example (5-13), the anchor is commenting on the government’s new plan for economic

\[7\] The relationship between the polite and intimate styles is discussed more in Chapter 6.

---

(5-13) From ‘News Desk’ (News)

1. onul nao-n cengpwu taychayk-ey tayha-n
   today come.out-MD government counter.plan-to toward-MD
   phyengka-lul Se minswu kica-wa hamkkey alapo-tolok
   evaluation-AC Se minswu reporter-with together check-in.order.to

   ha-keyss-supni-ta
do-will-DEF-DC

   오늘 난은 정부 대책에 대한 평가를 서민수 기자와 함께 알아보도록 하겠습니다
   ‘Let us know more about the evaluations of the government’s counter plan that was presented today.’

2. Se-kica
   Se-reporter

   시기자
   ‘Reporter Se!’

3. onul cengpwu-uy mokphyochi-lul po-nikka manhi nacchw-ess-kwunyo
   today government-GN target.figure-AC see-now.that much lower-PST-POL

   오늘 정부의 목표치를 보니까 많이 낮췄군요.
   ‘I see that the government lowered its target figure a lot.’

4. cennwunka-tul phyengka-nun ettehkey nawa iss-supni-kka?
   expert-PL evaluation-TC how come out exist-DEF-Q

   전문가들 평가는 어떻게 나와 있습니까?
   ‘What are the evaluations by specialists?’
growth. By using this ending, –kwunyo, he is expressing his realization and a little bit of surprise at this fact. Also, the suffixes –lkka and –ci, and their honorific ending forms –lkka-yo and –ci-yo respectively express a speaker’s emotional attitude. The function of –lkka-yo is to indicate that the speaker is asking an opinion of the listener, and –ci-yo often invites confirmation or agreement (Martin, 1992). The function of the –ci-yo use in the above example is to confirm what the speaker and the listener already know. In the following example, the discussion participants are supposed to express their opinion one by one and the host requests they start the debate by using this –ciyo ending.

(5-14) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

1 yenil chospwul-cengkwuk-ul ttukepkey talkwu-ko.iss-nun
everyday candle.light-political.situation-AC hot heat-being-MD

onlain kwangcang
online square

연일 촛불정국을 뜨겁게 달구고 있는 온라인 광장,
‘The on-line square is heating up the current political situation of the candlelight protest.’

2 kwayen chamye-wa sothong-uy yellin kongkan-i-lkka-yo?
really participation-and communication-GEN open space-be-wonder-POL

파면 참여와 소통의 열린 공간임까요?
‘Is it really a space for participation and communication?’

3 wusen Cin Seng-ho uywen-kkey tuli-tolok ha-ciyo
first Cin seng-ho congressman-to give-in.order. to do-POL

우선 진심호 의원께 드리도록 하죠.
‘To start, let’s give (an opportunity to speak) to Assemblyman Cin Seng-ho.’

In news and debate programs, most of the cases where the polite style is used are of this type. In these programs, there are rare cases where –yo is directly used after a bare verb stem. In this case, the use of –yo should not be regarded as less polite or less formal than the deferential style, because there is no choice between the deferential and polite
styles with those suffixes that express one’s emotional attitude. As discussed above, the major function of the deferential style in news programs is presenting information. The polite style ending, on the other hand, was found when the speakers expressed their emotional attitude while interacting with others.

5.2.4 Back-channeling in polite ending or incomplete sentences

The data for this study show that expressions for showing agreement to the speaker (e.g., That’s right!), or signaling following along with the conversation (e.g., “Uh-uh,” “Ah,” etc), are rarely made in the deferential style. Such expressions for showing conversational participation are found either with a polite ending or in incomplete sentences. Conversation participants often made comments, like kuleh-ciyo ‘(You’re) right,’ mac-ayo ‘(You’re) correct,’ while listening to others talking. These kinds of remarks well exemplify characteristics of the polite style discussed so far in that they are found in very interactive conversations when conversation participants share their emotions. Conversation participation remarks sometimes appear in non-completed sentence or single words, which are non-honorific expressions. However, for the purpose of conversation participation, they are not regarded as impolite styles. In the following example, just repeating certain a word from other person’s remarks in the previous turn expresses his active participation in the conversation.

(5-15) From ‘Happy Hero’ (comedy Show)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Guest:</th>
<th>hwaksilhi</th>
<th>kulay-se</th>
<th>kule-n-ci</th>
<th>kyoyuk-ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely</td>
<td>like.that-so</td>
<td>like.than-MD-NOM</td>
<td>education-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tayhay</td>
<td>kwansim-i</td>
<td>com</td>
<td>iss-eyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about</td>
<td>interest-NM</td>
<td>a.little</td>
<td>be-POL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above example, after the guest expressed his interest in education, Host 1 shows his agreement with the expression *kuleh-ciyo* ‘That is right’ in the polite style. This is followed by another host repeating the word *kyoyuk* ‘education’ adding an interjection *a::* ‘ah’ to exclaim his feeling. It sounds like Host 2 is talking to himself to show that he is interested in the current topic and actively participating in the conversation.

In the example below, repetition of a word from a previous turn by another speaker expressed the speaker’s attitude of collaboration within the conversation.
(5-16) From ‘The Star Show’ (Talk Show)

1. Host1: 
   ceysuchye-to   iss-nayo?
gesture-also   exist-POL

   재스처도 있나요?
   ‘Is there a gesture, too?’

2. Guest1: (with a gesture)  
   ney   kacang:::
yes   the.best

   네, 가장
   ‘Yes. The best…’

3. Host2: (laughing)  
   tasi   tasi   kathi
   again   again   together

   다시 다시 같이
   ‘Again, again. Together.’

4. 
   phwulsyas-ulo
   full shot-with

   풀샷으로
   ‘With a full shot.’

5. 
   si:::cak
   start

   시::작
   ‘Start!’

6. Guests:  
   kacang:::
   best

   가장:::
   ‘The best!’

7. Host 1:  
   moktoli   tomapaym-i-nteyyo?
scarf   lizard-be-POL

   목도리 도마뱀인대요.
   ‘They look like a collared lizard.’

8. Host 2: (laughing)  
   moktoli   tomapaym
   scarf   lizard

   목도리 도마뱀
   ‘A collared lizard!’
In this example, the hosts asked the guests to imitate the habit of a person they were talking about. After the guests did as asked, in Line 7, Host 1 made a joke saying that the guests’ gestures looked like “collared lizards.” Host 2 repeated the word *moktoli tomapaym* ‘collared lizard’ while laughing to indicate that he got the joke and it was funny.

In the following example, the host keeps checking the information by repeating words or expressions to clarify meaning. This kind of spontaneous checking is often expressed in simple words or phrases without sentence ending.

(5-17) From ‘The Star Show’ (Talk Show)

1 Guest:  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ney-si</em></td>
<td><em>cengto-ka</em></td>
<td><em>tway-yo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four-hour</td>
<td>about-NM</td>
<td>become-POL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

네시 정도가 됨요  
It’s getting close to four o’clock.

⇒ 2 Host:  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nac.</em></td>
<td><em>nac</em></td>
<td><em>ney-si</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>four-hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

낮 낮 네시?  
Four o’clock in the afternoon?

3 Guest 1:  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ney.</em></td>
<td><em>nac</em></td>
<td><em>ney-si</em></td>
<td><em>cengtoka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes,</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>four-hour</td>
<td>about-NM</td>
<td>become-if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

네 낮 네시 정도가 되면  
Yes, when it gets close to four o’clock

4 Guest 2:  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ma-uy</em></td>
<td><em>ney-si-lako</em></td>
<td><em>pwull-eyo</em></td>
<td><em>cehuy-ka</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon-GEN</td>
<td>four-hour-as</td>
<td>call-POL</td>
<td>we-NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

마의 네시라고 불리요 지뢰가  
‘We call it ‘cursed four o’clock.’

⇒ 5 Host:  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ma-uy</em></td>
<td><em>ney-si</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon-GEN</td>
<td>four-hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

마의 네시?  
‘Cursed four o’clock?’
Even though repeating a word or a part of a sentence without a predicate is considered a non-honorific expression, such remarks made by participants in a conversation are regarded as natural in Korea society. Examples here show that such repetition often expresses a speaker’s spontaneous feelings (exclamation, surprise, confirmation, suspicion, etc.).

