Language Socialization in Korean-as-a-Foreign-Language Classrooms

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

Abstract

Within the language socialization framework, the second language (L2) classroom would constitute a powerful context of secondary socialization, particularly when it exists outside the learners' culture of origin. In this paper, first year Korean-as-a-Foreign-Language (KFL) classrooms are viewed as L2 socializing environments in which students are not only learning the target language, but are also being socialized into particular Korean sociocultural interactive norms. The study analyzes teacher–student interaction in two American college-level KFL classes in light of language socialization perspectives. The analysis illustrates that teacher–student interactions are consistent with hierarchism (Byon, 2004; Sohn, 1986), which is one of the major cognitive value orientations of Korean culture. The result contrasts with English-as-a-Second-Language settings (Poole, 1992) in which English teachers try to minimize the status differences between themselves and students.

Language socialization is a newly emerging area of study that concerns the process in which a language learner, either a child or an adult, acquires the communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) of a target language, and the function of the language in the process. Language socialization claims that the unconscious display of implicit cultural notions through language will foster socio-pragmatic competence in novices. The theoretical underpinning of this study is language socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In the language socialization perspective, the relationship between expert (e.g., caregivers, teachers) and novice (e.g., children, students) is critical in that the expert plays a key role in the socialization of the novice, and in the process, the language is the key means of socialization. Natural conversational data between an expert and a novice (e.g., between a caregiver and infants or children in the first language [L1] home settings; or between teachers and students in L1 or second language [L2] school settings) have been primary sources of data in socialization studies.

As a language socialization study, this paper examines the ways in which sociocultural meanings are transmitted through classroom interactional routines in the Korean-as-a-Foreign-Language (KFL) classroom setting. In particular, the focus of the analysis is on initiation, response, and follow-up (IRF) routine, which is a major interactional routine of foreign language classrooms (Mehan, 1985; Ohta, 1994; van Lier, 1988). An initiation turn can be a greeting, a question and/or a drill prompt; a response turn can be an answer and/or a response; a follow-up turn can be an evaluation or a comment. In classroom interaction, learners' participation in IRF routines tend to be limited to the response turns, especially in teacher-fronted classroom settings (van Lier, 1988), whereas initiation turns and follow-up turns are normally dominated by teachers.

This paper uses transcripts of teacher–student conversations in two college-level KFL classrooms, and the focus of the analysis is on the teacher talk found in the IRF routines. The qualitative analysis of the teacher talk in the routines will provide KFL educators and researchers with insights into potential socializing roles of teacher talk, framed in classroom routines. The following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the sociocultural messages conveyed through the teacher talk in the KFL classroom?
2. How does the classroom discourse reflect the socio-cultural messages?

Literature Review

Language Socialization Studies in Second Language Settings

Language socialization research has tended to focus on three topics: L1 socialization in a home setting; L1 socialization in a school setting; and L2 socialization in a school setting. As language socialization emphasizes the importance of crosslinguistic studies, the studies with the following various issues have been conducted on different languages such as Japanese, Chinese, Samoan, and American English. Topics include the interactional organization of teacher's directives (He, 2000), communicative style (Clancy, 1986), affective stance (Clancy, 1999; Suzuki, 1999), interactional routines (Nakamura, 1996), social relationships (Ervin-Tripp, 1988), status difference (Anderson, 1986; Platt, 1986), language socialization through particular linguistic features (Cook, 1990, 1997; Platt, 1986; Suzuki, 1999), and L1 socialization in school settings (Cook, 1999). Recently, studies on L2 socialization in school settings have also been conducted (He, 2000; Kanagy, 1999; Ohta, 1994, 1999, 2001; Poole, 1992; Yoshimi, 1999). However, as it is still a newly emerging area of study, the number of language socialization studies that deal with the Korean language has been limited (e.g., Byon, 2003; Park & King, 2003). Moreover, to date there has been no single language socialization research attempted in college-level KFL classroom settings.

Language socialization can occur either implicitly or explicitly. Implicit language socialization occurs when learners come to perceive sociocultural meaning transmitted to them indirectly through conversation. On the other hand, explicit language socialization takes place when experts (either teachers or caregivers) overtly convey sociocultural meanings to learners. According to Cook (1990), implicit socialization may be more effective than explicit socialization, since learners or novices cannot readily contradict the way in which language is used in society, whereas they can challenge an explicit mention of some norm of society.[1]

The Role of Interactional Routines in Adult L2 Acquisition Contexts

An interactional routine is "a sequence of exchanges in which one speaker's utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants" (Peters & Boggs, 1986, p. 81). Interactional routines are culturally structured mediums of expression, and they are prevalent in daily human communication (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). From L2 pedagogical perspectives, interactional routines play important roles in socializing learners into L2 communicative norms (Johnson, 1995; Ochs, 1988; van Lier, 1996). For instance, by nature routines are repetitive and highly predictable in their usages. This in turn promotes language acquisition by assisting students in understanding the relationship between linguistic forms and socio-pragmatic meanings.

Ohta (2001) discusses the following steps of language socialization in L2 classroom settings. In the beginning stage, learners' participation in the routines with experts is limited (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this stage, learners are simply peripheral observers (Ohta, 1999). However, with the help of experts (e.g., scaffolding) and increasing exposure to routines, learners gradually begin to learn the meaning of a routine, its purpose, and how to participate appropriately (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). As learners' participation increases, they establish a deeper understanding of cultural meanings implicit in routines (e.g., the roles of social variables, such as power and solidarity). Gradually, learners gain the ability to use these routines for their own purposes (Wertsch, 1985).

