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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify errors made by English-speakers learning Korean as a foreign language. The students were divided into two groups: heritage learners and non-heritage learners. By analyzing students’ speech, the difficult areas of learning Korean for English-speakers were identified. First language interference was also examined. For pedagogical purposes, the weaknesses of heritage learners were compared with non-heritage learners. The subjects were 33 students (10 non-heritage learners, and 23 heritage learners) who took Korean 102 and 200 at the University of British Columbia. Results of the study revealed that both groups showed very similar difficulties in learning Korean. However, they made slightly different errors at different levels. In K102, the heritage learners demonstrated a weakness in the sociolinguistic area, while non-heritage learners revealed weaknesses in listening competence. In K200, both groups showed very similar weaknesses in the use of particles. However, pragmatic errors started to appear in non-heritage learners’ speech, and heritage learners showed poor performance, possibly due to a lack of motivation in learning Korean. This study concluded that intralingual errors were more prevalent than interlingual errors in the early stages of learning Korean.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter one (1) discusses the need for studies of error analysis, (2) provides the background of the study, (3) presents the purpose of the study and central questions to investigate, and (4) defines the terms used.

2. THE PROBLEM

The 'errors' that students make in the process of learning a second or foreign language have always been a cause of much concern to teachers, textbook writers and second language acquisition researchers. The analysis of second language learners’ errors is important for understanding the processes of second language acquisition (SLA), and for developing teaching materials. The dramatic growth of Korean Language programs around the world is accompanied by many problems; multi-level classes, lack of textbooks and other teaching materials, curriculum, teaching and testing methods, and so on. One of the major problems at the college level is that of teaching “heritage learners” vs “non-heritage learners”. There are two groups: heritage learners (Korean-Canadians) who have been exposed to Korean and Korean culture naturally through their family and the Korean community where they reside, and non-heritage learners who learn Korean as a foreign language. Existing textbooks are far from satisfactory for both heritage students and non-heritage learners. There is an urgent need to develop textbooks to meet the need of both heritage and non-heritage learners.
In order to create more effective materials, students' weaknesses in learning Korean have to be identified. However, there are few studies of error analysis in speech production and composition in Korean.

3. BACKGROUND

During the past ten years, Korean language programs have grown rapidly for various reasons: growing interest in Korea around the world, especially after the 1988 Seoul Olympics; an increasing population of overseas Koreans; the support of the Korean government in promoting Korean studies around the world; the development of Pacific Rim relations with western countries and so on. Korean Language courses are offered by major Canadian universities, more than sixty universities in the United States, and in many other countries around the world. However, the teaching of Korean as a foreign language or as a heritage language is in its infancy. Korean language education is at the stage in which the textbooks and other teaching materials need to be developed systematically in order to meet learners' needs.

Both heritage learners and non-heritage learners learn Korean for various reasons: to fulfill the university foreign language requirements, to speak Korean for pleasure or for business purposes, to understand Korea (e.g., culture, literature, history, economics, politics and so on), to teach English to Koreans, to improve their job prospects and to identify themselves more fully as Korean-Canadians in a multicultural society. However, the two groups are out to accomplish very different objectives. The heritage learners want to expand the level of proficiency that they already have attained, while the non-heritage learners want
to acquire basic skills in the Korean language (Lukoff, 1986; King, 1995; Ramsey, 1995). Instructors have to deal not only with multi-level classes, but also with the disadvantage of teaching the two groups in one class. Comparing these two groups, Sohn (1991a) investigated American university students' strengths and weaknesses in Korean Oral Proficiency. He found that non-Koreans were much weaker in sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and listening competence than Korean-Americans. King (1995) points out heritage learners and non-heritage learners have different pedagogical needs, particularly at the novice level. A comparison of the learning difficulties of the two groups is necessary to identify the different needs of each group. This is an important step in improving the quality of Korean language education.

Research (Sohn, 1989) has shown that Korean is a difficult language to learn as a foreign language, especially for English speakers, while Japanese speakers find Korean the easiest language to learn (Sohn, 1991a). Sohn suggests that Japanese students learn Korean much easier because of Japan's linguistic and cultural similarity with Korean. Martin (1964) points out that there is a remarkable similarity in syntax between the two languages although small points of difference do exist. Sometimes, similarities between a first language (L1) and the target language (TL) pose the most serious problems for learners because of overprediction (Kim, 1992; Whitman and Jackson, 1972). It is also true that learners do not transfer all of their L1 systems to TL but are selective in some ways, and there are similarities in errors made by learners of different backgrounds (Richards, 1974).

Learning a foreign language is far more than learning its grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. To speak a language both accurately and appropriately, it is also necessary
to learn the cultural context in which that language is used. The more distant the TL’s
culture is from L1, the more difficult it is to overcome the cross-cultural divide and learn to
speak like a native speaker. There is a significant difference between the English-speaking
culture of North America and the culture of Korea. This is one reason that the Korean
language is so difficult for English-speakers to learn. Korean society is hierarchial. Social
positions are defined by age, social standing, sex, family position and so on. Everyone is in
a vertical relationship to everyone else. Proper social relationships are extremely important
in Korea. The Korean language has highly developed and elaborated honorific or polite
forms which require speakers to show their relationship to the addressee using lexically,
morphologically, and grammatically distinct forms (Koo, 1992). The Korean language, like
Japanese, has a grammar which reflects the social hierarchy of the society in which it is
spoken. Speakers must select the proper words, phrases, and verb endings depending on who
they are talking to and whom they are talking about. For example, Koo (1992) found sixty-
four forms of ‘you’ used in South Korea in place of the second person pronoun ‘you’ in
English.

Korean and English have markedly different syntactic systems, at least at the surface
level. Korean is an SOV (Subject + Object + Verb) language, whereas English is an SVO
(Subject + Verb + Object) language; in Korean, the verb is always the last constituent of
the sentence although constituents other than verbs are relatively free to be switched around.
In Korean, since the main verb of a sentence is always located at the end of a sentence, a
sentence tends to expand on the left hand side of the verb. On the other hand, English
sentences tend to expand on the right side; English is a right-branching language, whereas
Korean is a left-branching language. In Korean, genitives, adjectives, and relative clauses precede the head nouns. Therefore sometimes English-speaking learners have difficulties with word order within a sentence, although they do not necessarily have difficulties ending a sentence with a verb.

There are other salient features of Korean compared to English: in Korean subjects or pronouns are frequently omitted when the agents are obvious in a sentence. Korean is a so-called situation-oriented language which forces situationally understood elements to be omitted in utterances under certain structural and pragmatic condition (Sohn, 1991a). The Korean answering system to negative questions is the opposite of the English answering system. The complexities of the Korean language are also illustrated by the fact that the language often requires speakers to choose from pure Korean or Sino-Korean words, phrases and numbers. For example, there are two ways of expressing numbers which are interchangeable in some cases but mutually exclusive in other cases: hours are expressed in ‘pure Korean’ numbers and minutes are expressed in ‘Sino-Korean’ numbers. This structure is repeated on many different levels (for months, weeks, years, etc.). The dual system of pure Korean and Sino-Korean words is an extra burden for learners. It is impossible to list all the differences between Korean and English in syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistic behavior. For English speaking learners, some of these linguistic areas are more difficult to learn than others. In order to gain an insight into these problems, learners’ errors should be analyzed.