Remarks that show conversation participation in the polite or the intimate style sounds that the speaker indicates psychological closeness to the addressee. The polite style sounds that the speaker cares for the listener, while the intimate style sounds that the speaker does not care for the listener. More discussions of the intimate style are found in Chapter 6.

5.2.5 The core meaning of the polite style

The examples above show that the polite style index friendliness, intimacy, closeness, interactiveness, being emotional, and the like. The polite style is found to be used when sharing personal feelings and emotions with interlocutors. -Yo ending style is used very interactive situation, exchanging emotions each other. When the polite style is used with the deferential style, it is generally agreed that the polite style indexes the above mentioned positive affective meanings. However, when it is used with the intimate or the plain style, it may not always index friendliness, intimacy or closeness. For example, if we use the polite style with a friend while talking in the intimate or the plain style, it may index distance from the friend. I have observed many couples who switched their speech style from intimate to polite after breaking up. Even when it indexes distance from the addressee, the utterance sounds softerer with –yo attached than without it.
Therefore, I argue that the polite ending –yo keeps its soft affective disposition, which can be its direct indexical meaning.

5.3 Conclusion

The deferential and the polite styles are used in similar situations and alternation between the two speech styles in the same discourse is very common. Both have been regarded as honorific styles, but their differences have not received much attention from scholars. As shown in the examples, speech style within one discourse, even with the same person, does not always remain unchanged. It is over simplified to say that the deferential style is higher in degree of politeness or more formal than the polite style, because they are often intermixed in the same situation with the same person. A more reasonable explanation is that their meanings and functions are not limited to expressing politeness and/or formality.

One of the most frequent functions of the deferential style sentence ending –supnita is ritualized self-presentation. The Korean deferential style ending –supnita has evolved from the verb solp ‘to tell, inform (a senior)’ (Sohn, 1998), therefore, I assume that this form developed for presenting facts or one’s thoughts in a formal situation. Since it is often related to facts or serious ideas, the use of this style often indexes seriousness, authority and/or formality and it is often found in situations where politeness is required. Therefore, I propose that the core meaning the deferential style is ritualized self-presentation.

In a very different case, the polite ending –yo has indexical meanings of friendliness, intimacy, being emotional, etc. For this reason, it used to be regarded as a
speech style for women, but it is widely used in contemporary Korean regardless of gender. This style is now found more when one is dealing with his/her emotions. However, when the polite style is used with non-honorific styles, its usage indexes psychological distance with the addressee. Considering these characteristics of the polite style, I suggest it has the direct indexical meaning of a soft affective stance.

One of the most notable distinctions between these styles is found in the role of interaction in conversation. The examples in this chapter show that the deferential style is generally found in unidirectional discourse, while the polite style is used more when a listener’s immediate response is expected. The deferential style is often used in making announcements and presenting information as in news programs. In multi-party conversations, like a debate, the interaction is less dynamic when the –supnita style predominates than when –yo does. In the former case, people take turns in the conversation and there is not much interruption or overlapping. Some phatic expressions for presenting one’s feelings are often expressed in the deferential style, even in casual situations. On the other hand, the –yo ending style is used in very interactive situations. Even in a unidirectional discourse, the use of –yo sounds friendly, since it sounds like the speaker is sharing his/her feelings with the listeners.

The deferential style is more often used when dealing with facts, while the polite style is preferred when speaking about personal feelings and ideas. The deferential style is not compatible with some suffixes that show a speaker’s psychological state. Suffixes such as -kwun, -ci, and –ney are used to express a speaker’s psychological attitude or judgment about his/her utterance, or to probe the listener for intentions or reactions, and they can only be followed by –yo for honorific styles (Sohn, 2007). Thus, the polite style
is more appropriate for dealing with emotional material, and the deferential style is more appropriate for talking about objective facts.

The meanings of politeness and formality, which are the most salient features characterizing the deferential styles, seem to be coming from ritualized self presentation. Also, it seems that the soft affective stance of the \(-yo\) style has made it the most popular speech style as contemporary Korean society requires friendly interaction more than it did in the past. In Chapter 6, further indexical meanings of these two styles as well as other non-honorific speech styles shall be discussed.
CHAPTER 6
INDEXICAL MEANINGS OF THE INTIMATE AND THE PLAIN STYLES

In Chapter 5, the indexical meanings of honorific speech styles (the deferential and the polite style) were discussed. This chapter continues the discussion examining the indexical meanings of non-honorific styles. Non-honorific styles include the blunt, familiar, intimate and plain styles. However, as mentioned in Chapter 3, the blunt and the familiar styles have become obsolete and the intimate and the plain styles are the commonly used non-honorific styles in contemporary Korean. In the data for this study, only the intimate and the plain styles were found in conversation. Therefore, this discussion of the non-honorific styles will focus on the intimate and the plain styles.

6.1 Formality and the Speech Styles

The intimate and the plain styles are generally used in conversations between close friends, or by an adult speaking to a child, and these two styles are frequently intermixed in the same discourse with the same person(s). Traditionally, it has been argued that the plain style is formal, while the intimate style is informal. As mentioned in previous chapters, formality has been a primary for classification of speech styles by some scholars (e.g., Han, 2002, 2004; Seo, 1984; Sung, 1985). They classified speech styles considering formality and degree of politeness at the same time and classified deferential and plain styles as formal, and polite and intimate styles as informal. The following table summarized the classification of speech styles from Seo (1984) and Sung (1985).
Table 6.1 *Dualistic Classification of Speech Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Style</th>
<th>Informal Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Respect</td>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>Polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respect</td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>Intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Seo (1984) and Sung (1985)

In this dualistic speech style classification, the difference between the intimate and the plain style (and the deferential and the polite style) is formality. The degree of politeness between them is similar. However, the classification of speech styles by formality can be problematic. First, there are many situations which cannot be clearly classified into either formal or informal. Formality is a matter of degree rather than something that can be dichotomized. Secondly, it is not enough to simply explain that formality causes a change of speech style because so called formal and informal styles are often intermixed in the same situation with the same person. The degree of formality can be changed within a discourse, but a classification of ‘+/- formality’ oversimplifies the situation. Therefore, it seems to be more appropriate to discuss the change of degree in formality, possibly with other social meanings in the situation, than to dichotomize the situation into formal or informal.
One of the merits of this classification, [+/- formality], however, is that it shows the close relationship between the polite and the intimate style. The informal styles—polite and intimate—are closely related, in that most of the intimate style sentence endings can be followed by –yo and become the polite style, but the plain style endings generally don’t allow –yo to follow. As mentioned in Chapter 5, –yo can be very productively attached to many suffixes, even to non-verbal elements. If we remove –yo from a polite style expression, what remains will be perceived as intimate style. The Korean term for the intimate style is panmal whose literal meaning is ‘half talk.’ It is called this because the intimate style is often regarded as an incomplete variation of the polite style. Lee (1970) explained that panmal is a style that evades the degree of politeness and is used when people are not sure what kind of honorific style to use. Thus, the intimate style used to be regarded not as an independent speech style but just as an incomplete form. However, in contemporary Korean, it seems to be more appropriate to regard the intimate style as an independent speech style, in that there are independent sentence endings which are recognized as marking the intimate style and they are more and more widely used. The following tables show sentence endings for the intimate and the plain styles and differences among sentence types for these two styles.
Table 6.2 Sentence Endings for the Intimate and the Plain Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Intimate</strong></th>
<th><strong>Plain</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declarative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Declarative</td>
<td>-e, -ci, -key, -ney, -nunkwun, -tey, -ketun, -nuntey, -ko - tana, -cana, -ulan, -nuntako, -nunyako, -cako, -ulako, -nantanikka, -naynikka, -canikka, -ulanikka, -illay, -ulkey, - nunkel, -ulkel, -komalko, -tamata</td>
<td>-nunta, -uma, -nunkuna, -ela, -uni, -ulla, (-nola, -nwula) - nuntanta, -nunila (-tota, -ulecince, - ulcintla, -ulkena, -ullela, -ulleyla, - ulcila, -ulcilota)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrogative</strong></td>
<td>-e, -ci, key, ney, nunka, na, tey, nuntey, ko - tani, -nyani, -cani, -ulan, -nuntako, - nunyako, -cako, -lako, -nantayense, -camyense, -ulamyense, -nuntay, -nantaci, -uldka, -ullay, -unci</td>
<td>-nunya, -ni - ulyetta, -ulsonya, -nuntani (-ulsonya, - nunko, -ullela)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposative</strong></td>
<td>-e, -ci</td>
<td>-ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperative</strong></td>
<td>-e, -ci, -ko</td>
<td>-ela, -ulyemwuna - ulyesta, (ulcieta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on Han, 2004)