Poole (1992) interprets adult English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) classroom discourse in terms of language socialization perspectives and argues that the EFL classroom interaction between teachers and students consists of white middle class American caregivers and children' interactional styles. Experts help novices to perform beyond their current competence levels through scaffolding (Ochs, 1986).[2]

The follow-up turn of IRF routines, in which the instructor's evaluation or comments occur, has been central to previous L2 studies (Ohta, 1999, 2001). Depending on the content of the response turn, the content of the follow-up turn can be an indication of comprehension, evaluation, alignment, and

confirmation-seeking. Ohta (1999) investigates IRF routines in college-level Japanese-as-a-Foreign-Language (JFL) classroom settings. She argues that JFL learners are perceptive to pragmatic knowledge implicitly and explicitly delivered to them through the routines. Asserting that L2 acquisition takes place as JFL students participate in interactional routines, she proposes that adults and children acquire interactional routines in a similar way. She notes that learners, as peripheral observers, are socialized into target cultural norms, even if they do not participate actively in the routine. Ohta (2001) asserts that L2 socialization, through the learners' participation in interactional routines, can take place both in naturalistic contexts and L2 classroom settings. She shows how L2 instructors regularly employ routines in their teaching. For instance, teachers can introduce new expressions and use them repetitiously in classroom practices in order to help students be socialized into the L2 usage and norm of the expression. Meanwhile, He (2000) analyzes the recurrent patterns of Chinese-as-a-Heritage-Language (CHL) teachers' directives in CHL schools in the Unites States. She argues that the recurrent patterns of teachers' directive, which can be viewed as a routine interaction in any L2 classroom, are in fact an effective socialization tool, through which the teacher can transmit cultural value to the student.

Korean Socialization Studies

In contrast to the prolific number of L2 studies, the number of socialization studies that investigate the Korean classroom discourse based on language socialization perspectives is scarce.[3] The limited number of these socialization studies includes Park and King (2003) and Byon (2003).

Park and King (2003) discuss how Korean American children are socialized into collectivistic and hierarchical value orientations of Korean culture in their L1 home settings. For instance, Korean American children are often instructed by the Korean-speaking family members in their homes that they need to show proper respect, deference, and a sense of hierarchy by using proper linguistic politeness (e.g., honorifics) when they interact with elders. However, when these children enter American schools (e.g., kindergarten or elementary school), they may face problems in adjusting to new classroom cultures. In other words, what these Korean Americans learned at home may not correspond to the ways of interacting that are valued in L2 school settings. Park and King argue that teachers should consider what their students (e.g., Korean American children) can bring to school. Although Park and King's argument is insightful and thought-provoking, their study is not based on empirical findings. The study instead focuses on discussing the kind of L2 pedagogical implications one can gain from L1 language socialization perspectives.

In a previous study (Byon, 2003), I investigated the use of the sentence-ending particle *yo* in the teacher–student's conversational data of Korean-as-a-Heritage-Language (KHL) classrooms setting from the perspective of

language socialization. Data examined were from classroom discourse in Korean language and culture schools in Honolulu, Hawaii, which only operated on weekends, offering KHL courses for Korean American K–12 students. I noted that because the status of the teacher is higher than that of the student, the use of *yo* by the teachers towards the students in the classroom is not to indicate politeness. Analyzing the teacher–student's spontaneous conversations with a special focus on teacher talk, I argued that *yo* is a powerful tool of socialization, which the teachers convey to their students, explicitly and implicitly, two important sociocultural norms of Korean: (a) It is important to show some extent of respect verbally by using the polite speech level, when one addresses someone who has a higher status (that is either determined by ascribed variables, such as age and kinship, or achieved variables such as occupational ranks); and (b) it is appropriate to speak politely when one addresses the public. I reported that the teachers use the *-e* form, which is the intimate speech level ender (e.g., without the *yo* form), when addressing students individually but use the *yo* form when addressing the whole class.

More studies are needed to appreciate the full socializing dynamics of the Korean language classroom discourse. Findings, as in other studies (e.g., Byon, 2003), are usually based on a limited context which is the K–12 Korean language classrooms of weekend Korean culture school settings, in which the majority of the students are Korean American children with strong heritage backgrounds. Further studies are needed to examine whether teachers' talks are different between KHL classroom settings and college-level KFL settings. There are no language socialization studies that investigate Korean classroom discourse in college-level KFL classroom settings, where the target subjects are non-heritage students.

Korean Cognitive Value Orientation

Previous studies (Byon, 2004, 2005; Sohn, 1986) support that Koreans and Americans have distinctively different cognitive cultures, which underlie intercultural communication between them.[4] Sohn (1986) asserts that Americans are, relatively speaking, more egalitarian, individualistic, direct, practical, and rational than Koreans, and Koreans are more hierarchical, collectivistic, indirect, formalistic, and emotionalistic than Americans.

I investigated how these values are reflected in the Korean speech act of request (Byon, 2004). Fifty KFL learners were asked to respond in Korean to 12 different situations in which they carry out the speech act of request. Their Korean performances were compared to those of 50 Korean native speakers in order to identify deviations and problems which American KFL learners were confronted with when trying to acquire this particular communicative function. Fifty American English native speakers also participated in order to provide baseline intracultural data as a possible source of the learners' deviant realization behaviors from target norms. Collected from a Discourse Completion

Task, the data were analyzed descriptively in terms of socio-pragmatic aspects. On the whole, the request formulae usage patterns of the respective groups support a stereotypical description of Koreans as being more hierarchical, collectivistic, roundabout, and formalistic in comparison to Americans. In addition, the semantic formulae usage patterns of the KFL learners were consistent with those of the American English native speakers, indicative of an L1 transfer effect. In another study (Byon, 2005), similar findings were indicated in the socio-pragmatic features of Korean apology: Koreans reflect a much stronger power-sensitivity than American English native speakers, and the distance variable seems to take precedence over the power variables in America.

Method

The Study Setting and Subjects

The KFL student population of this U.S. college setting consisted of two distinctive groups: heritage and non-heritage students. According to Sohn (1995), KFL heritage students are those who have acquired the Korean language from their family members, as well as the Korean community in which they reside. Consequently, they are to some degree bilingual (with individual variations) in English and Korean. Their Korean proficiency, however, may be characterized by underdeveloped literacy due to the lack or absence of formal language instruction and limited knowledge in oral components (listening and speaking).[5] Non-heritage students are those who have started to learn Korean as a foreign language through formal KFL instruction as true beginners without any previous language or cultural learning experience.

Motivational factors of heritage students taking Korean-language courses are, in general, threefold: (a) to maintain and promote their cultural and linguistic heritage, (b) to fulfill the foreign language requirement, and (c) to get an easy passing grade, wrongly perceiving that a Korean class would be easier than other foreign language courses. On the other hand, motivational factors of non-heritage students can be instrumental (e.g., Korean language as a means for pursuing one's own academic interests or major), and integrative (e.g., students who are merely interested in learning about the culture and language for personal reasons).