An adequate explanation for learners’ errors in second language acquisition (SLA) has long been a central theme for discussion in linguistics, applied linguistics, and education.
Some applied linguists (Fries, 1945; Lado, 1957) tend to assume that the first language is a major factor in secondary language acquisition and performance. They claim that they can predict those linguistic structures that will and those that will not cause difficulty in learning L2 by systematically comparing the structure and cultures of the learners’ L1 and L2. In other words, L1 and L2 differences bring about learning difficulty whereas similarities between the two languages facilitate acquisition. However, the hypothesis was discredited, except at the level of pronunciation (Borden, Gerber, Milsark, 1983; Ioup, 1984). It was found that, contrary to expectations, not all areas of differences between two language systems actually resulted in errors. Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974a, 1974b) have shown that error types are the result of the processing strategies a learner uses to organize and produce a new language, rather than L1 interference. From their findings they formulated what became known as the Creative Construction theory. In any context, research on the role of L1 is important for a better understanding of the nature of SLA.

Due to the remarkable differences between Korean and English in phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax, evidence of L1 might be easily noticeable. This study is designed to examine the role of L1 in learning Korean, and to identify the difficult areas in learning Korean for English speakers by analyzing learners’ errors in a conversational context. Furthermore, for pedagogical purposes, differences between the heritage learners and non-heritage learners will be considered.
4. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The first purpose of this study was to identify types of errors, and sources and causes of errors made by English speakers in learning Korean as a foreign or heritage language. The second purpose of this study was to examine the differences between heritage learners and non-heritage learners in the process of learning Korean. A third purpose of this study was to determine whether the errors which learners make while learning Korean are due to L1 interference, or to the use of universal language processing strategies, especially in the early stages of learning Korean. If L1 interference causes errors, learners will tend to transfer the structures of their L1; certain types of errors are directly traceable to the structure of their L1. If the creative construction process does play a major role in second language acquisition, then common errors should be found in learners’ errors regardless of their different language backgrounds. The following questions are considered:

1. What kinds of errors do students make in a conversational context?

2. Are errors traceable to L1 and/or other-than-L1 sources?

3. What errors are more persistent than others?

4. Why are some errors so persistent?

5. Is there a ‘system’ in learners’ errors?

6. Do students who learn Korean as a FL (non-heritage learners) make different errors than those who learn Korean as a HL (heritage learners)?
5. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Language interference: the term is used as a broad meaning of 'cross linguistic or cross cultural influence' between a learner's first language and his second/foreign language.

Interlanguage: a metaphoric term used in the sense of intermediate linguistic system between a learner's first language and his second/foreign language.

Foreign language: a language which is not an official language in a country. A distinction is not made between foreign language and a second language in this paper.

Heritage learners: a group of people in a country who are learning their ancestral language which is not the official language of the country; Korean-Canadians who are learning Korean are heritage learners in Canada.

Errors: the unacceptable forms which are used by someone learning a foreign/second language. A distinction is not made between an error and a mistake in this paper.

Acquisition: a conscious or subconscious process of rule internalization: a distinction is not made between 'acquisition' and 'learning' in Krashen's (1982) sense in this thesis.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review the theories that relate to errors in second language acquisition. In order to understand the role of the native language in second language acquisition, some issues regarding learners' errors are reviewed. The second section reviews the literature which examines the errors made by learners of Korean.

2. BACKGROUND

The source of errors in learning a second language has been a major concern in the literature of second language acquisition. In the past, errors in learning a second language were believed to be the result of interference from the first language (The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis); in this analysis, L1 is regarded as a main factor causing errors (Lado, 1957). However, the results of morpheme studies (Brown, 1973; Dulay and Burt, 1974a,b) in first and second language acquisition indicate that errors are often the result of the processing strategies which learners try to organize in the new language (Performance Analysis; Creative Construction Theory); this perspective minimizes the role of L1 interference, and regards the source of errors simply as a process of creative construction. As a result, researchers (Richards 1971b; Bailey, Madden & Krashen, 1974) started to look at the similarities of the learners' errors (Error Analysis), and observe the learner's progress from L1 to the target language (Interlanguage). Interlanguage (Nemser, 1971; Corder,
1981; Selinker, 1972, 1992) is thought to be distinct from both the learner’s first language and the target language; in this analysis the source of errors is regarded as an indication of the learner’s progress.

3. THE ERROR ANALYSIS MOVEMENT

3.1 Contrastive Analysis

The main objective of Contrastive Analysis (CA), first developed by Lado and Fries, is to improve pedagogical materials. The methodology concentrates on differences between a learner’s native language and the target language. In 1945 Fries wrote:

The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner (p. 9).

According to the CA School, a learner’s native language and the target language can be contrasted in terms of sound system, grammatical structure, vocabulary system, and culture. Much of the work in CA has assumed that a linguistic comparison of two languages can predict areas of the learner’s difficulty: linguistic structures that will or will not cause difficulty in learning can be predicted by systematically comparing the language and culture of the learner’s native language with the target language to be learned.

CA is based upon the assumption that learning problems are directly related to the degree of differences between the target language and the native language. Lado (1957) has claimed that those elements in the second language that are similar to his native language will be simple for him to learn, and those elements that are different will be difficult. Hammerley
(1986) described three types of transfer from L1 to L2: positive transfer, which occurs when two learning tasks are the same; negative transfer or interference occurs when two learning tasks are different but related; zero transfer occurs when the two learning tasks are unrelated. Some scholars have demonstrated that negative and positive transfer theory has significant implications for the study of Korean as a foreign language. Sohn (1986) points out that “due to their syntactic and semantic complexity, [the] learning of articles is probably the most vexing to Korean adults. No matter how long they have lived in the U.S. as adults, they rarely have a native-like control of them [English articles]” (p. 477). Furthermore, Oller and Redding (1971) also point out that ESL learners whose L1 contains articles perform better than those whose L1 does not contain articles. Korean topic and subject markers overlap almost completely with those of Japanese both in syntax and semantics. A Japanese learner who studies Korean has no problem whatsoever in acquiring Korean topic marker and subject markers (Ko, 1974). However, these case markers are tremendously difficult for English-speakers to acquire because there is no grammatical equivalent to them in English.