Table 6.3 Conjugation of the Plain and the Intimate Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Intimate</strong></th>
<th><strong>Plain</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb predicate</strong></td>
<td>(ka- ‘go’ mek- ‘eat’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(ka- ‘go’ mek- ‘eat’)</td>
<td>hakkyo-ey ka-a school-to go-INT ‘(I) go to school.’</td>
<td>hakkyo-ey ka-nnta school-to go-PLN ‘(I) go to school.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjective predicate</strong></td>
<td>(coh ‘good,’ pappu ‘busy’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(coh ‘good,’ pappu ‘busy’)</td>
<td>nalssi-ka coh-a weather-NM good- INT ‘The weather is good.’</td>
<td>nalssi-ka coh-ta weather-NM good-PLN ‘The weather is good.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onul-un pappu-a today-TC busy- INT ‘It is busy today.’</td>
<td>onul-un pappu-ta today-TC busy-PLN ‘It is busy today.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copular predicate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Copular predicate</td>
<td>hakkayng-i-ya student-be- INT ‘(I’m) a student.’</td>
<td>hakkayng-i-ta student-be-PLN ‘(I’m) a student.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hakkayng-i ani-ya student-NM not be- INT ‘(I’m) not a student.’</td>
<td>hakkayng-i ani-ta student-NM not be-PLN ‘(I’m) not a student.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another notable difference between these two styles is that even though they are interchangeable in conversations, only the plain style is used in formal writing such as newspaper articles or scholarly papers, and only the plain style used in an embedded clause of a quotative construction (Sohn 1999: 271). When the plain style is used in such written genres, it is thought not to convey honorific connotation, rather it is considered neutral in politeness. However, few studies have explained in depth why the plain style, which is a non-honorific speech style, can be used in written genres with no connotation of honorifics. Later in this chapter, while dealing with the indexical meanings and social functions of these two styles, I will discuss this matter.

6.2 The Intimate Style

The function of the intimate style has been often explained as twulwu nacchwum ‘general lowering,’ because we can use this form in most occasions when we talk to people of lower status (e.g., Sung, 2007 a). As mentioned above, this style is also called as panmal ‘half-talk’ reflecting some scholars’ thinking that its ending is not distinguished clearly. Actually, the intimate style has the shortest endings, and they do not have much grammatical meaning. For example, the most representative intimate style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Written genre/embedded clause of a quotative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>-ni, -(n)nya</td>
<td>-(n)nya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>-(e/a)la</td>
<td>-(u)la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this usage, the plain style endings for the interrogative and imperative vary slightly between conversation, and written genre or a embedded clause of a quotative construction.
sentence endings are \(-e/-a\) and \(-ci\), and they are used in four different sentence types with the same form.

(6-1)

a. (na-nun)  hakkyo-ey  ka-a.
   (I-TC)  school-to  go-INT
   (나는) 학교에 가.
   (I) go to school.

b. (ne-nun)  hakkyo-ey  ka-a?
   (You-TC)  school-to  go-INT
   (너는) 학교에 가?
   (Do you) go to school?

c. (wuli)  hakkyyo-ey  ka-a.
   (We)  school-to  go-INT
   (우리) 학교에 가.
   Let’s go to school.

d. (ne)  hakkyo-ey  ka-a!
   (You)  school-to  go-INT
   (너) 학교에 가!
   (You) go to school!

Since the parenthesized part can be omitted in actual conversation, “hakkyo-ey ka-a” can be interpreted in four different ways depending on the context. The only way to distinguish the sentence type is with its contextual information and paralinguistic features, or affective keys (Cook, 2008). According to Cook (2008), affective key refers to linguistic and non-linguistic features related to the speaker’s feelings, moods, and attitudes. It includes sentence-final particles, vowel lengthening, rising intonation, coalescence, certain voice qualities, etc. Thus, the sentence type (i.e., statement, interrogative, propositive, and imperative) of the intimate style is realized in the context depending on affective keys.
6.2.1 Expressing spontaneous feeling

A common occasion where the intimate style was found was when people expressed their spontaneous feelings such as surprise, exclamation and admiration. In such cases, use of intimate style sounds like a speaker is talking to himself/herself frankly expressing his/her inner feelings in the moment. If these kinds of feelings are expressed in honorific styles (i.e., deferential and polite), they may sound like the speaker is describing his/her feeling to the addressee in a more modified way.

The following two examples show how similar expressions in different speech styles function differently. They are from different talk show programs. The guest of each program is saying a similar expression, which is “It is embarrassing.” However, the first one expressed it in the deferential style, while the second one in the intimate and the polite style.

(6-2) From Kim Jung-Eun’s Chocolate

1 Kim: ipen aylpem-i khonseyp cachey-ka seyksi-lateni
   this.time album-NM concept itself-NM sexy-they.say
   이번 앨범이 콜센 자체가 섹시라니
   I heard that the main theme of your album this time is ‘sexy’

2 e:: kulssey-yo:: uysang-eyse nwunkil-i ka-nunkel-yo
   uh well-POL clothes-from glance-NM go-you.see-POL

   이:: 클세요:: 의상에서 눈길이 가는걸요
   Well, clothes draw attention.

   (audience laugh)

3 Sia Cwunswu ssi-uy ku:: ku kooyngcanghi etten ku
   Sia Cwunswu HT-GEN that that extremely somewhat that

   phwuleheychi-n aphkasum-i
   open-MD chest-NM
시야 준수씨의 그 그 굉장히 어떤 그 품이해질 앞가슴이
Your that.. that exposure of your chest…

(2.0)

⇒ 4 Sia: pwukkulep-supni-ta ye
embarrassing-DEF-DC yes
부끄럽습니다 예
It is embarrassing.

(6-3) From Park Jung-hwun show

1 Park: hyutayphon kwangko-eyse po-nikka
cell.phone advertisement-from see-then

휴대폰 광고에서 보니가
I saw you in the cell phone commercial

2 kunyang tanci chimtay-eyse ttuwy-ess-ul ppwun-i-ntey
just simply bed-at jump-PST-MD only-be-but

그럼 단지 잠시에서 뛴었을 뿐인데
You just jumped on the bed

3 kunikka kunyang ilehkey ttuwy-canhayo ilehkey
so just like.this jump-POL like this

그니까 그냥 이렇게 뛴어봐야요 이렇게
So you just jumped like this, like this

4 Guest: kulehkey an-ttwi-ess-ketun-yo
like.that not-jump-PST-you.know-POL

그렇게 안뛰었기 때문요.
I didn’t jump in that way

5 Host: ani camkkan-man poyecwu-sey-yo
well moment-only show-SH-POL

아니 잠깐만 보여주세요.
Please show us for a moment

6 ttwi-nun pangpep-to kunyang
jump-MD method-also just

뭐하는 방법도 그냥
The way you jumped was just…

7 Guest: ce ettehkey ttwi-eyo
well how jump-POL
In the first example, the show host is commenting on the guest’s clothes by describing how sexy they look. After her comment, there was a little pause and the
audience and other guests laughed. Then, he replied that he was embarrassed by hearing her describing his outfit in that way, in a ritualized way, with the deferential style.

Actually, the host’s comment sounded like she was teasing him and the guest expressed his feeling on hearing what she said. So the guest’s remark didn’t sound like he was talking about his spontaneous feeling of embarrassment at the moment, but rather, as if he was filling in a gap, as there was a little pause after the host’s remark.

In the example (6-3), the host asked the guest to perform what she did in a specific television advertisement. At first, she refused to do that but after the host asked her several times, she reluctantly performed a little bit of what he asked. After she performed, with loud cheering from the audience, she covered her cheeks with her hands to hide that she blushed and said *chayngphihay* ’It is embarrassing.’ in the intimate style, as if she was talking to herself. She then repeated this expression in the polite style and in the intimate style. With the intimate style she sounded like she was expressing her spontaneous feeling of embarrassment, the same expression with the polite ending in the next line sounded like she was talking to the host, with a feeling of blaming him for her embarrassment. Thus, the honorific styles were used to give a message to specific addressee(s), while the intimate style is used to express her spontaneous feeling.