The participants of this study were American KFL students taking Korean 101 (Elementary Korean I, the first semester of the first year the KFL course was offered in the fall semester) and 102 (Elementary Korean II, the second semester of the first year the KFL course was offered the following spring semester). The overall course objective of elementary Korean is to provide students with basic conversational and grammatical elements, assuming that the students have had little or no previous background knowledge of Korean.

For Korean 101, 18 KFL students participated in this study.[6] As Table 1 shows, they are all non-heritage students with different native languages: English (17 students) and Japanese (1 student). None of these students had formal Korean language training prior to taking this course. The group consisted of 8 males and 10 females, and 22 being the average age. The only Korean descendants among these students are two Korean adoptees and two Korean American students. The two Korean adoptees were adopted by American families when they were infants, and Korean 101 was their first exposure to the Korean

Table 1
Students' Background

Student	Ethnic background	Native language	Gender
1	European American	English	M
2	European American	English	M
3	European American	English	F
4	European American	English	F
5	European American	English	F
6	European American	English	M
7	Hispanic American	English/Spanish	F
8	Afro American	English	M
9	Korean adoptee	English	F
10	Korean adoptee	English	M
11	Korean American	English	F
12	Korean American	English	F
13	Japanese American	English	M
14	Chinese American	English	M
15	Chinese American	English	M
16	Chinese American	English	F
17	Chinese American	English	F
18	Japanese	Japanese	F

language. In addition, the two Korean American students were identified as non-heritage students based on their low Korean proficiency and their limited contact with the Korean culture. At the time of entrance, these students' Korean proficiency was almost non-existent like other non-heritage students. Although they were second-generation Korean Americans, both were from English-speaking Korean families in rural American towns, where the contact with Korean culture and language is rare.

From Korean 102, 16 students participated in the study. Fifteen of them were from Korean 101. The only student who was newly placed in 102 was an European American student, who acquired some basic knowledge of the Korean language during his military career in Korea.

The instructors for these two classes differed. Korean 101 was taught by Teacher K, and Korean 102 by Teacher L. They were female native speakers of Korean who were raised in Korea. Both had graduate degrees in either applied linguistics or in Korean Studies, and each had five years of KFL teaching in U.S. college settings.

Data Collection

Both Korean 101 and 102 were worth five credits, and the classes met for 55 minutes Monday through Friday. Classes were divided into two parts: 2 hours of lectures and 3 hours of recitation sections. Lectures include explanations of conversational patterns in grammatical and pragmatic terms. Recitation sections provide students opportunities to practice in actual communicative situations with various tasks and activities. I observed the Wednesday class and audio taped the sessions. I chose the Wednesday class for data collection because the Wednesday session had more teacher–student interaction than Monday and Friday. Although Monday and Friday were also designated for recitation, other non-interactional activities, such as dictation practices, quizzes, and homework or quiz reviews, took place on those days.

Each semester lasted approximately 15 weeks, and I observed and audio-taped three lessons during the fall semester (Korean 101) and another three lessons during the spring semester (Korean 102). Audio-recordings were collected through the use of a recorder placed in the center of the class. I sat to the side or back, observing and taking notes regarding participants, interaction, spatial organization, and type of lesson. Because of my familiarity with both students and teachers, my presence did not intrude on the nature of the class activity.

Six classes were audio-taped throughout the academic year, in September (the third week of 101), October (the ninth week of 101), and December (the 14th week of 101) in the fall semester, and in February (the third week of 102), March (the ninth week of 102), and May (the 14th week of 102) of the following year. I transcribed the audiotapes, using the Yale Romanization system for Korean which was used in class.

Analysis

Implicit Socialization

Assertive directives

According to Searle (1976), a request or directive formula can be more or less direct, and it can be assessed in terms of assertiveness. For example, Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) developed eight strategy types for English requests which ranged in accordance with their assertiveness levels (see Table 2).

Applying Blum-Kullka et al.'s (1989) categories, Byon (in press) proposed the following five assertiveness scales of Korean directive. These strategies are arranged from *the most assertive* (1) to *the least assertive* (6), based on the degree of illocutionary transparency. The criterion for deciding the assertiveness level is the length of the inferential process one needs to identify a token as a directive. The most transparent strategy is the "basic directive" (e.g., imperative) and the least assertive pattern is "hint," whose illocutionary force is not indicated by any conventional verbal means and hence demands a higher inferential process:

Table 2

Strategy Types for English Requests

Level of directness	Strategy	Example
Direct	1. Mood-derivable	You shut up
	2. Performative	I am telling you to shut up.
	3. Hedged performative	I would like to ask you to shut up.
	4. Locution-derivable (want)	I want to shut up.
Conventionally indirect	5. Suggestory formula	Let us play a game.
	6. Query-preparatory	Can you draw a horse for me?
Non-conventionally indirect	7. Strong hint	This game is boring.
	8. Mild hint	We've been playing this game for over an hour now.

Basic directive: The grammatical mood of the locution conventionally determines its illocutionary force as a directive, and the exemplary form is the imperative

(1) *Pilly-e cwu-e!*
Borrow give-INT[7]
"Lend it to me!"

Performative: Utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named

(2) *Pwuthak hay.*
Favor do
"I ask for your help."

Query basic directive: The grammatical mood of the locution conventionally determines its illocutionary force as a directive, but with a question mark

(3) *Pillye cwu-l-lay?*
Borrow give-will-Q
"Will you lend it to me?"

Suggestion: Utterances which contain a suggestion to do something

(4) *Computer com pillye cwu-ci*
Computer little borrow give-SUP
"How about lending me (your) computer?"

Ellipsis: An elliptical syntactic structure that omits a main clause

(5) *Pil-lye-to toy-l-kka hay-se*
Borrow-though become-wonder if Q-do-so
"Wondering if I can borrow (it, so I came to ask you)."

Hint: Similar to preparatory, but not conventionalized, requires more supposition

(6) *Ne ecey swuep-ey ka-ss-ci?*
You yesterday class-to go-PST-SUP
"You attended the class yesterday, right?" (as a way of asking indirectly for a note).