The predicted areas of transfer, as determined by CA, do not occur in all cases (Whitman & Jackson, 1972). In fact, as others (Richards 1971b; Bailey, Madden, & Krashen, 1974) have noted, there are many similarities in the errors which are produced by speakers of different native languages. Long and Sato (1984) point out the problems associated with CA: CA does not identify errors that occur; it says nothing about common errors; most of the descriptions are of a surface structure; it ignores the learner and the
learning context; it does not say anything about 'how', but only explains what was learned and when. Furthermore, Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977) have also pointed out that it is difficult to be certain what type of error a second-language learner is making or why the learner makes it; that the theory ignores avoidance, underestimating the importance of negative transfer, and it is hard to classify the errors subjectively because of the lack of familiarity with the learners' native language. As a result of these findings, researchers have turned their attention to similarities in the acquisition process among all language learners regardless of their native language backgrounds.

3.2 The Performance Analysis

One of the interesting discoveries that researchers have found in second language acquisition is that the acquisition of grammatical structure proceeds in a predictable order. Dulay and Burt (1974a, 1974b) proposed what they called the Creative Construction Hypothesis. They claimed that the guiding force in second language acquisition is universal innate principles and not the native language. They found evidence that learners of English with markedly different mother tongues learned morphemes in very similar sequences. The research was based on the work of Brown (1973) who found that children learning English as a first language followed a common sequence in the acquisition of 14 functor words. Based on Brown's findings of acquisition of grammatical morphemes, a number of studies have investigated the speech of children acquiring a second language, especially in the order of acquisition of grammatical morphemes. Dulay and Burt (1974a) have attempted to
determine whether the syntactic errors children make while learning a second language are
due to native language interference, or to developmental cognitive strategies as Brown had
found in first language acquisition. The differences in both sets of predictions are relatively
simple to identify by error analysis. They examined more than 500 errors made by Spanish-
speaking children who were learning English as a second language. The type of errors were
classified into three categories by Dulay and Burt:

**Developmental**: those errors that are similar to
L1 acquisition errors.
**Interference**: those errors that reflect Spanish structure.
**Unique**: those errors that are neither ‘developmental’ nor
‘interference’ errors, but appeared in the sample (p. 131).

Eighty-seven percent of the errors reflected developmental errors; these provided evidence
that children do not use their ‘native language habits’ in the process of learning the syntax
of their new language. Dulay and Burt suggested that making errors is a necessary condition
of the learning process. Based on the natural acquisition of morphemes, Perkins and
Freeman (1975) investigated the effects of formal second language instruction on the order
of acquisition of five morphemes. Perkins and Freeman suggested that formal language
instruction did not change the order of acquisition; language instruction might result in
improved performance but not necessarily a change in the order. Also, Fathman (1975)
found no significant differences in English proficiency between children who had ESL
instruction and children who did not. Felix (1981) investigated whether second language
learning in the classroom was a creative construction process, in the sense defined by Dulay
and Burt (1974a, 1974b), or whether classroom learners basically rely on behavioristic habits in language formation processes. Felix confirmed that, contrary to popular belief, the way people learn a second language did not completely depend on the conditions under which they are exposed to the second language data. Dulay and Burt’s studies (1974a, 1974b) support the claim that there exists a common acquisition sequence of certain English grammatical morphemes for learners, regardless of native language background. Their studies have revealed that most syntactic errors are the result of the developmental linguistic rules children construct to generate the language.

Furthermore, Baily, Madden, and Krashen (1974) investigated a ‘natural sequence’ in adult second language acquisition. Thirty-three Spanish speaking adult subjects and forty non-Spanish speaking adult subjects representing eleven different mother tongues were tested. Despite the differences in the amount of instruction, exposure to English, and the mother tongue, there was a high degree of agreement as to the relative difficulty of the functors among all groups, and a significant correlation between relative accuracy of function words for Spanish and non-Spanish speakers. The results indicate a common order of acquisition for English functors in adults, and that adults use common strategies for second language learning. These results supported the findings of Dulay and Burt’s studies in the early 1970s.

The morpheme studies of child subjects and adult subjects have concluded that second language learners with different language backgrounds follow similar developmental paths, and that the observed orders are similar in first language learners. The results are also
consistent with findings that errors in second language learning are not all the results of interference from the first language, but are a function of the use of universal language processing strategies. The morpheme studies relate to acquisition sequence, and can show language learning strategies. Long and Sato (1990) point out that orders of accuracy do not help us understand how a second language is acquired, but instead they tell us something about what is acquired and in what order. However, it indicates that the strategies of second language acquisition used by children and adults may be universal.

3.3 Error Analysis

Weaknesses in the Contrastive Analysis school have given way to error analysis (EA) which was developed from a weak version of the CAH. The EA school abandoned the CA’s emphasis on predicting errors based on the distance between L1 and TL, and instead attempted to describe and explain the differences between the L2 student’s grammar and the accepted grammar of the TL. EA attempted to deal with all aspects of language. It looked not only at the grammar and the sound system but also at the internal irregularities in the target language, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic concerns, differences in teaching materials and methodology, and L1 transfer and interference. Richards (1971b) identified three major types of learner errors: interlingual errors which can be traced to L1 interference, intralingual errors which are committed by learners, regardless of their L1, and developmental errors, indicated by the learner’s attempts to build up hypotheses about the TL based on a limited experience of using the TL. Although he found that interference from
the mother tongue was a source of difficulty in second language learning, he concluded that many errors are caused by the strategies employed by the learners.

The developmental errors and other aspects of students' performance were called 'interlanguage (IL)' (Selinker, 1972). By this he referred to the interim grammars constructed by second language learners on their way to learning the target language. According to Selinker, an interlanguage is a transitional state between L1 and L2, and has its own grammar, rules of use and registers (Selinker, 1992). As the learner progresses, he formulates hypotheses based on the state of his interlanguage grammar. The more the learner's interlanguage resembles L2, the more the hypotheses should resemble the rules of the L2 grammar. The learner, as a result of hypothesizing, will make errors. When the learner realizes his error he revises or rejects the hypothesis to account for the error and moves closer to L2 (Selinker, 1992; Corder, 1981; Richards, 1974). Such errors have nothing to do with L1 interference and cannot be explained in terms of the CAH. In this perspective, error is seen as a natural and necessary part of second language acquisition; error is an indication of a student's progress which reveals the state of his interlanguage grammar. This phenomenon has been referred to by others as an idiosyncratic dialect and transitional competence (Corder, 1981), and as an approximate system (Nemser, 1971). Some researchers (Selinker, 1992; Sridhar, 1981) who have re-examined CA and EA carefully, have demonstrated that CA predictions lead to IL predictive data and a better understanding of potential units of interlingual identifications. EA data is considered as a subset of IL data. In other words, interlanguage incorporates the assumptions of both CA
and EA. In spite of the criticisms of CAH, it is obvious that a learner's L1 plays an important role in SLA. EA recognizes the linguistic type of errors, and the psycholinguistic type of errors produced by L1 learners through the learner's performance and TL. The learner's L1, TL, and the learner's performance can be used to investigate the various processes that contribute to interlanguage development. Corder (1981) suggests the following 5 steps in EA research: (1) collect a sample of learner language, (2) identify the errors, (3) describe the errors, (4) explain the errors, and (5) evaluate the errors. This study will utilize the first four elements of Corder's methodology.