The intimate style has the shortest sentence endings and they might be the most economical way to express spontaneous feelings. In the above example, repeated use of the intimate style (–e/a) ending emphasized that she was expressing her most spontaneous psychological state without concern for the audience’s presence. The use of the intimate style for this kind of purpose is illustrated here: *sallyejwu-e* ‘Save (me)!’ *ttukew-e* ‘(It is) hot.’ *chwuw-e* ‘(It is) cold!’
6.2.2 Expressing closeness, friendliness, and/or joking

The intimate style is known as a speech style that is often used between people in close and friendly relationships. This might be because the intimate style is used to express one’s most immediate feelings and thoughts. Unlike the plain style, it is often used with one’s friends and family members, sometimes even when they are older than the speaker. A sudden change of speech style to the intimate style, therefore, often signals that the speaker is trying to emphasize that the situation is friendly and/or that the interlocutors are in a close relationship. In the following example, the host changed the speech style to the intimate style while he was asking questions of the guest in the polite style, thereby trying to make the situation friendly, which is appropriate for talking about one’s private thoughts.

(6-4) From “Park Jung-hwun show” (Talk Show, Park [44], Kim [30])

1 Park: nam-eykey saym-ul yupalha-nun Kim Taehuy ssi-ka
      other-to jealousy-AC cause-MD Kim Taehuy HS-MN
      saym-ul nayss-te-n sicel-to
      jealousy-AC have-RT-MD time-also
      iss-ess-eyo?

남에게 살을 유발하는 김태희씨가 살을 낼던 시절도 있었어요?
‘You make others jealous, but did you ever have a time you were jealous of others?’

2 Kim: e. ney cikum-to ce saym manh-ayo
      well yes now-also I jealousy much-POL

어 네 지금도 저 살 많이요.
‘Well, yes. I am still jealous of others a lot.’

3 Park: e. a:: kulay-yo?
      eh ah like.that-POL

어 아 그래요.
‘Oh, really?’
What are you jealous about?

Well, there are many kinds of things.

What kind of things are you jealous about?

Can’t you tell us?

What kind of things are you jealous about?

Well, I’m jealous about everything.

In Line 6 and 7, the host suddenly changed the speech style from the polite style to the intimate style. When he spoke in the intimate style, he spoke in animated voice indicating that he was playing as if he were a close friend of hers. The host was asking about very personal thoughts of the guest, what she was jealous about, which might be talked about between close friends. In this part, by acting as if he were a close friend of hers, he was trying to build a friendly atmosphere, which would make it appropriate to answer the question more frankly.
A change of speech style from the honorific to intimate sometimes indexes that a remark is not serious but joking. Since joking can be easily shared between close friends who can share frank thoughts and feelings, using the intimate style makes the discourse atmosphere more appropriate for joking. In the following example from a comedy show, the panelists started the conversation in the polite style. The topic of this conversation was a social issue (high gas prices) and they started the discussion seriously. In Line 1 and 3, Park and Kim used the subject honorific polite suffix –si, which is perceived as more polite style than regular –yo ending style. However, in the next turn, Kim switched the speech style into the intimate style (Line 7) and the whole topic turned humorous. By using the intimate style along with a humorous tone of voice, this person appears to be joking, not taking seriously what was just said by another person. Recognizing this, other speakers then accuse him, humorously, in intimate style.

(6-5) From ‘Happy Hero’ (Comedy show)

1 Park: 2-man-wen-echi kilum neh-epo-si-ess-eyo?
two-ten.thousand-won-amount gas put-try-SH-PST-POL

2 만원이지 기름 넣어 보셨어요?
‘Have you put 20,000 won of gas (in your car)?’

2 ce-nun kakkum 2-man-wen-echi-to neh-ketunyo
I-TC sometimes two-ten.thousand-won-amount-also put-POL

저는 가끔 2 만원이 지도 넣기든요.
‘I sometimes put in 20,000 won of gas.’

3 Kim: way neh-use-yo?
why put-SH-POL

왜 넣으세요?
‘Why do you put (in such a small amount of gas)?’

4 Park: tankolcip-ul ka-yatoy-nuntey kilum-i kantangkantang ha-l ttay
favorate.store-AC go-have.to-but gas-NM running.out do-MD time
When I want to go to my regular gas station but I’m running out of gas, I go to a nearby gas station and put in gas for about 20,000 won.

But, if I put in 20,000 won of gas, they’d just put in [the pump] and take it back right away.

Well, maybe not right away.

That is just an expression, not really (like) this (way).

The pump stays there for a while

Maybe not (right away).

What is important put and take or take and put?
In Line 7, Kim was referring to the expression that Park used for emphasizing the high gas price. His utterance was made in the intimate style with a humorous tone of voice. As can be confirmed in Line 14, he was joking and his use of the intimate style led to other conversation participants speaking in the intimate style. Park responded to Kim in the intimate style and Yoon even referred Kim as ‘this kid’ (Line 13), which can be only used in very close relationships or with a little kid. He also used the intimate style, and the conversation sounded like a personal conversation, close friends joking with each other. Consequently, use of the intimate style signaled that the conversation’s atmosphere changed from dealing with a serious topic to joking.

In this way, use of the intimate style often emphasizes that the relationship between the interlocutors is close and the atmosphere is very casual. Also, a sudden use
of intimate style sometimes indexes that the speaker is not dealing seriously with a topic, but joking. For this reason, this type of usage of the intimate style is often found in comedy shows.

### 6.2.3 Conveying one’s inner feeling in an indirect way

The intimate style, along with the plain style, is generally used in casual conversation, but people sometimes use it as if talking to themselves in situations where polite styles are mainly used. In the Chapter 5, it was discussed that people may use the deferential style when a speaker presents his feelings to others in a ritualized way. Additionally, the polite style often expresses a speaker’s spontaneous feelings and/or emotional attitude while interacting. When these honorific styles are uttered directly to others, the intimate and the plain style are sometimes used for expressing one’s feelings and thoughts as if talking to oneself, not directly expressed to a specific addressee. The strategy of talking to oneself to express one’s thoughts and feelings indirectly is also often adopted by people when they make complaints, express objections, or criticisms, etc. It can be used as a passive or sarcastic strategy to express negativity. Since this kind of non-honorific usage is not directly addressed to a listener, the non-use of an honorific form allows a speaker to express inner feelings with no elaboration to an addressee and excuses the speaker from being considered impolite.

(6-6) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

| 1 Chin: | I Myengpak cengpwu-ka ha-lyeko ha-nun cengchayk-i palo |
|  | I Myengpak government-NM do-intend to do-MD policy-NM exactly |
|  | Pwusi-ka ha-lyeko ha-yss-ten palo ku cengchayk-i-ketunyo ama |
|  | Bush-NM do-intend do-PST-RT exactly that policy-be-POL maybe |
The policy that the Lee Myengpak government is trying to implement is what Bush wanted to do, maybe.

Because of that I think maybe the Hannala Party might feel very frustrated.

Well, I don’t know about that.

In the above example from a debate program, Na was trying to express her disagreement and/or unpleasant feeling about Chin’s opinion. In this conversation, Chin, who is a famous critic of the current government, was expressing his opinion of the current government’s policy. Na was the spokesperson for the ruling party, so she was representing the government’s stance in this debate. In this example, it seems like she did not agree or felt uncomfortable with Chin’s opinion in Line 1 and 2 and expressed this feeling in Line 3, alluding that she is not talking to any specific person, but to herself. She also said this with a little laughter, trying to express that what was just said was funny or did not make sense. Even though the surface structure of this speech is directed toward the speaker herself, she is still expressing her feelings of discomfort to the listeners. Her remark was obviously intended for others to hear since she was in front of a microphone. This kind of talking to oneself strategy is an indirect way of expressing one’s thoughts or feelings.
In the following example, Kim and Shin do not talk directly, but indirectly give messages each other. Starting on Line 6, Kim is teasing Shin while he is pretending to be talking to himself. After Kim’s comment, Shin grumbles back, not directly to Kim but as if talking to someone else and himself, but still sending a message to Kim.