It should be noted that the degree of honorific meaning of these directives depends on the level at which Korean honorific elements (e.g., speech level, honorific suffix, euphemistic words, and various addressee-terms, including humble and plain personal pronouns) are employed in a sentence structure. For example, (2) is the directive used by a speaker when making a request to someone with either lower status (e.g., close junior) or equal status (e.g., best friend). We understand these power and distance relationships because of the use of the intimate speech level ender *-e*, and the absence of other honorific elements. Conversely, the honorific meaning of the same request can be raised,

without any change in its assertiveness level, by replacing the intimate speech level with other polite speech levels, such as -*yo* "the informal polite level" and -*sipsio* "the deferential level," as well as adding the aforementioned honorific elements.

In this study, the most frequently used directive structure was -*(u)sey-yo* form, which belongs to the most assertive category (Byon, in press)

Example 1 (K101)[8]

1. Teacher K: *Acwu kkaykkus-hay-yo. Ca, coh-a-yo. Kulem. Lisa-nun? Lisa pang-un?*
   Very clean-do-POL well good-POL then Lisa-TC Lisa room-TC
   "Very clean. Well, good. Then, how about you, Lisa? How about yours?"

2. Lisa:*Acwu kkaykkus-hay-yo.*
   Very clean-do-POL
   "Very clean."

3. Teacher K: *Kulay-yo? Ca ipen-eyn nwuka hay po-l-kka? Andrew! Andrew pang-un ettay-yo?*
   So-POL Well this time-at who try-shall-Q Andrew Andrew room-TC how POL
   "Is that so? Well who should I ask this time? Andrew! How about your room?"

4. Andrew: *Khu-ta?*
   Big-DC
   "Big?"

5. Teacher K: *A, ney, khe-yo? Kulem* ***mwul-e-po-sey-yo****. Wei-hanthey! Andrew ka* ***mwul-e-po-sey-yo****. Khun-ci.*
   Ah, yes, big-POL Then ask-see-SH-INT-POL Wei-to Andrew-NM ask-see-SH-INT-POL whether big
   "Oh, is it big? Okay, then. Ask Wei, whether her room is also big."

In this example, Teacher K asks students to comment on their rooms. In line 1, Teacher K initiates the routine, asking Lisa to comment on her room. In line 3, the teacher acknowledges Lisa's response (line 2) and initiates another routine by asking Andrew the same question. In line 4, Andrew responds that his room is big. In line 5, the teacher acknowledges Andrew's response and initiates the next sequence by directing Andrew to ask another student, Wei.

The frequent use of the assertive directive can be attributed to the hierarchical value orientation in Korean culture and language (Byon, 2004; Sohn, 1986). Historically speaking, Korean culture is influenced by Confucian values, which have validated a hierarchical class system, honoring deference

and submissiveness to authority. In Korean culture, imposing on or not giving an option to the addressee is often natural, and generally polite on two conditions; namely, when the addressee is an in-group inferior person, or when the speech act is in the interest of the addressee (Sohn, 1988). Consequently, Koreans may prefer assertive request formulae over less assertive formulae, if (a) the speaker is in a position of authority or power, (b) interlocutors are intimate with one another, and/or (c) the speech act benefits the addressee (Byon, 2004). By giving assertive directives, the teacher implicitly indicates that she is in the position of authority.[9]

This result contrasts with findings of previous socialization studies (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Poole, 1992) done in English. For instance, since directives are "face-threatening acts" (Brown & Levinson, 1987), English native speaking ESL teachers tend to minimize the status difference between themselves and students. ESL/EFL teachers often use first personal plural pronouns when initiating or urging students to perform a task. By using these inclusive pronouns, experts convey an implicit message that the teacher and the student complete the task together. This in turn minimizes the power difference between teachers and students (Poole, 1992). The attempt to downplay the vertical relationship is further indicated by speaking. For instance, English teachers tend to use pauses, false starts and filler words when initiating requesting sequences to indicate an uneasiness in giving directives.

Personal pronouns

The most frequently used first person pronoun by teachers was *sensayng-nim* [teacher-HT] (310 occasions), followed by *ce* "the first person humble pronoun" (49 occasions).

Example 2 (K101)

1. Teacher K: ***Sensayng-nim****-un sayngil-i sa-wel-in-tey, James, James -nun sayngil-i myechil-iey-yo?*
   Teacher-HT-TC birthday-NM April-but James James-TC birthday-NM what date-be-POL
   "My birthday is April. How about you, James? When is your birthday?"
2. James: . . .
3. Teacher K: *Sayngil-i-yo. Kulem ca, Susan-un-yo?*
   Birthday-POL then well Susan-TC-POL
   "Then, well, Susan, how about your birthday?"
4. Susan: *Sa wel kwu il.*
   4 month 9 day
   "April 9th."

5. Teacher K: *Sa wel kwu il iyo? A,* ***sensayng-nim*** *sayngil-to sa-wel-iey-yo.* ***Sensayng-nim****-un isipchil il-iey-yo*.
   4 month 9 day POL Ah, teacher-HT birthday-also April-POL
   Teacher-HT-TC 27 day-POL
   "April 9th? Oh, My birthday is also in April. My birthday is the 27th."

In this initial turn (line 1), Teacher K uses the occupational term *sensayng-nim* to refer to herself. The teacher uses it again as the first person possessive pronoun in line 5. By using the occupational term, the teacher explicitly indicates the status difference between herself and the students.

In hierarchical Korean society, power difference is embedded in the interlocutors' social status, often denoted by his or her occupational title (e.g., *kyoswu-nim* [professor-HT]). The extensive use of the occupational title terms as the first person pronoun by the KFL teachers can be explained using the notion of face. According to Sohn (1988), due to strong collectivism, *cheymyen* "face or self-image in relation to other" is highly valued in Korean language. In addition, an individual's need to express moral sense, which regards role and place, is an important aspect of face in Korean culture (Byon, 2004). By using the occupational titles as the first person pronouns, the teachers highlight their status differences and deliver the cultural message (hierarchism) to students.

The students' use of *sensayng-nim* as an address term was common. This is due to the fact that Teacher K instructed her students to call her *sensayng-nim* in the very beginning of the semester.

Example 3 (K101)

1. Teacher K: *Ca, al-keyss-ci-yo? Kulem cilmwun iss-e-yo?*
   Well know-SUP-POL Then question have-INT-POL
   "Well, did you understand? Then, do you have any questions?"
   Ca kulem, workbook *phalsipo* page *po-sey-yo phalsipo* page. *Ca ese*.
   Well then, workbook 85 page see- SH-INT-POL 85 page well hurry
   "Well, then, please open page 85 of the workbook! Page 85 hurry!"