4. ERRORS MADE BY LEARNERS OF KOREAN

4.1 The Difficult Areas of Korean for English-Speakers

Korean is considered a difficult language to learn as a foreign language, especially for English-speakers. In 1989 Sohn pointed out that the Research Division of the (U.S.) Defense Language Institute categorized Korean as one of the most difficult languages for Americans to learn; languages were classified into four groups depending on their level of difficulty for Americans to learn, and Korean was placed in group 4, the hardest. When we think about the reasons why Korean is difficult for English-speakers to learn, it is natural to compare or contrast linguistic features and cultures, as Lado (1957) suggests. In addition to a systematic comparison of Korean and English language and culture, an analysis of students' errors will help teachers be aware of the difficulties students have in learning Korean. An error analysis is particularly important not only for the development and
improvement of materials and techniques of language teaching, but also for an understanding of the process of second language acquisition.

Sohn (1989) investigated why Korean is so difficult for English-speakers to learn by discussing the salient features of the Korean language which make it difficult to learn. He claimed that Korean is difficult for English-speakers to learn not only because of the mechanistic levels of their linguistic structures, but also because of cultural differences in the two societies. He concludes that “when the sociolinguistic and semantic aspects are considered, the problem becomes extremely complex, and therefore it is very difficult to teach Korean to English-speaking people (P. 106)”. In other words, the sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and structural disparity between Korean and English undoubtedly contributes to the difficulties English-speakers have in learning Korean. One of the major concerns in teaching Korean is how to deal with these problems. Students have to learn much more than patterns of sound, grammar, and vocabulary. They must also learn to use these patterns appropriately in everyday social situations. Kim (1989) claims that the Korean language has pragmatic-based discourse features since Korean communication operates within a high context system. According to Kim, a high context systems tend to be less expressive in the way information is codified in text because of the high degree of presupposed information. Baker (1989) explains how ‘nwunchi’ is important in communicating with Koreans. ‘Nwunchi’, which has no English equivalent, literally means ‘reading the eyes of the other’. Baker quotes Kalton’s interpretation of ‘nwunchi’ as ‘the art of quickly and accurately assessing another’s emotions, attitude, and reaction or likely reaction to a given proposal or
situation’. In Lee’s (1967) book, Steinberg notes that ‘nwunchi’ is both the feelings and the manners of a person and the study of the attitudes and emotions of another person so that you may know how to respond. In the second sense, it is therefore something like the sizing up of a situation, but it forms a more central core of Korean thought” (P. 28). Sometimes a Korean may say ‘Maybe’ to avoid saying ‘No’, and he expects you to read his mind by using ‘nwunchi’. It is particularly true that verbal language exclusively is not enough to communicate in Korean, and non-verbal language is as important as verbal language.

Sometimes a student produces a sentence which is grammatically flawless but sociolinguistically inappropriate. Sohn (1991a) urges Korean language educators to be aware of the significance of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic issues in teaching Korean:

First, such cognitive cultural aspects of the two societies as values, world views, ideas, assumptions, and expectations differ immensely, and these differences are mirrored in the linguistic structure, language use, and non-verbal behavior of the two people. Second, Korean is an honorific language and its complex registers reflect intricate and delicate interpersonal relationships to the extent that a Korean may not speak without his knowledge of his relative status in relation to the person addressed. Third, Korean vocabulary contains a large number of culturally unique words and phrases, as well as doublets of native and Sino-Korean origins whose cultural connotations are divergent. Fourth, Korean is a so-called situation-oriented language which forces situationally understood elements to be omitted in utterances under certain structural and pragmatic conditions (pp. 461-462).

Language and culture cannot be separated. Human personality, as Lado points out, has evolved in a variety of ways to live, ways that we call cultures. We constantly
misinterpret each other across cultures. Klop and Park (1982; 1992) demonstrate how communication style, speech behavior, non-verbal communication, and other areas like value, belief, and attitude systems are different in two different cultures: Korean and American. Moreover, Lee (1967) proposes that if Western society can be called a society of “buttons”, Korea can be called a society of “strings”:

The usage of the word “tie” is a kind of comparison in which we feel the difference between Western and Korean societies. If buttons are independent and solid, string is always dependent and two dimensional, and is a kind of “line.” Westerners see the relationships between people as form; we see ours as a line, tied to each other as one string to another (P. 97).

Korean society is a totality in which “I” is buried within “we”; Koreans say “our wife” or “our country” instead of “my wife” or “my country”. As Lee states, relationships are extremely important to Koreans; Korean society is very hierarchical and relations between people often reflect this hierarchical structure. Crane (1978) comments how important it is for one to know all the levels of Korean society. As Koo (1989) points out, respective social status and age differences are represented in the linguistic forms. When one is involved in verbal communication, in order to choose an appropriate speech level, one has to know his relationship with the interlocutors; whether he is superior, inferior, close-equal, distance-equal, and so on. According to Sohn (1991a), in recent years addressee honorifics have been found in Korean society in six different speech levels; deferential, polite, blunt, intimate, familiar, and plain.

Although scholars have been able to describe specific patterns of behavior, much more work needs to be done on understanding the structure of Korean culture since culture
is an integral part of learning a language. A major concern of teaching Korean, therefore, is how systematically to teach sociolinguistics as well as grammatical syntax.

4.2 Errors in Sociolinguistic and Pragmatic

There are a few studies (Sohn, 1991a, 1991b; Baker, 1993) related to students’ performance errors, and some studies (Sohn, 1986; Wang, 1995; Kim, 1994) observe students’ errors in composition. Sohn’s study (1991a) tries to identify American students’ strengths and weaknesses, especially in terms of sociolinguistic and pragmatic appropriateness, by examining interview tapes of the Korean Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPIs) that were conducted at the University of Hawaii. The subjects consist of all levels: novice, intermediate, advanced, and superior. Sohn points out six areas of students’ weakness:

(1) Lexical misuse;
(2) An unnecessary use of mianhapnita (I am sorry.);
(3) The frequent omission of the polite addressee honorific ender ‘-yo’ when a word or phrase is called for as an answer;
(4) The misuse of the subject honorific suffix ‘-usi’;
(5) Difficulty in appropriately using personal pronouns, deferential words for same meaning, and ‘-ta’ speech level enders;
(6) Appropriate use or nonuse of indirect speech acts.