(6-7) From ‘Happy Hero’ (Comedy show)

1 Shin:  
\textit{tayhak-un com nuckey tuleka-ss-eyo}  
college-TC a.little lately enter-PST-POL  

대학은 좀 늦게 들어갔어요  
I entered college a little late.

2 Park:  
\textit{cayswu-nun an hay-ss-eyo?}  
taking a year out-TC not do-PST-POL  

계수는 안했어요?  
Didn’t you study for an extra year to enter college?

3 Shin:  
\textit{a com nuckey tuleka-ss-cyo}  
ah a.little lately enter-PST-POL  

아 좀 늦게 들어갔죠  
Oh, I entered just a little late.

4  
\textit{silki-lo tuleka-ss-cyo ce-nun silki-lo}  
talent-with enter-PST-POL I-TC talent-with  

실행이 들어갔죠 자는 실행이  
I entered (college) with a talent exam.

5 Yoon:  
\textit{a}  
oh  

아  
Oh.

6 Kim:  
\textit{taytanka-n chinkwu-ya}  
great-MD friend-PLN  

dеантан кинкуя  
He is a great guy.

7  
\textit{ani ettehkey ilcamusik-i tayhak-ul ka-ci?}  
well how illiteracy-NM college-AC go-INT?
Beginning on Line 6, Kim was sarcastically saying that Shin was a great guy because he entered college even though he was an *ilcamwusik* ‘illiterate.’ He was saying this as if he was talking to himself, not looking at a specific person, but loud enough for everybody to be able to hear. In response to Kim’s remark, looking dumbfounded, Shin tries to blame Kim for making such an inappropriate comment. At this point, in Line 10, Shin first turns his head to the person next to him as if talking to them and then, in Line 11-13, he looks at nobody and talks to himself. Nonetheless, Shin’s complaint was to Kim.
As discussed in Chapter 4, even when the target of the speech is the speaker himself/herself, we cannot say that the speaker’s awareness of the addressee(s) is low. As shown in the above examples, ‘talking to oneself’ can be a strategy for expressing one’s feeling in an indirect way. At times, even though the speaker appears to be talking to himself/herself, the awareness of an addressee could be extremely high, as the speaker checks the response from the listener(s). Regardless of the direction of the speech, the intimate style indexes that the speaker is speaking his/her inner thoughts or feelings as they are.

6.2.4 Non-honorific styles in narrative report

The intimate and the plain styles, which are known as non-honorific styles, sometimes appear even in institutionalized situations such as narrations in news programs. In the data for this study, there were some cases where they appear in a self-questioning form with honorific speech styles. As discussed in Chapter 5, reports in news program are mostly in the deferential style. However, in the following example, intimate style questions are sometimes found while the deferential style is primarily used.

(6-8) From ‘KBS 9’clock News’ (news)

1 Kyengkito-ey iss-nun hwankyengcwenkongsa-uy
   Kyengkito-at be-MD Korea.Environment.and.Resources.Corporation-GEN

   apswuphum changko
   confiscated.article warehouse

   경기도에 있는 환경자원공사의 압수품 창고.
   ‘A warehouse for confiscated articles of the Korea Environment and Resources Corporation in Kyengki province.’

2 sahayngseng keyimki-i-n ‘pata iyaki’ phalpayk-ye-tay-ka
   gambling game machine-be-MD ‘Ocean Story’ eight.hundred-about-item-NM
사행성 게임기인 ‘바다 이야기’ 8백여대가 해체를 기다리고 있습니다.
‘About 800 gambling game machines, ‘Ocean Story,’ are waiting to be dismantled.’

지난달에는 불법 게임기에서 빼어낸 26 인치 LCD 모니터 4300 여대가 대당
19 만원짜리 8 역 2 천만원에 낙찰되었습니다.
‘Last month, about 4300 LCD monitors removed from these illegal game machines were
auctioned. A bid for 820,000,000 won, which is 190,000 won each.’

Where do these LCD monitors go?’

The bidder who got these monitors says that the used monitors from the game machines
will go to manufacturers of game machines.’
answer from the narrator himself, but was written into the script prior to broadcast for the purpose of introducing the topic which followed. It would be more reasonable to explain that the question in the above example is a possible question that may occur to the audience who are watching the program or to any person who observing the scene.

Thus, the narrator is directly using this kind of question in the narration. If the narrator used the deferential style for this as “*i LCD monithenun etilo ka-pnikka?*” it would sound as if the narrator were actually asking this question of the audience and the rhetorical function of getting the attention of the audience and introducing the following information would not be achieved.

The example below shows a similar case, with a different question form in the intimate style. The question in Line 3 is a different from the above example in that it is a question of what should be, rather than personal question. However, the function of this question is the same as that of the above example, because it allows the narrator to raise a question regarding what will be discussed in the following news.

(6-9) From ‘KBS 9’clock News’ (news)

1  Tanginli  palcenso-i-pni-ta
    Tanginli  power.plant-be-DEF-DC

담안리 발전소입니다.
‘This is the Tang’inli power plant.’

2  elmahwu-myen   katong-ul   memchwu-pni-ta
    sometime.after-when  operation-AC  stop-DEF-DC

 얼마후면 가동을 멈춥니다.
‘It will stop operating in the near future.’

3  pwuswu-ko   saylo   ci-ul   kes-i-nka
    break-and  newly  build-MD  thing-be-PLN

    poconha-n   chay   saylow-un   kongkan-ulo   caysayngsikhi-l   kes-i-nka?
    preserve-MD  state  new-MD  space-toward  restructure-MD  thing-be-INT
The question raised in the Line 3 is a social issue for citizens of Seoul. This narration is quoting this question, which should be asked of policy makers in Seoul. In this way, the intimate style, which is classified as informal and non-polite, is sometimes used where the deferential style is mainly used.

This kind of usage can also be found in everyday conversations either in the intimate or the plain style. In the following conversation, the guest of the show is explaining the title of his new album. The basic speech style used in this conversation is the polite style, but he suddenly used the plain style which has a function similar to the intimate style examples above.

(6-10) From ‘Kim Jung-Eun’s Chocolate’ (Talk show)

1 Jaycwung: alpem thaithul-un milothik-i-kwuyo
album title-TC milothik-be-POL

앨범 타이틀은 미로티이구요
The title of the album is “Milothik”

2 Kim: milothik
milothik

미로티
milothik

3 Jaycwung: cehuy-ka pangkum pwull-ess-ten nolay-uy thaithul-un
we-NM just.now sing-PST-RT song-GEN title-TC

미안하게 당신의 앨범을 좋아합니다.
The title of the song we just sang is “Magic Words”

4 Kim:  

**cwumun**

cwumun  

주문  

Magic words

⇒ 5 Jaycwung:  

**way  milothik-i-nya**  

why  milothik-i-PLN  

왜 미로틱이나  

Why Milothik?

6 Kim:  

**ney**  

yes  

네  

Yes

7 Jaycwung:  

**e::  cengmal  cwumun-ey  kellyetu-nta**  

uh::  really  magic.word-at  to.be.caught-PLN  

어:: 정말 주문에 걸려든다  

Well, being trapped by magic words

8  

**milo-ey  ppacyetun-ta**  

maze-at  fall-PLN  

미로에 빠져든다  

Trapped in a maze (milo)

9  

**ppacyetu-l-kes  kath-un  ile-n  uymi-eyse**  

fall-thing-MD thing  same-MD  think.kind-MD  meaning-as  

빠져들 것 같은 이런 의미에서  

Meaning ‘as if being trapped’

10  

**milothik-i-la-nun  thaithul-ul  puthy-ess-nuntey**  

milothic-be-DC-TC  title-AC  put-PST-and  

미로 틸이라는 타이틀을 붙였는데  

(So) we gave title of ‘Milothik’

11  

**a::**  

ah::  

아::  

Aha!
In Line 5, the guest raises a question, later followed by his own answer, to explain the meaning of the song title. It is the same strategy discussed in the above examples. By first asking a question that might possibly be raised by other people, the speaker tries to get more attention from the listeners. This kind of strategic choice of non-honorific styles is adopted to convey that the question is not the speaker’s own but rather, it is a question that can be presumed to be thought generally.

The intimate style, along with the plain style, does not always reflect relative social positional difference but often is used for various purposes in situations where the honorific speech styles predominate.