2. Ray: ***Sensayng-nim****,* can I go to restroom?
   Teacher-HT
   "Professor, Can I go to the restroom?"

3. Teacher K: *Ney hwacangsil. Ppali ka-ss-ta-o-sey-yo.*
   Yes restroom Hurry go-PST come-SH-INT-POL
   "Sure, restroom. Please come right back."

Example 3 is from the second data (taken on the fifth week of Korean 101), Teacher K is asking the class to open up the page 85 of the workbook. Ray raises his hand, asking for a permission to go to the restroom. Ray asks for permission in English, but uses the Korean occupational title to address the instructor. In line 3, the teacher acknowledges the request of the student and offers the Korean word for "restroom." Then, she gives permission to the student.

Assertive sentence-final suffix

Most of the teacher talk ended in informal polite speech levels (e.g., the *yo* form). The use of the deferential form *-sup-ni-ta* appeared in only four occasions in the greeting routines, such as *onul-un iman hakeyss-sup-ni-ta* "we will finish here." Korean sentence-final suffixes, in general, determine the sentence-type in formal speech styles (e.g., *supnita*); however, in informal speech styles (e.g., *yo*), the suffixes indicate the speaker's attitudes (e.g., affective stances and assessment of the situation) toward the referential message of the utterance conveyed to the addressee (Lee, 1991).[10]

In classroom discourse, the most frequently used sentence-final suffix by teachers was *-e* (41%), followed by *-ci* (28%) and *-ney* (9%). These are frequent in ordinary Korean conversation. Without these, conversation cannot flow smoothly. Previous studies (e.g., Lee, 1991) identified *-e* as the unmarked and most basic informal sentence-final suffix, the function of which is to convey the information of the speaker directly to the addressee. The suffix is used in the straightforward exchange of information both in declarative as well as interrogative contexts. In addition, Lee argues that an indexical meaning of the suffix (*-e*) is assertion. By using this suffix, instead of other informal suffixes (e.g., *-ci* and *-ney*), the speaker indicates that the information delivered belongs to the speaker's territory. On the other hand, the function of *-ci* is to call forth agreements or to obtain affirmation about what the speaker believes to be true. The English equivalent is "is that right?" or "…isn't it?" The function of *-ney* is to indicate the speaker's momentary reactions, such as surprise and sympathy, to some new information.

Teachers used these suffixes in the IRF routines. In the data, teachers employed various types of follow-up turns, such as evaluating students' performance and seeking confirmation, both in interacting with individual students and with the whole class. The three most frequently used evaluation tokens included

(1) *Cal hay-ss-**e**-yo!* (564 occasions)
Well do-PST-INT-POL
"Well done."

(2) *Cal hay-ss-**ci**-yo!* (251 occasions)
Well do-PST-SUP-POL
"Well done, isn't it?"

(3) *Cal hay-ss-**ney**-yo!* (79 occasions)
Well do-PST-AP-POL
"Well done (to my surprise)!"

These are declarative sentences (e.g., evaluation) but with different indexical meanings (e.g., conveying one's message in an assertive tone, seeking confirmation, or expressing surprise). The following is a typical IRF routine, commonly found in the data. Notice that the teacher's utterances contain the suffix -*e,* which renders the utterances assertive.

Example 4 (K102)

1. Teacher L: *Kulem, Jacob-i* ***hay-po-sey-yo***.
   Then, Jacob-NM do-see-SH-INT-POL
   "Then, Jacob, please try to do it."

2. Jacob: *Pi-ka o-nun-tey . . . . Umbrella?*
   Rain-NM come-but umbrella
   "It rains. . . . Umbrella?"

3. Teacher L: *Wusan?*
   Umbrella
   "Umbrella?"

4. Jacob: *Wusan-i eps-e-yo. Wusan iss-e-yo?*
   Umbrella-NM do not have-POL Umbrella-have-INT-POL
   "I don't have an umbrella. Do you have one?"

5. Teacher L: *Acwu* ***cal hay-ss-e-yo!***
   Very well do-PST-INT-POL
   "Very well done!"

   Ca kulem Jamie-ka Susan-hanthey mwul-e-po-sey-yo.
   Well then Jamie-NM Susan-to ask-see-SH-INT-POL
   "Well then Jamie, ask Susan."

The class is practicing requests, using *issta* [have] and *epsta* [do not have]. In line 1, Teacher L asks Jacob to make a request (e.g., borrowing an umbrella). In line 2, Jacob has difficulty finding a target word, *wusan*. In the follow-up turn (line 3), the teacher offers the target word for umbrella in Korean using a form of scaffolding. The student performs successfully (line 4). In line 5, the teacher evaluates the student's performance.

Explicit Socialization

Language socialization may be explicit when teachers overtly transmit sociocultural knowledge to students. The value of hierarchism is most clearly

reflected in Korean honorifics. Consequently, explicit socialization of this Korean cognitive value orientation takes place during the explicit instruction of the Korean honorifics.

The use of -(u)si

In Example 5, Teacher L socializes a student in the proper use of Korean honorific suffix *-(u)si*: One has to add the suffix to a verb stem when the subject is honored by the speaker because he or she is older in age, and/or higher in social status, or simply out of courtesy.

Example 5 (K102)

1. Teacher L: *Kulem, ilpone swuep-un sensayng-nim-i nwukwu-**sey**[11]-yo?*
   Then, Japanese class-TC teacher-HT-NM who-be-SH-INT-POL
   "Then, who is the Japanese language professor?"
2. John: *Ilpone-nun Yuka-sensei-ka kalucye-yo.*
   Japanese-TC Yuka-teacher (Japanese)-NM teach-INT-POL
   "Yuka-sensei teaches Japanese."
3. Teacher L: *Yuka-sensayng-nim-i kaluci-**sey**-yo. Tasi hanpen!*
   Yuka teacher-HT-NM teach-SH-INT-POL again one time
   "Professor Yuka teaches. One more time!"
4. John: *Kaluci-**sey**-yo*
   Teach-SH-INT-POL
   "She teaches."
5. Teacher L: *Ney, acwu cal hay-ss-e-yo.*
   Yes, very well do-PST-INT-POL
   "Right, very well done."