In his findings, the most frequent error pattern is the misuse of the subject honorific suffix ‘-usi’, as shown below (correct forms are given in brackets):

(1) a. A: kongpwu haci anhko mwues ul haseyyo?
B: TV poseyyo [pwayo]. I am watching TV (with honorific -sey). (Novice; NH)

b. A: hankwuk ey ka pon cek issuseyyo?
   Have you ever been to Korea?
   B: epssuseyyo [epseyo].
   I've never been in Korea (with honorific -usey) (Novice; H)

c. B: “shopping” haysseyyo [hasyesseyo]?
   Did you do your shopping? (without honorific -sye) (Intermediate; H)

Mastering the honorific system, which a student has to deal with from the very beginning stage of learning Korean, is one of the most difficult and crucial aspects of learning the Korean language. Sohn found that students at the advanced and superior levels know relatively well how to use strategic speech acts in their proper ways. For example, “satto lako hapnita. (Superior; NH), “com siwenhan kes kathun tey yo. (Superior; NH), “hancae isscanhayol (Superior; NH)”, and “.....kwansim i manhketun yo. (Superior; NH)”. On the other hand, he found that lower level students have difficulty in correctly using personal pronouns, deferential words, and ‘-ta’ speech level enders as illustrated in (2).

(2) B: tangsin [sensayngnim] to kulehkey ilhapnikka [ilhasipnikka]?
   Do you work like that as well? (Intermediate; NH)
   B: emeni Pennsylvania isseyo [kyeyseyyo].
   Is your mom in Pennsylvania? (Novice; NH)
   B: ceuy chachey lul ‘clean’ hay tulikyesseyo [cwusikeysseyo]?
   Would you please wash my car? (Intermediate; H)

Sohn (1991a, 1991b) also points out that the most frequent pragmatic errors are related to indirect speech acts. The frequent use of the blunt expression mollayo (I don’t know; direct, blunt) instead of molukyeysnutey yo (indirect, polite). The Korean language is endowed
with extremely complex structures of polite, blunt, honorific, and humble forms (Sohn, 1991). Moreover, Koo (1989) has claimed that ambiguity in expression is used to show one’s respect for others and to maintain harmonious human relationships in Korean culture. Clearly, sociolinguistic and pragmatic problems have been a major difficulty in Korean language education since the main goal of Korean language teaching is to communicate across culture.

4.3 Errors in Vocabulary

Native speakers of Korean experience little difficulty understanding words when they are used with connotative meanings. Foreign language learners, however, sometimes find words with connotative meanings difficult to understand. This is a serious problem for Korean language learners, since native speakers often use words connotatively in everyday conversation. For example, Koreans use halmeni with favorable connotation, and halmem with pejorative connotation, although they have the same denotative meanings “an old woman”. Although there is a general awareness of cultural differences in connotative meaning, few studies on the acquisition of the connotative meaning of Korean words by Korean language learners have been conducted so far. In a study conducted by Wang (1995), lexical errors are classified into 8 categories (Correct forms are given in brackets):

1) Errors caused by confusion of similar meaning;
   e.g.: I iyakika sengsilhan [cinsilhan] iyakiipnita.
   This is a true story.
Kamtoki socwunghi [sincwunghi] paywutulul kollacapaya hapnita.

The director should carefully select his actors.

(2) Errors caused by formal similarity in TL (phonetic or orthographic);
(3) Lexical shift/code switch;
   e.g.: cey ex-anayka hwuhoyhako isskeyssko....
   My ex-wife will probably regret ....
   cohun yenghwanun interesting inmwultuli issko....
   Good movies have interesting characters
(4) Collocation/idiomaticity;
(5) Word coinage;
(6) Simplification or redundancy;
(7) Literal translation.

Among these categories, errors most frequently occurred in (3) code switch (24% of the total errors students made). This was followed by (1) words which have similar meaning (23% of the total errors). The errors made in the words in (1) are similar in meaning but different in form (e.g.: 'sengsilhada vs cinsilhada' and 'socwunghi vs sincwunghi'). These kinds of errors are often caused by the way vocabulary items which are introduced to students; students often depend on dictionary meanings, or vocabulary items are not introduced in context. Let us now examine how easily a student can be misled by the meanings provided in a dictionary. The Minjungseorim Korean-English dictionary lists these meanings as shown below:

  sengsilhada: (be) sincere; faithful; truthful;
  cinsilhada: (be) truthful; sincere; genuine;
  socwunghi : seriously; carefully; with care; with caution;
  sincwunghi : carefully; circumspectly; cautiously; with caution;
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The above words have a common meaning but they are used very differently according to specific texts. Therefore, vocabulary items should always be presented in such a way that it may be possible for a student to understand clearly not only the meaning and the usage, but also the connotation of the vocabulary items when necessary. Errors in (3) ‘Code switch’ may be simply due to limited knowledge of vocabulary. Sohn (1991b) also found that the main cause of communication breakdown was due to poor knowledge of vocabulary. This was especially true for novices. There are vast differences between written communication and spoken language, and some words are more appropriate for spoken language than written language. Further analysis of Wang’s sample data demonstrates that students have a difficult time understanding when they should use native and Sino-Korean forms in written and spoken language. Sino-Korean forms are more frequently used in written form when doublets occur in the same linguistic context. Sohn (1991a) notes that, “one problem for the learners of Korean is the abundance of doublets of native and Sino-Korean origins, whose syntactic-morphological distributions are not always the same and whose sociocultural connotations are vastly different (PP. 466-467)”. In Sohn’s studies (1991a, 1991b), most of the lexical misuse was identified in the area of culture-bounded vocabulary; kinship terms, two sets (native and Sino-Korean) of numerals, and number classifiers. Vocabulary teaching has not been a priority in Korean language teaching. However, Korean language educators have to realize that vocabulary is an important area worthy of effort and investigation.
4.4 Errors in Syntax

Errors in syntax may be categorized into word order, case markers, tense, negation, clause conjunction, and so on. Despite the difference in word order typology between English (SVO) and Korean (SOV), errors in case markers occur most frequently among the syntactic categories (Sohn, 1986; Kim, 1994). Kim (1994) conducted an error analysis of compositions done by 58 students who were studying Korean at Yonsei University in Korea. Twenty-eight subjects, including thirteen heritage learners, were English-speakers, and thirty subjects were Japanese-speakers. Data was collected after 200 hours of formal instruction. The errors made by students were classified into various linguistic categories; case marker, vocabulary, word order and so on. A hierarchy of difficulty was found in both English and Japanese speakers groups as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English-speakers</th>
<th>Japanese-speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Case marker</td>
<td>(40.5%)</td>
<td>Case marker (36.5% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Vocabulary</td>
<td>(20.5%)</td>
<td>Vocabulary (22.8% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Morphological error</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
<td>Morphological error (12.9% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Ill-constructed structure</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>Clause conjunction (11.2% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Clause conjunction</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>Ill-constructed structure (9.1% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Word order</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>Word order (1.7% of the total errors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Kim’s findings, word order was found to be the least problematic area in both groups. Errors, in both English and Japanese speakers, were most frequently found in (1) case markers followed by (2) misuse of vocabulary. Among case markers, Sohn (1986) has claimed that the nominative particles (ka/l) and the accusative particles (ul/lul) are most
frequently confused by students. However, Eom (1989) suggests that students have more problems with the place particles (ey/eyso) than with the object particles (ul/lul). Eom has investigated acquisition order of 7 major Korean particles: topic particles (un/nun), subject particles (l/ka), object particles (ul/lul), place particles (ey/eyso), time particle (ey), person from/to particles (egeyso/hantheyso, egey/hantey), and direction from/to particles (egeyso/hantheyso, egey/hantey). In order to minimize tension which might affect students’ performance, the data collected by Eom on five different tasks was as follows:

- Situation #1: ungraded story telling;
- Situation #2: oral interview;
- Situation #3: story retelling;
- Situation #4: free composition;
- Situation #5: comprehensive composition as homework.