6.2.5 The core meaning of the intimate style

The above examples show that the intimate style is used to convey the most direct expression of a speaker’s own thoughts, ideas, emotions, feelings, etc. That is, the intimate style is used to manifest what a speaker thinks or feels as it arises while not attending to situational restrictions for behavior. Therefore, this form is used when a speaker expresses his or her affect most directly.

As we can see from its name, the intimate style has been understood to expresses intimacy. However, Park (1976) pointed out that the intimate style does not always express [+ intimacy] feature but may express [- intimacy] depending on the context. In fact, depending on affective keys accompanying this style, the intimate style may be used for expressing negative feelings as well (e.g., threatening, blaming, complaining). The
example (6-11) may be said with a hateful tone of voice and we cannot say the intimate
style in this case expresses a [+ intimacy] feature.

(6-11)

a. tangsin nwukwu-i-a?
you who-be-INT

당신 누구야?
‘Who are you?’

b. na-nun ne cengmal po-ki silh-e
I-TC you really see-NOM hate-INT

나는 너 정말 보기 싫어.
‘I really hate to see you.’

Thus, the intimate style is appropriate for conveying the speaker’s feeling, either positive
or negative, most directly. Since this style is used while exchanging emotions, it is found
in very interactive situations between people in close relationships. This style is also
found in soliloquy when the speaker expresses his/her own inner feelings spontaneously.

6.3 The Plain Style

The plain style is generally regarded as the least polite style and is thought to be
used between close friends or people of lower social status. Actually, while the intimate
style can sometimes be used directly with a person of higher social status when the
relationship is very close (Sung, 2007 b), the use of the plain style is generally limited to
people of lower social status in everyday conversation. For this reason, many scholars
classified the plain style as acwu nacchwum ‘very lowering style,’ while the intimate
style as twulwu nacchwum ‘generally lowering style.’ Han (2002) explained that the plain
style is generally used when the speaker is older than the addressee or the interlocutors
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are in a very close relationship. This style is not only found in very casual situations but also found in very authoritative commands and warnings. The following examples could be heard in military.

(6-12)

a. *ppalli an twi-myen kihap-i-ta*
   quickly not run-if punishment-be-PLN

발리 안 뛰면 기함이다.
   If you don’t run fast, you will be punished.

b. *cikum ciphapha-nta*
   now gather-PLN

지금 집합한다.
   You should gather now.

The plain style and the intimate style are often used together in the same situation. While the discussion will focus on the plain style, I will compare these styles in the following sections.

6.3.1 Detached style

As mentioned above, the plain style is used in formal writings such as newspaper articles and scholarly papers. In this case, it is not regarded as a ‘lowering style,’ rather it is seen as neutral in politeness. In the data of this study, this kind of neutral plain style was found in very formal conversations. In the debate programs for this study, conversation participants sometimes switched to the plain style, while mostly speaking in the deferential and the polite styles.
In Line 2 and 3, this person is summarizing his argument in the plain style. He started with the humble pronoun ce ‘I,’ but the sentence ending is the plain style which is classified as non-honorific style. Generally, in everyday conversation, the humble first person pronoun ce is not followed by the plain style. However, in this kind of
institutional context, the plain style ending does not convey non-honorific style, but rather that the speaker is trying to clearly transfer the points of his argument. When the plain style is used in a formal situation like this debate, it is not regarded as an informal style, but as neutral style, as in written genres such as newspapers, scholarly papers and scientific writings.

Structurally, when quoting one’s own or another’s remark indirectly in Korean, the quoted remark is expressed in plain style, followed by a main verb like …-*lako mal hata* ‘say that …’. Namely, an embedded clause for indirect quotation is always realized as the plain style regardless of the speaker’s choice of sentence ending. For this reason, T-Y. Kim (2006) pointed out that the plain style in an embedded clause has neither a respecting nor a lowering function, and argued that the plain style is not intrinsically a lowering style. In the following example, three statements end in plain style, ending as subordinating clauses for the following main clause.

(6-12) From ‘One hundred-minute debate’ (debate program)

1  
*chospwu*l candle.light
*ciphoy-ka* demonstration-NM
*kaci-ko.iss-nun* hold-being-MD
*yektongseng-ul* dynamic-AC

*kyeysokhayse* continuously
*eknwulu-ko* suppress-and
*panghayha-ko* interrupt-and
*pyencilskhi-lye-nun* deteriorate-intend.to-MD

*sito-lul* attempt-AC
*kkunhimepsi* continuously
*ha-ko.iss-nun* do-being-MD
*kes-un* thing-TC
*talum-ani-n* difference-not.be-MD

*cingpuwu-wa* yetang-i-ta  
government-and ruling.party-PLN-DC

詹姆斯：'It is the government and the ruling party who keep suppressing the dynamic power of the Candlelight Protest and are trying to distort the meaning of it.'

2  
*i-ey* this-to
*panhayse* contrary
*chospwulciphoy-uy* candlelight.protest-GEN
*chamyeca-tul-un* participants-PL-TC
*kuleha-n* like that-MD
This person is making his argument in three plain style sentences. Following these statements, he adds “ilehkey yayki tuliko sipheyo ‘I want to say it like this.’” In this way, the last statement can function as the main clause of his previous statements. Because the main verb was uttered in honorific style at the end, and the previous statements were spoken in the plain style, the result is that the speaker sounds like he is quoting written statements. Even though Lines 1-3 could be structurally considered to be subordinate clauses, they could also be functioning as independent sentences and this gives a dry and formal feeling.

The main function of this use of the plain style is to convey the content of what the speaker says without containing any kind of emotion from the speaker. The plain style endings used for this purpose make the statement sound dry. Such use of the plain
style is often found in this kind of institutional talk. The plain style as a detached strategy is sometimes found even without a tense marker in titles of newspaper articles and movies, slogans, signs, catchwords, etc. The example below is a narration from a comedy show program where the discussion topic is changed.

(6-13) From “Happy Hero” (Comedy Show)

" Concern for a support plan for common people’s economy during the high price period."

In this comedy program, there are discussion panels and they talk about social issues in a humorous way. This narration introduces the next discussion topic and the main verb of this statement, *kominha-ta* ‘to concern’ lacks a tense marker. The regular plain style form with the present tense marker for this word is *kominha-n-ta* ‘to concern.’ This usage of the plain style implies that there is no specific recipient for this statement but the message, the information, is just being delivered to unspecified people.

The use of the non-honorific style of Japanese in institutional talk was discussed by Cook (2008). She pointed out that the plain form of Japanese is used differently in ordinary conversation than in institutional talk. Institutional talk includes talk which occurs in courtrooms, church services, political debates, interviews or classrooms (Cook, 2008). Unlike Korean, Japanese has only one non-honorific style, the plain style. However, Cook (2008) distinguished two different types of Japanese plain style: informal speech style and *detached* speech style. According to her, informal speech style is mostly used in casual conversation between people in a close relationship, while the detached
speech style, being devoid of emotion, is found in written genres or institutionalized talk. Regarding the informal speech style, she observed that in casual conversations, most instances of the plain form occur accompanied by affective keys including a sentence-final particle (Cook, 2008). Cook (2008) also argued that the plain style without affective keys only refers to the referential content of the utterance, and she called this the detached speech style. She explained that the plain form used in written genres such as newspaper articles and scientific writing is detached speech style (Cook, 2008: 85). This example is provided here to clarify the case for Korean, Korean detached style having a function similar to what Cook (2008) described.

When the Korean plain style is used in the institutional talk or writings, it is devoid of affect and its function is simply to deliver information. However, when it is used in everyday conversation, it is generally regarded as a non-honorific speech style. The following sections will discuss its use in everyday conversations.

6.3.2 Describing sudden realization

One notable situation where the plain style is used is when the speaker suddenly realizes the on-going situation and describes it to get others’ attention. In the example below, the plain style statement attracts everybody’s attention by highlighting certain facts that the speaker realized in the moment.

(6-14) From ‘Family Outing’ (Comedy Show)

1. Lee: 

내일 아침에 퀴즈 넣겨요?
Will you give us quizzes tomorrow morning?
In this conversation, Lee was having a conversation with Yu, when Lee suddenly realized that someone was snoring and found out who. Actually, her remark was not related to the ongoing conversation, but Lee abruptly described what she realized in that moment, which might have been interesting to other people, too. After realizing the situation, she described it using the plain style, which gave the feeling that she suddenly realized this fact. In this case, the speaker was not talking to specific addressee, but publicly saying to the people around her what she realized.