In line 1, Teacher L initiates the routine by asking John the name of the Japanese professor. Notice that the teacher is using *-u(si)* when referring to the Japanese professor. In the following response turn, John's failure to observe the rule of honorific elements indicates that he is less conscious of social stratification embedded in the language than Korean native speakers are. Noticing the error, in line 3 the teacher offers the correct example and asks John to repeat the correct utterance. In line 4, John responds in the explicitly instructed form, and Teacher L evaluates John's response with an assertive tone (e.g., using the suffix *-e*) in line 5.

Now, the students' use of the suffix was also analyzed to better observe whether the students were indeed socialized to the use of the suffix. In the data, the students displayed two types of patterns in using the suffix. The first is found in the use of fixed expressions or social formulae (e.g., greeting formulae). For instance, the greeting routines found in the data included

(1) *Annyeng ha-**sey-**yo?*
Peace do-SH-INT-POL
"How are you?"

(2) *Annyenghi ka-**sey**-yo.*
Peacefully go-SH-INT-POL
"Good bye (literally, please go peacefully)."

Students' use of the suffix in using these social formulae is involuntary, since the suffix is part of the greeting routines.

The second pattern is the voluntary use of the suffix to indicate deference to the addressee or the subject of the utterance. The following example illustrates such an incidence:

Example 6 (K102)

1. Teacher L: *Joyce-nun-yo? Halwu-ey coffee myech can masye-yo? Myech can?*
   Joyce-TC-POL day-at coffee how many cup drink-POL How many cup
   "How about you, Joyce? How many cups of coffee do you drink a day? How many cups?"
2. Joyce: *Han cup masye-yo.*
   One cup drink-POL
   "I drink one cup."
3. Teacher L: *A, han-can masye-yo? Han-can pakk-ey an masye-yo? Kulem Danny-nun?*
   Oh, one-cup drink-POL One-cup only don't drink-POL Then, Danny-TC
   "Oh, you drink a cup? Only a cup? Then, how about Danny?"
4. Danny: *E-* [unintelligible sound]
5. Alita: *Sensayng-nim-un coffee masi-**sey**-yo? Manhi?*
   Teacher-HT-TC coffee drink-SH-INT-POL A lot
   "How about you, Professor? Do you drink it? A lot?"
6. Teacher L: *Ney sensayng-nim-un han ney-can cengto? Mom-ey body-ey anh coh-ci-yo?*
   Yes, teacher-HT-TC about 4-cups about Body-at body-at not good-SUP-POL
   "Yes, I drink about four cups. It is not good for the body, right?"

In this example, Teacher L is making students practice the use of *can* [the counter for cup]. In line 1, the teacher is asking each student to answer how many cups of coffee they normally drink in a day. In line 3, the teacher evaluates Joyce's response in line 2, and then asks another student, Danny. However, in line 4, Danny murmurs and does not reply. Then, in line 5, Alita joins the conversation, asking the same question to the teacher. Notice that Alita uses the honorific suffix in asking the question to the teacher. In line 6, the teacher responds and makes comments on her own reply.

Pronouns: ce versus na

Example 7 shows another case of explicit socialization. Students are socialized into a sociocultural norm that one has to use the humble person pronoun whenever he or she speaks to someone of higher status.

Example 7 (K101)

1. Teacher K: *Swuep hwu-ey eti* ***kal-ke-yey-yo****?*
   Class after-at where go-intend-POL
   "Where will you go after class?"

2. John: ***Na****-to tosekwan-ey kal-ke-yey-yo.*
   I (plain)-too library-to go-intend-POL
   "I will go to the library too."

3. Teacher K: ***Na-****to****?***
   I (plain)-too
   "Me too?"

4. Aileen: ***Ce-****to****?***
   I (humble)-too
   "Me too?"

5. Teacher K: *Nay,* ***ce****-to tosekwan-ey kal-ke-yey-yo.*
   Yes I (humble)-too library-to go-intend-POL
   "Right. I will go to the library too."

6. John: ***Ce****-to tosekwan-ey kal-ke-yey-yo.*
   I (humble)-too library-to go-intend-POL
   "I will go to the library too."

In this routine, Teacher K is drilling students in the use of *-(u)l ke yey-yo* (probability ending).[12] The teacher asks each student to try out the pattern, asking where he or she would go after class. It is John's turn to respond in line 2. However, John responds, using *na* (the plain first person pronoun). In the follow-up turn (line 3), Teacher K echoes John's use of the plain form, signaling that the response is not in the correct form. In line 4, Aileen intervenes by

saying the correct form. In line 5, the teacher recasts John's response with *ce* (the humble person pronoun). In line 6, John utters the correct form.

The students' use of the humble pronoun was also analyzed to observe whether the students were socialized to the use of the humble pronoun. Example 8 shows one incident where the student used the humble form.

Example 8 (K102)

1. Teacher L: *Ipen hakki myech kwamok tul-u-sey-yo?*
   This semester how many classes take-SH-POL
   "How many classes do you take this semester?"

2. Rachel: *O-kwamok tul-eyo.*
   Five classes take-POL
   "I take five classes."

3. Teacher L: *A, tases-kwamok? Tases-kwamok-ina tul-eyo?*
   Oh, five- classes Five-classes-as many as take-POL
   "Oh, five classes? You take as many as five classes?"

4. Teacher L: *Kulem tto nwuka hay-pol-kka-yo? Terrence-nun-yo?*
   Then again who do-will-Q-POL Terrence-TC-POL
   "Then, who wants to answer this time? How about you, Terrence?"

5. Terrence: ***Ce****-to tases. . . .*
   Me (humble) -too five
   "I also take five. . . ."

6. Teacher L: *Terrence-to tases-kwamok-ina tul-eyo? Wa, pappwu-kyess ney-yo.*
   Terrence-also five-classes-as many as take-POL Wow, busy-SUP-POL
   "You also take five classes? Wow, you must be busy!"

In this example, the students are practicing the use of particle *-(i)na,* the function of which is to indicate that the quantity in question is more than the speaker's expectations. In line 1, the teacher asks Rachel how many classes she takes, so that Rachel may answer with the target particle. However, in line 2, Rachel replies to the teacher's question, but uses the wrong number system (e.g., Sino-Korean number *o* [five]) without using the target particle. In line 3, the teacher recasts Rachel's utterance using the correct number system (e.g., native Korean number *tases* [five]) and the particle. In line 4, teacher asks another student, Terrence. In line 5, Terrence replies with an incomplete answer (maybe he does not remember the counter for the class, *kwamok*). Notice that Terrence uses the humble personal pronoun.