He provides the acquisition order of Korean particles as shown below (the percentages of accuracy are provided in parentheses):

1. time particle (97.4%);
2. direction from/to particles (93.2%);
3. person from/to particles (90.2%);
4. object particles (83.0%);
5. subject particles (77.4%);
6. place particles (75.6%);
7. topic particles (72.5%).

He claims that the time particle is the easiest particle to learn because it has only one morpheme while other particles have two morphemes depending on the ending of the preceding word. He also notes that the difficulty students have in learning topical and
subject particles is due to the complexity of usage. The cause of difficulty in learning the place particles is often due to the poor explanations given by authors. He criticizes traditional grammarians' simplistic distinction between *ey* and *eys*o, and claims that their conventional distinction cannot account for many cases. As a matter of fact, Samuel (1992) illustrates 19 different ways to use *ey* and *eys*o. Sohn (1989) has pointed out that students are rather confused about grammatical explanations given by instructors or textbooks. Lack of quality textbooks is a major problem in teaching Korean. Although each book has its own strengths and weaknesses, most of the existing textbooks are unsatisfactory. Some of the weaknesses of existing textbooks include: lack of systematic organization for grammatical structures; inaccurate, or unclear, or inadequate grammar explanations; inconsistent linkage between grammar and drills; lack of communicatively oriented exercises; unnatural dialogues and drill; absence of cultural notes; too many errors in English translation; and inconsistencies in using terminology (Lee, 1993; Cho, 1994; Sohn, 1994; Lee, 1994).

Most of all, accuracy of linguistic facts as well as the order and manner of linguistic presentation is identified as a major problem. Consequently, many errors may be derived from the transfer of training.
4.5 Errors and Learners’ Strategies

One of the many factors causing errors in second language learning is the strategy employed by the learner. Baker (1993) pointed out two learners’ strategies that cause some of the more frequent and persistent errors students make: (1) preserving as much of an utterance as possible in the response to an utterance (student inertia), and (2) thinking in English (L1 interference). He claims that strategy (1) can lead to 2 types of errors.

Type 1: Students include lexical or grammatical elements which were in the utterance but should be left out of their response (p. 2).

(The asterisk marks an inappropriate response; it can be grammatical.)

A: hankwuk mal cal haseyyo.

Student: (a)* Yey, hankwuk mal cal haseyyo. You speak Korean well.

(b)* Yey, hankwuk mal cal hayyo. Yes, I do speak Korean well.

(c)* Kamsahapnita. Thank you.

(d) Aniyo, cal mos hayyo. Not at all, (I) cannot speak (Korean) well.

Baker suggests that the errors in (a) and (b) are due to student inertia, and that the error in (c) is due to L1 interference. In this case, response (d) is an appropriate self-effacing reply.

He also points out the awkward or inappropriate utterances that are caused by thinking in English:

Because of the cultural differences between Korean and the English-speaking world, thinking in English often results in students speaking in ways that sound more ego-centric and self-assertive than is generally appropriate in Korean. It is very difficult for most North American undergraduates to act deferential and self-effacing and that affects the way they speak Korean (p. 5).
Type 2: Students do not change parts of the utterance which should be changed in a response.

( Correct forms are given in brackets.)
A: kyosil aneyse tampay phiweto toyyo?
"Is it okay to smoke in the classroom?"
Student: anio, kyosil aneyse tambay phiweto [phiwumyen] an toyyo.
"No, it is not okay to smoke in the classroom."

Avoidance (Brown, 1980) is a common communication strategy in second language learning. Baker (1993) and Sohn (1991a, 1991b)'s studies show that the most common type of avoidance strategy is syntactic or lexical avoidance within a semantic category. Asked "hankwukey ka posyesseyo?" ("Have you ever been to Korea?"), a student often responds "Anio, hankuk ey kaci an hayo" ("No, I don't go to Korea.") or "Anio, hankwuk ey an kasseyo" ("No, I didn't go to Korea"). Students often avoid using the "epota" ending, since it sounds awkward in English to say "No, I have not had the experience of going to Korea". Baker also points out other problems related to interlingual and intercultural barriers. For example, students avoid the use of -teyyo, com, -ecwuta, and -epota which would not be appropriate in the English equivalent; students do not use the passive voice as much as they should; students over use "ani hata" ("do not do") and underuse of "mos hata" ("cannot do"); students underutilize such softening expressions as "inda" and "com", and sentence endings as -kyunyo and -teyyo; students overuse the Korean literal equivalents for "Thank you". He suggests that in order to minimize students' errors, we have to find ways to give students the self-confidence to change what they hear into what they should respond, and minimize translation exercises to avoid encouraging students to think in English.
So far, major sources of errors students make in learning Korean are discussed in terms of L1 interference, overgeneralization of TL, and transfer of training. It is impossible to identify all possible sources of errors students make in learning Korean. According to Taylor (1975), errors resulting from reliance on L1 structures are more prevalent among beginners, while errors made by intermediate speakers are more attributable to overgeneralization from approximate knowledge of L2. Contradictory to Taylor's claim, intralingual errors appear to be more prevalent in the early stage of learning Korean, as Kellerman (1983, 1984) has pointed out.