Praising someone to the public is also sometimes done with the plain style, which calls public attention by describing what the speaker is witnessing.
In this example from a TV show, one of the guests is dancing and other people are cheering for him. The plain style statement canha-nta ‘(He is) doing well!’ sounds like the speaker is delivering what he thinks about the dancing to everybody, including the person who is dancing and bystanders, to praise the dance. The same meaning said in the intimate style, cal han-ey ‘(He is) doing well!’ sounds like the speaker is simply expressing how he feels, but not specifically directing his thoughts to others.

The following example is a similar situation in which the hosts of the show praise the guests as they are performing on stage. The hosts of the show expressed their spontaneous judgment of the singers to praise them in the plain style. In the example below, a group of singers explain how to dance to their song while performing it, while the hosts exclaim their feelings in plain style in Line 4 and 5.
A plain style expression *ippu-ta* in this context sounds like the hosts of this show are exclaiming their feelings, cheering for these singers. While the intimate style exclamatory expressions in a similar case were spoken as if the speakers were talking to themselves, the plain style ones in this case were said in a loud voice to draw others attention to those singers and openly praise them. It is similar to the praise in an above example with an expression like *calhanta* ‘(They/You are) doing well.’ which is in the plain style to cheer for the performers.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the deferential form is also often used for *presenting* one’s feeling in an objective way. The difference between these two styles is that the deferential style is used for presenting oneself in a ritualized way, but with the plain style, the speaker is simply describing the contents. If this expression were spoken in the deferential form to the audience, as in *ippu-pnita*, it would have sounded as if he was
presenting his judgment of the singer’s dance to the audience. If it were said in the polite form with an exclamatory suffix –ney as in ippu-ney-yo, it would have sounded as if he were saying what he felt, trying to sharing his emotion with the audience. If it were spoken in the intimate style, as in ipp-e, it might have sound as if the person were expressing what he felt as he felt it.

The plain style in these examples was used to express the speaker’s sudden realization of certain facts or spontaneous feelings. Noh (2008) examined the plain style ending –ta in casual conversation. Noh supposed that –ta indexes a speaker’s cognitive process of selecting a specific scene from an ongoing situation as the topic of the conversation (Noh, 2008). While the intimate style is often expressed as if one is talking to oneself to express one’s spontaneous feelings, the plain style for such purposes is found to be said loud enough to be heard by listeners. The next section will discuss this matter further.

6.3.3 Presenting one’s spontaneous feelings

As previously mentioned, the Korean plain style is also used as a non-honorific speech style, often mixed with the intimate style. Like the intimate style, the plain style is also often used to express a person’s spontaneous feelings. While the intimate style is used to express one’s emotional states, feelings, etc. as they are, the plain style is used for presenting what the speaker is thinking and/or feeling. The following example is from a comedy show and the use of the plain form shows that the speaker is describing her feeling.
(6-17) From ‘Family Outing’ (Comedy Show)

1  You:  
Pak Yecin ssi-ekey han pyo-lul tuli-kess-supni-ta  
Pak Yecin AH-to one vote-Ac give-will-DEF-DC

박예진씨에게 한 표를 드리겠습니다.  
There goes one vote for Miss Pak, Yecin.

2  sam tay i toy-ss-supni-ta  
three to two become-PST-DEF-DC

3 대 2 됐습니다  
It’s 3 to 2.

3 incey ce-ekey motunkey tallyeiss-nun ke-i-nkayo?  
now me-to everything depend be-MD thing-be-POL

인제 지에게 모두가 달려 있는건가요?  
Is everything on my decision now?

➡️ 4 Lee:  
a kuke cengmal silh-ta  
ah that really dislikable-PLN

아 그게 정말 싫다  
I hate it

5 Yu Caysek-ekey motunkey tallyeiss-nun-ke  
Yu Caysek-to everything dependiss-nun-ke

유채석에게 모두가 달려 있는지  
that everything is depending on Yu Caysek.

In this example, Lee says how she feels about the situation with the plain style. In this case, she could have spoken in the intimate style, too. If this expression had been said in the intimate style as a kuke cengmal silh-e ‘I hate it.’ it may have sounded like the speaker was directly expressing her spontaneous feeling of dislike. The same expression in the plain style sounds like she is presenting her spontaneous internal state.

6.3.4 The core meaning of the plain style

The discussion on the plain style has been based on two different aspects of it. On the one hand, when the plain style is used in formal writings or institutional discourse, it
does not carry affective keys and indexes a detached stance devoid of the writer’s or speaker’s affect. In this case, the sentence only delivers propositional meaning. On the other hand, when it carries affective keys in casual conversation, it is perceived as a non-polite style and is often used to describe the current situation as the speaker is realizing it. It is also often used in spontaneous expressions when the speaker describes his/her ongoing psychological state.

Examples in this section show that the plain style is often used to describe or explain what a speaker realizes or feels in the moment. Yoon (1996) explained that the plain style ending –ta is the most representative ending for explanation in Korean. He mentioned that the –ta ending has been characterized with the features of [+ certainty] and [+ objectivity] and it enables the speaker to deliver the information most objectively. When the speaker deals with propositional information, the [+ certainty] and [+ objectivity] features explain the plain style. However, the plain style is sometimes used for very subjective cases, when expressing one’s spontaneous feeling. In such cases, it seems that a speaker is just describing or explaining his/her feelings.

Therefore, this study suggests that the core meaning of this style can be spontaneous self-presentation. The discourse where the plain style is used is not interactional but is used for simply expressing what the speaker feels or thinks at the moment. While the deferential style is used when the speaker expresses his/her ritualized self, the plain style often used when the speaker simply expresses his feelings and ideas not concerning the relationship among the interlocutors.
6.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, the indexical meanings of the intimate and the polite styles have been discussed. These two styles have been known as non-honorific speech styles, which are used between close friends of similar ages, with younger friends or with little children. They are thought to express similar degrees of politeness and both styles are commonly mixed together within a discourse. It has been often explained that the plain style is formal and the intimate style is informal. However, distinguishing speech styles into formal and informal is not appropriate in that they are often mixed together within one discourse with the same person. Therefore, this chapter has focused on the differences in their indexical meanings.

The most basic function of the intimate style sentence endings is to show the speaker’s thoughts or feelings as they are. They are often accompanied by paralinguistic features or affective keys (Cook, 2008) to express the speaker’s emotional attitudes and grammatical functions. This style is often used for expressing spontaneous feeling. Also, use of the intimate style often indexes that a situation is casual and/or the interlocutors are in a close relationship. When it indexes friendly and casual situation, it sometimes indexes non-seriousness of topic or even joking. Also, speaking in non-polite style, the intimate and the plain styles, as if talking to oneself, is often done when making complaints or being sarcastic. In these cases, even though the speech may be directed to the speaker himself/herself or someone else, the intention of the speech is to let others know about the speaker’s thoughts or feelings. Self-questioning strategy is sometimes
found even in narrative reports where the deferential style is mainly used. In this case, it is a rhetorical strategy to get listeners attention before talking about the next topic.

The plain style is used in written genres such as newspaper articles and scholarly papers. For this purpose, the plain style does not carry affective keys to express a speaker’s feelings or psychological attitude, but it can be regarded as a detached style (Cook, 2008) whose main function is conveying propositional content devoid of speaker’s affect. This kind of usage is also found in institutional talk, which occurs in courtrooms, church services, political debates, interviews and classrooms (Cook, 2008). As in the written genres, there is no connotation of politeness in this usage.

When the plain style is used in an everyday conversation accompanied by affective keys, it is regarded as a non-honorific style. The plain style seems not to carry any politeness connotation because its basic function is just describing or explaining what the speaker realizes or feels in the moment. The plain style is often found when a speaker is trying to bring a specific fact to people’s attention. I propose the core meaning of the plain style is spontaneous self-presentation. Consequently, the plain style endings sometimes sound authoritative and are generally regarded as having the lowest degree of politeness in the speech level system.