Concluding Remarks

The language that students are exposed to in L2 classrooms affects the sort of language students produce (Swain, 1985). This is especially true for foreign language settings, in which contact with the target language is confined within the classroom. In this paper, the first year KFL classrooms were viewed as L2 socializing environments, in which students are not only learning structural competence, but are also being socialized into particular Korean sociocultural interactive norms. This paper argues that classroom interactional routines are powerful language socializing tools, through which target cultural messages are both implicitly and explicitly conveyed. The analysis illustrate that teacher–student interactions are consistent with hierarchism (Byon, 2004; Sohn 1986), which is one of the major cognitive value orientations of Korean culture. The result contrasts with ESL settings (Poole, 1992) because English teachers try to minimize the status differences between themselves and students.

What effects does teacher talk have on students' socialization? According to Wentworth (1980), sociocultural meaning is constantly created and reformed through social interaction between the members and novices of society, and language plays a great role in this process (Miller & Hoogstra, 1992). It is reasonable then, to assume that teacher talk has a crucial role in socializing KFL students into Korean sociocultural values. Here, I propose that the socializing effects of teacher talk in IRF routines can be interpreted on both social and cognitive sides.[13] Through the exposure to teachers' utterances with certain sentence-final suffixes, assertive directives, the use of occupational titles as the first person pronoun, and the explicit instruction of the Korean honorific elements, students are gradually socialized into the hierarchical sociocultural norm of Korean.

The honorificity of the utterance can be raised using the linguistic politeness features of Korean. Consequently, it is often possible that, while referential contents of utterances may be similar, their social meanings may be very different. Thus, cognitively, students come to comprehend that the same or similar referential content can be framed with different shades of social meaning. Although students may not be fully familiar with this sociocultural value at the time of exposure, socializing effects may help them realize that there are intricate and dynamic honorifics patterns in the Korean language.

This study raises questions for further research. First, this study reported the kinds of sociocultural meanings KFL instructors display through IRF routines in the first-year KFL classrooms. However, students' different proficiency levels may affect the nature of teacher talk as well as classroom discourse. A similar socialization research study that analyzes the KFL classroom interactional routines of different levels is worth exploring. Second,

this study discusses teacher talks of female KFL teachers. A study that investigates gender difference in teacher talk is also a subject for further study. Finally, Korean language learning provides an excellent environment in which to observe the development of honorifics. The longitudinal investigation of how KFL learners develop their ability to use specific honorifics (e.g., the use of humble pronouns) is another possible subject for future study.

References

Andersen, E. (1986). The acquisition of register variation by Anglo-American children. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 153–164). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 1–36). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

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

Byon, A. (2003). Language socialization and Korean as a heritage language: A study of Hawaiian classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 16*(3), 269–283.

Byon, A. (2004). Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: Pedagogical setting. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1673–1704.

Byon, A. (2005). Apologizing in Korean: Cross-cultural analysis in American KFL classroom settings. *Korean Studies, 29,* 137–166.

Byon, A. (in press). The link between politeness and linguistic indirectness in the Korean speech act of request. *Journal of Politeness Research.*

Campbell, R., & Rosenthal, J. (2000). Heritage languages. In J. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of undergraduate second language education* (pp. 165–184). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213–250). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Clancy, P. (1999). The socialization of affect in Japanese mother–child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1397–1421.

Cook, H. M. (1990). The role of the Japanese sentence-final particle *no* in the socialization of children. *Multilingua, 9*, 377–395.

Cook, H. M. (1997). The role of the Japanese *masu* form in caregiver–child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*, 695–718.

Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1443–1465.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1988). *The learning of social style marking and honorifics*. Paper presented at the Honorifics Conference, Portland, OR.

Garrett, P., & Baquedano-Lopez, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*, 339–361.

He, A. W. (2000). The grammatical and international organization of teacher's directives: Implications for socialization of Chinese American children. *Linguistics and Education, 11*(2), 119–140.

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

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected reading* (pp. 107–138). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kanagy, R. (1999). The socialization of Japanese immersion kindergartners through interactional routines. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1467–1492.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, H. (1970). *A study of Korean syntax*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brown University, Providence, RI.

Lee, H. S. (1991). *Tense, aspect, and modality: A discourse-pragmatic analysis of verbal affixes in Korean.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.

Martin, S. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 407–415). New York: Harper & Row.

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. A. Van Dijik (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Volume 3: Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 119–131). London: Academic Press.

Miller, P., & Hoogstra, L. (1992). Language as tool in the socialization and apprehension of cultural meanings. In T. Schwartz, G. White, & C. Lutz (Eds.), *New directions in psychological anthropology* (pp. 83–101). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Nakamura, K. (1996). The use of polite language by Japanese preschool children. Paper presented at the 7th International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Istanbul, Turkey.

Ochs, E. (1986). From feelings to grammar: A Samoan case study. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 251–272). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. (1994). Socializing the expression of affect: An overview of affective particle use in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Issue in Applied Linguistics, 5*, 303–325.

Ohta, A. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1493–1512.

Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition process in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Park, E., & King, K. (2003). Cultural diversity and language socialization in the early years. *Digest*. Retrieved May 10, 2006, from http://www.cal.org/resources/Digest/0313park.html

Peters, A. M., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 80–96). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Platt, M. (1986). Social norms and lexical acquisition: A study of deictic verbs in Samoan child language. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 127–152). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42*, 593–615.

Rogoff, B. (1993). Children's guided participation and participatory appropriation in sociocultural activity. In R Wozinak & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environment* (pp. 121–153). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15,* 163–191.

Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*, 1–23.

Sohn, H.-M. (1986). *Linguistic expeditions.* Seoul, Korea: Hanshin

Sohn, H.-M. (1988). Linguistic devices of Korean politeness. In E. Baek (Ed.), *Papers from the 6th international conference on Korean linguistics* (pp. 655–669). Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.

Sohn, H.-M. (1994). *Korean: Descriptive grammars*. London: Routledge.