4.6 Heritage Learners vs Non-Heritage Learners

One of the most difficult tasks to tackle in Korean language class is to meet the needs of both heritage and non-heritage learners. The reality of Korean language programs in North America is that heritage learners make up the majority of the class; the needs of non-heritage learners are often ignored. Lee (1991) investigated the motivation of two groups, heritage learners and non-heritage learners, in learning Korean. Two motivational orientations, which have been identified by Gardner and Lambert (1972), were used; an integrative motivation and an instrumental motivation for second language learning. Integrative motivation is the desire to learn a second language in order to communicate with its speakers, and is considered a particularly important source of motivation. Instrumental motivation is the desire to learn the language for more utilitarian reasons; e.g. professional advancement, capacity to do one's job well, ability to read useful material in the target
language, potential to interact with members of the foreign culture, etc. Gardner and Lambert claimed that an instrumental motive is less effective. Lee's (1991) subjects were 26 students (20 heritage learners, and 6 non-heritage learners) who were taking the first level of Korean at the University of British Columbia. She found that most heritage learners had integrative motivation (the 'identification' motive was found to be very important, and 3 heritage learners had both integrative and instrumental motivation), and all of the non-heritage learners had an instrumental motivation (they felt Korean would be an important language in the future). She also indicated that all students who received a poor grade were heritage learners, and all the non-heritage learners were high achievers except one who was simply taking the course to fulfill credit needs. Lee's findings contradict Gardner and Lambert's findings; and her data indicated that the strength of the motivation was much more an important factor than the types of motivation.

In terms of error analysis, no research seems to be available on of the topic "Heritage learners vs Non-Heritage learners". We just have vague ideas, and as Sohn (1991a) has mentioned, non-heritage learners have more problems in sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and listening competence than heritage learners. Because of the increasing number of non-heritage learners in recent years, the problem cannot be ignored any longer. Therefore, one object of this study is to identify the learning difficulties of both groups.
5. SUMMARY

In this chapter, contrastive analysis, performance analysis, and error analysis were introduced in order to understand and explain the nature of the errors that second language learners make. This chapter also reviewed the literature which discusses why Korean is difficult for English-speakers. Areas of learning difficulty discussed in the literature include syntax, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and learning vocabulary. Finally, the motivational differences between heritage learners and non-heritage learners was introduced.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN

1. INTRODUCTION
This chapter will provide the reader with the research design. Information is given on the number of subjects chosen for the study, the background of the students, the nature of the exam conducted, and the methods of data collection and analysis.

2. SUBJECTS
The subjects who participated in this study were 33 university students who were taking beginning Korean I (K102) and II (K200) at the University of British Columbia. The study was carried out with two groups; the first group (K102) consisted of a total of 20 students, and the second group (K200) consisted of a total of 13 students.

Amongst the first group, 14 students were heritage learners who had been exposed to Korean language and culture to some degree, although their spoken ability in Korean was quite limited. There were 6 non-heritage learners who were pure beginners; 2 Chinese-speaking learners, 1 Spanish-speaking learner, 1 Japanese-speaking learner, and 2 English-speaking non-heritage learners (Caucasians). However, students from both groups all attended secondary school in Canada, and were considered to have a good command of English. No subjects of the first group (K102) had ever received either KHL (Korean as a
Heritage Language) or KFL (Korean as a Foreign Language) instruction.

The second group (K200) was divided into 3 subgroups; 5 beginning heritage learners (H) who had had no formal KHL instruction previously, and who had started to learn Korean in K200; 4 heritage learners (H) who took K102 at UBC the previous year; and 4 non-heritage (NH) learners who received formal KFL instruction previously at UBC or somewhere else. The errors of 5 students (4H and 1NH) who continued on into K200 were observed carefully to learn in what areas of language errors persisted over time. The distribution of subjects is given in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

The distribution of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of data collection</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>A Total of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep., '93 - Apr. '94</td>
<td>K102</td>
<td>20 ( 6NH, 14H )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep., '94 - Apr. '95</td>
<td>K200</td>
<td>13 ( 4NH, 9H )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H: Heritage learner          NH: Non-Heritage learner
3. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Data of both groups, K102 and K200, was collected by the author through oral examinations. The first oral interview was held in the middle of the first term, and the second exam was held in the middle of the second term. Details are provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Hrs of instruction before the test</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group #1 K102</td>
<td>Test #1</td>
<td>'93 November</td>
<td>approximately 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K102</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (6NH 14H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #2 K200</td>
<td>Test #1</td>
<td>'94 November</td>
<td>approximately 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K200</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (4NH 9H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test #2</td>
<td>'95 February</td>
<td>approximately 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H: Heritage learner   NH: Non-Heritage learner

Each subject in both groups was scheduled for a twenty-minute test, and the oral exam was conducted by the writer. The utterances were all tape recorded for analysis, and later were transcribed by the writer.

All the questions were carefully prepared by using the grammatical structures and vocabulary items they had already learned through the courses. For K102, the first exam consisted of 20 questions (see Appendix 4). Fifteen questions were asked in the second exam (see Appendix 5). Subjects were encouraged to respond to the questions based on their real lives. For K200, each test consisted of 20 questions (see Appendix 5 and 6); most often, unlike K102, situations were provided in order to elicit specific grammatical patterns or vocabulary items. In other words, students’ responses were elicited by telling students to
imagine that they were in a certain situation, and to formulate a response to a question appropriate to the situation. The instructor designed the situation in which an appropriate utterance would have to include the grammatical patterns or vocabulary items for those being tested.

4. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Out of all the students’ responses, those containing errors were extracted and analyzed by the writer; every stage of this study was conducted by the writer for consistency of the study. Students’ errors were analyzed in three categories: (1) linguistic level, (2) the type, and (3) possible sources of the learner’s errors.

At the linguistic level, errors were classified into six categories: errors in lexicon, syntax, pronunciation, morphology, sociolinguistics and pragmatics, and miscellaneous errors. Lexical errors were subcategorized into four areas: noun and pronoun, verb, adverb, and pure Korean and sino-Korean collocation. Eight areas were observed in syntactic errors; word order, particle, tense, negation, clause conjunction, nominalization, complementation, and appropriate verb ending. The questions which students could not understand or misunderstood were categorized as miscellaneous errors (see Appendix 1).

With respect to the manner of errors, four categories were considered: addition, omission, substitution, and word ordering (see Appendix 2).

As for the sources of errors, four sources were identified in students’ errors: (1) interlingual interference in which the learners carried over the habits of the mother tongue
into the target language, (2) intralingual transfer which included overgeneralization in the target language, (3) transfer of training (e.g., teacher-induced errors, material-induced errors), and (4) miscellaneous, including the ambiguous errors in which the sources could not be clearly identified (see Appendix 3).

In transcribing Korean forms, the Yale romanization system is used.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents three sections in which the errors of two groups are discussed in terms of (1) the linguistic levels, (2) the types, and (3) the possible sources. The comparison between heritage learners (H) and non-heritage learners (NH) is presented.

2. LEARNERS IN K102

2.1. Linguistic Errors of Heritage Learners

One-hundred-sixty-five errors were collected from fourteen students. The distribution of errors is given in figure 1.

Figure 1

The Distribution of Errors
Heritage Learners (K102)
Errors were most frequently found in the sociolinguistic and pragmatic area. Thirty-one percent of the total errors was in this categories. Appropriate use of the honorific suffix *si/us* was the major problem, as shown below:

(1) a. A: apecinun myechsiey ilenaseyyo?  
   B: 7siccum *ilenayo* [ilenaseyo].  
   He wakes up at about seven AM.

b. A: yocum pappuseyyo?  
   B: ney, *pappuseyyo* [pappayo].  
   Yes, I am busy.