As is shown in the above discussion, use of the intimate and plain styles is not limited to non-honorific situations. Even though it has been generally believed that they were non-honorific speech styles, their use can vary depending on the context. The indexical meanings of each speech style will be summarized in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.1 Summary of the Main Points of This Dissertation

This dissertation has explored the use of Korean speech styles in the honorific system and their interpretation in actual conversation in a variety of situations. As the term honorifics suggests, the understanding of honorific forms has been limited mostly to politeness, respect, and social positional differences. The traditional understanding of honorifics has regarded them as linguistic forms that reflect relative social positional difference and has assumed that social structure and language use have a static relationship. However, in actual conversation, the use of honorific styles is more dynamic and people strategically make use of honorific forms to regulate their interpersonal relationships, not always passively following social conventions.

Chapter 1 raised the issue that studies on Korean honorifics have not paid much attention to the social meanings of honorific forms. An indexical perspective on language and speech style shifting phenomena was introduced, followed by the data, method, and plan of this dissertation.

Chapter 2 described the Korean honorific system in general. It emphasized that Korean honorifics are expressed with a combination of several different features, including nouns, verbs, address-referent terms, particles, and sentence endings. Sentence endings are generally classified into six speech styles. Even though these six speech level classifications assume that the degree of politeness is fixed by the sentence ending, various combinations of sentence endings with other honorific features create significant
variation in honorific meaning, which allows Korean speakers to make creative use of honorifics. Additionally, some sentence endings, which have the function of mitigating illocutionary force, are expressed only in two speech styles, marked (polite) and unmarked (intimate), and these endings cannot be used with other speech styles (Sohn, 2007). Even though it has been assumed that there are six speech levels, actual use of honorifics allows many variations of honorific form usage. This chapter suggested that the rich honorific features of Korean make it possible for its speakers to create a range of social meanings that are not limited to honoring others.

Chapter 3 discussed the social constructivists’ views of the relationship between language and society, and the indexical nature of language. Social constructivists assume that people actively create and change their social identities in context, and do not simply follow a fixed social relationship. They also see that social identity is rarely grammaticalized or otherwise explicitly encoded in language (Ochs, 1993). Thus, even though the use of honorific forms appears to mark relative social positional differences, the relationship between those honorific forms and social identity is not static. This view suggests that certain properties of each honorific form often indirectly index social positional differences, but their indexical meanings are not limited to honoring purposes.

Chapter 4 reviewed the studies on speech style shifts in Korean and Japanese. Traditional studies of honorifics regarded speech style shifts as simple stylistic variations or abnormal phenomena. However, recent studies have argued that various social and personal motivations are reflected by speech style shifting. For example, the dynamics of power and solidarity (Yu, 1996), social roles (Cook, 1999a) and social identity (Cook, 1999a, 1999b, 2006) were reviewed. Additionally, Lee (1996) showed that people of
higher social status negotiate and regulate interpersonal relationships. Cook (2006) presented examples in which people of both lower and higher social status redefined social relationships during conversation. Also, psychological boundaries (Strauss & Eun, 1995) and distance and discourse structure (Ikuta, 1983, 2008) were argued to be motivations for speech style shifting. Direction of speech (Makino, 2002) and awareness of the addressee (Maynard, 1991, 1993) were also discussed as factors.

In Chapter 5, discussion focused on the deferential and polite styles. The most basic meaning of the deferential style sentence ending is thought to be ritualized self-presentation. Examples from the data for this study showed that this style indexes public announcements, seriousness, objectivity, and formality. This style is mainly used when people are performing a role such as news anchor, show host, or reporter where the main job is to present to an audience. Thus, the deferential style is most often found in non-interactional situations. On the other hand, the polite style is found in interactive situations. Even though the polite style is found in public presentations, it sounds friendlier and more interactive than the deferential style. This style is also often found when expressing one’s emotional attitude when people are sharing emotions with one another. The polite style is thought to have the direct indexical meaning of soft affective stance.

In Chapter 6, the indexical meanings of non-honorific forms were discussed. The basic function of the intimate style is thought to express the speaker’s thoughts and/or emotions directly. This style was found in exclamatory expressions, conversation participation remarks, situations where a speaker is acting as a close friend, and making a
joke or an indirect complaint. The intimate style is thought to express a speaker’s unfiltered feelings or thoughts most directly.

While the intimate style is often used for expressing one’s emotions, the main function of the plain style is to convey the contents of what the speaker says clearly. When the plain style is found in written texts or in institutional talks, it functions as a detached style which makes the statement sound dry, devoid of the speaker’s emotions. When plain style is used in casual conversation with affective keys, it is used to describe and/or explain what the speaker is realizing or feeling in the moment. Therefore, this study proposed that its core meaning is spontaneous self-presentation.

The discussion of the characteristics of the four speech styles can be summarized as in the Table 7-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- Interactional (impersonal)</th>
<th>+ Interactional (personal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Distance</td>
<td>Deferential style:</td>
<td>Polite style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ritualized self-presentation</td>
<td>Expressing soft affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Distance</td>
<td>Plain style:</td>
<td>Intimate style:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Detached style</td>
<td>Directly expressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Spontaneous self-</td>
<td>speaker’s affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for this study showed that the deferential and the plain style were non-interactional styles. The use of them does not induce immediate response from the
addressee(s). The use of the deferential style indexes that the speaker is doing a ritualized self-presentation while he/she is aware of the existence of the addressee(s) and feeling some psychological distance to the addressee(s). On the other hand, the plain style is used for describing or explaining what the speaker realizes or feels in the moment and the speaker does not feel distance to the addressee(s).

The polite and the intimate styles are often used in interactive conversations while the speakers share feelings for each other. The polite style is thought to express soft affect, while the intimate style is used for directly expressing the speaker’s emotions. When a speaker uses the polite style, he/she is aware of the addressee(s) and feels some psychological distance to the addressee(s). However, the use of the intimate style does not index such distance.

7.2 Implications of This Dissertation for Teaching Korean Learners

This study provides a perspective which allows honorifics to be seen beyond the frame of politeness and/or formality in social structures. When traditional explanations were limited to social structure, there was little chance of considering the various social meanings of honorific forms. Taking an indexical approach, which regards language as an integral part of the social world (Cook, 2008), this study has shown that honorifics can and should be understood in their social contexts. Also, this study has argued that linguistic forms and social identities do not have to be intrinsically related, but may be indirectly indexed in a social context.

Honorifics have been explained in Korean textbooks using the concept of respect and formality, concepts which are too vague and abstract for many KFL learners to
understand. Students have a hard time understanding honorifics since there are so many honorific forms and six speech styles, but the explanation that textbooks have given is overly simple and still unclear. For example, it has been explained that honorifics should be used when addressing esteemed people including parents and other older relatives; older people in general; high officials; and well educated people—teachers, doctors, and other professional people (King & Yeon, 2000). This explanation fails to mention how crucial context is for the choice of the honorific form. Also, students may meet many people who cannot be simply classified into the above categories. For KFL/KSL students, honorifics have been something that had to be learned through a lot of embarrassment resulting from much trial and error. Even advanced learners find it difficult to use appropriate honorifics.

This study implies that understanding the indexical nature of honorific forms will help KFL/KSL students to use honorifics more appropriately. Correct use of honorific forms depends most importantly on social context, so students need to understand the contextual characteristics of a conversation. For example, students may be able to learn genre specific speech styles: Public presentation is generally spoken in the deferential style, and friendly interactions about nonserious topics generally happen in the polite style. Also, students may be able to learn to use –yo after non-verbal elements to make a situation more interactive, softer, and friendlier. It would be helpful if textbooks provided a variety of examples with social contexts including an explanation of the relationship between the contexts and speech styles.

When students learn phatic expressions, they should learn each expression’s most frequent forms connected to situations. This is important because, as discussed in Chapter
5, a single situation may require phatic expressions appearing in different speech styles. The importance of learning pragmatic routines should be emphasized for developing students’ communicative competence (e.g., House, 1996), and they should be learned in their appropriate speech style for each context.

The data for this study is from TV programs, so the nature of the conversations is obviously intended for viewing by television audiences. Therefore, the data may not represent all Korean conversations. The indexical approach provides a tool for understanding linguistic forms in a given context, and does not confine indexical meaning to a limited number of social meanings. Therefore, such an approach makes it possible to interpret many other different indexical meanings from context.
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