Sohn, S.-S. (1995). The design of curriculum for teaching Korean as a heritage language. In H.-M. Sohn (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 1* (pp. 19–35). Honolulu, HI: American Association of Teachers of Korean.

Suh, J. S. (1984). *Studies of politeness*. Seoul, Korea: Hanshin.

Suzuki, R. (1999). Language socialization through the affective auxiliary *chau*. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31,* 1423–1441.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–256). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second language classroom research.* New York: Longman.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity.* New York: Longman.

Wang, H. S.(2003). A review of research in Korean as a foreign language. In C. You (Ed.), *The Korean language in America Vol. 8* (pp. 7–36). Berkeley, CA: American Association of Teachers of Korean.

Wentworth, W. (1980). *Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory*. New York: Elsevier.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 17,* 89–100.

Yoshimi, D. (1999). L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1513–1525.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to three anonymous reviewers' constructive comments. I am, of course, solely responsible for any errors that remain.

Endnotes

[1] Language socialization studies often use the notion of "bidirectionality in socialization" (Garret & Baquedano-López, 2002), the idea that a novice can be both a recipient and a generator of socialization influences. For instance, several studies (e.g., Rogoff, 1993; Schiefflelin & Ochs, 1986) discuss what the novice can bring to interaction with experts. Due to the limited scope of this study, this paper focuses on the unidirectional influence of teachers who convey norms to students. The issue of what students can bring to interaction with teachers is subject to future investigation.

[2] Scaffolding represents the teacher's effort to help students to complete communicative tasks beyond their proficiency levels. Examples of scaffoldings include rephrasing a question in a more simplified form and partial completion. During scaffolding, students have to constantly make an effort at the proper response.

[3] For instance, according to Wang's report (2003), the most common research topics of previous American KFL studies have included: (a) technology- and computer-assisted language learning, (b) teaching literature and culture, (c) general curriculum issues, (d) teaching materials, (e) testing, (f) heritage and non-heritage issues, and (g) content-based instruction.

[4] In discussion of contrastive cognitive value orientations between Americans and Koreans, Sohn (1986) notes that it is impossible to statistically measure the value of society because it varies with time, space, and social class; and, his assertion regarding the value of society is strictly based on relative terms, as they are deduced from the members' general communicative patterns.

[5] According to Campbell & Rosenthal (2000), typical heritage language learners bring the following competencies and knowledge:

1. Nearly 90% of the phonological system of a prestige dialect of their ancestral language
2. Have acquired 80%–90% of the grammatical rules
3. Have acquired extensive vocabularies
4. Have acquired typical sociolinguistic rules
5. Have learned and adopted many of the customs, values, and tradition
6. Rarely have opportunities to gain literacy skills
7. Have a wide range of reasons for wanting to study their ancestral language

[6] Until Spring 2002, the majority of Korean 101 students were heritage students (e.g., second generation Korean American students). Consequently their dominant presence in this first Korean class prevented any true-beginners with no heritage background from taking the course. Since Fall 2002, in an effort to increase the number of non-heritage students in Korean 101, more strict screening processes, such as conducting individual interviews and implementing thorough placement tests, have been employed. Those KFL learners with strong heritage backgrounds have been placed in Korean 201. Such efforts have resulted in the drastic increase in the non-heritage students' enrollment of Korean 101. For instance, the number of non-heritage students of Korean 101 in Fall 2002 was 16, and it reached 17 in Fall 2003. The number of non-

heritage students in Korean 102 also increased, as the majority of 101 students continued their Korean language study in 102.

[7] The following abbreviations are used to label the linguistic terms employed in this paper:

AP	Apperceptive (e.g., *-ney*)
DC	Declarative sentence-type suffix (e.g., *-ta*)
HT	Honorific title (e.g., *-nim*)
INT	Informal speech level, suffix, or particle (e.g, *-e/a)*
NM	Nominative case particle (e.g., *-ka/i*)
POL	Polite speech level, suffix, or particle (e.g., *-yo*)
PST	Past tense and perfect aspect suffix (e.g., *-ess/ass)*
Q	Question marker (e.g, interrogative sentence-type suffix)
SH	Subject honorific suffix (e.g., *-usi/si*)
SUP	Suppositive (e.g,. *-ci*)
TC	Topic contrast particle (e.g., *-un/nun*)

[8] All the names of the students in the data are pseudonyms.

[9] A reviewer noted that the *-(u)sey-yo* form is not always used as an assertive directive. Depending on the linguistic context (e.g., kind of verb it is used with), the form may indicate some other pragmatic function. For instance, if the form is used with the Korean verb *topta* 'help,' it will be *towa-cwu-seyyo* 'please help me.' In this case, the pragmatic meaning of the utterance is not an assertive directive but rather a plea for help. This works the same for English as well, in that the expression "close it!" is an assertive directive, but "help!" is rather a desperate plea, and "watch out!" is a warning. Depending on the verb it is used with, the *-(u)sey-yo* form can mean different things. However, its pragmatic meaning of assertiveness is still present.

[10] There has been disagreement among grammarians on the number of levels that should be recognized and on the hierarchical order of those levels shown below. Some scholars proposed six levels (Martin, 1964; Sohn, 1988, 1994), five (H. Lee, 1970) , four (Hwang, 1975), or two (Suh, 1984). Despite the disagreement, it is the six-level system of sentence enders (Sohn, 1994, p. 8) that receives the most support. For the analysis of the speech levels, Sohn's (1994) categorization is used in this investigation:

Speech level	Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative	Propositive
Deferential	*-sup-ni-ta*	*-sup-ni-kka*	*-sup-si-o*	*-sup-si-ta*
Polite	*-e-yo*	*-e-yo*	*-e-yo*	*-e-yo*
Blunt	*-o*	*-o*		
Familiar	*-ney*	*-na/-nun-ka*	*-key*	*-sey*
Intimate	*-e*	*-e*	*-e*	*-e*
Plain	*-ta*	*-ni /-nya*	*-la*	*-ca*

[11] *Sey* is the contracted form of *si-e*.

[12] One uses *-(u)l-ke-yey-yo* (by adding this to a verb stem) to mark a situation which the speaker thinks likely to occur and/or to indicate speaker's or the listener's intention or plan.

[13] Cook (1997) has discussed the socializing effects of *masu* form in both social and cognitive sides.