Within the sociolinguistic and pragmatic areas, the use of honorific and humble speech also posed problems for students, as shown below:

(2) a. A: cenyek 9siccum cipe kyeysilkeeyyo?  
   B: ney, kyeysilkeeyyo [issulkeeyyo].  
   Yes, I will be there (at home).

b. A: pang chengsonun nwukahayyo?  
   B: nay [chey] ka hayyo.  
   I am doing it.

c. A: pwumenimto chal towa tulyeyo?  
   B: ney, chal towa cweyo [tulyeyo].  
   Yes, I am helping them out.
Problems with syntax accounted for 30% of the total errors. Among the syntactic categories, 68% of the errors occurred in the use of particles, as shown in table 3.

TABLE 3
The syntactic errors (K102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Heritage Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>68%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb Ending</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Order</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three types of errors were found in the use of particles:

(3) a: cases in which the appropriate particles were missing:

A: apecinun 2siO [e] cwumwuseyyo.
   My father sleeps at two o’clock

   In January my friend and I did not go travelling.

b: misused particles:

A: swuepu/ [I] isseyo. I have a class.

   25 people are studying the Korean language.

C: achimey [ul] an mekeyo. I don’t eat breakfast.

D: 4siey sinayey [nun] pokcapayyo. At 4 o’clock downtown is busy.
c: wrong choice between the subject particles -ka/I- and the topic marker -un/nun-:

A: chinkwunun etiey salayo? Where does your friend live?
A: pangchengsonun nwuka hayyo? Who is cleaning the room?
B: chenun [cheyka] hayyo. I am doing it.

Students most frequently dropped particles, especially the time particle ey, when it was needed in (3) a. A and B. The fact that students were encouraged to drop the subject, the topic, and the object markers in their spoken Korean seems to have been responsible for the absence of the time, the place, and other particles. Not only does English grammar not have topic markers un/nun or subject markers ka/I, but it also does not have nominative particles ka/I or accusative particles ul/lul. As a result, students seem to have difficulty acquiring these particles and produce errors as seen in (3)b and (3)c respectively.
2.2 Linguistic Errors of Non-Heritage Learners

Eighty-seven errors were collected from 6 non-heritage learners. The distribution of errors is given in figure 2.

The major problematic area was in students’ listening competence. In this study, if students misunderstood questions or could not understand questions, these problems were classified in the miscellaneous category. Thirty-seven percent of the total errors were related to listening competence. Of the 4 main skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), listening is the most fundamental in successfully communicating with others. In L1 acquisition, children go through a lengthy period of listening to people talk to them before they produce their first words. This silent period is necessary for children who are acquiring
their first language. Although the silent period is not obligatory in L2 acquisition, there is evidence that many L2 learners, especially children, go through a silent period. Long and Richards (1987) suggest 33 micro-skills which are required for conversational listening in L2 learning. However, learners, particularly classroom learners, are required to make an effort to speak before they develop their listening skills. Non-heritage learners in this study showed especial difficulty with longer questions as in (4), and with questions which require a concrete answer as in (4)C and (4)D.

(4)  A: onul cenyek 9siccum cipey kyeysilkeeyyo?
    Are you going to be home at 9 o'clock this evening?

    B: nahako kathi sinayey an kakeysseyo?
    Do you not want to go downtown with me?

    C: nwukwuhako kathi hakkyoey wayo?
    With whom do you come to school?

    D: myechsipwuthe myechsikkaci hankwukmal swuepi isseyo?"
    From what time til what time do you have Korean language class?
Besides problems in listening competence, errors amongst non-heritage learners were most frequently found in lexicon - 24% of the total errors- especially in verbs (67% of lexical errors ), as shown in table 4.

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexicon</th>
<th>Non-Heritage Learners (K102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure/Sino Korean #</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun/Pronoun</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the lexical errors in this study occurred in the use of ota/kata (come/go), as in (5).

(5)   A: 9sie hakkyoe kayo [wayo]. I come to school at 9 o’clock.  
     B: honca kayo [wayo]. I come to school alone.

The Korean use ota/kata (come/go) is a little different from that of English “come” and “go” (Huszcza, 1992). In Korean, “go” means motion away from the speaker’s position, and “come” always means motion toward the speaker. Furthermore, in English come/go can be used interchangeably; in Korean, they cannot. Examples are as follows:

(6) Can I come in? Tule ka(“go”)to twayyo?  
    Do you want to come/go with us? Wulihako kathi kal(“go”)layyo?
2.3 Linguistic Errors of Heritage Learners and Non-Heritage Learners

The result is given in table 5.

TABLE 5

THE PERCENTAGE OF ERRORS IN EACH CATEGORY (K102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE LINGUISTIC LEVEL</th>
<th>H &amp; NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>27%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. &amp; Pragmatics</td>
<td>26%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH: Non-Heritage Learner       H: Heritage Learner

Syntax was found to be the most problematic area. This was followed by sociolinguistic and pragmatic errors. Twenty-seven percentage of the total errors (69 out of 252) were syntactic errors, and twenty-six percentage of the total errors (65 out of 252) were made in the areas of sociolinguistic and pragmatic.

Among the syntactic errors students made, errors most frequently recurred in the use of particles (64% of the syntactic errors students made). This was followed by tense (23% of the syntactic errors students made).

Both heritage and non-heritage groups showed similar weaknesses, in the following
categories: the proper use of the subject honorific suffix *usi/si* (e.g. ilenas\text{\textit{ita}}/ilenata, paywus\text{\textit{ita}}/paywuta); the misuse of particles; and the misuse of honorific and humble speech (e.g.: capswusita/mehta, ce/na).

Non-heritage learners were much weaker in listening competence than heritage learners. In pronunciation, non-heritage learners spoke slowly but produced more accurate pronunciation than heritage learners. Non-heritage learners had more difficulty with aspirated sounds, voiced/voiceless sounds, and tensed sounds as well as with the ‘\textit{t}’ sound followed by another ‘\textit{t}’ sound (e.g.: kellyeyo). On the other hand, heritage learners’ mispronunciations were much different from that of non-heritage learners. Heritage learners substituted \textit{wu} instead of \textit{e} (e.g.: hanpwun[hanpen]), \textit{ay} instead of \textit{a} (e.g.: haylkeeyyo[halkeeyyo]), \textit{e} or \textit{u} instead of \textit{a} (e.g.: pappe[ppa]yo, or pappu[ppa]yo), and \textit{o} instead of \textit{wu} (e.g.: chinkwu hakwu[hako]).

These errors were common among heritage learners.

Despite the differences in word order typology between English and Korean, word order was found to be the least problematic area for both heritage and non-heritage groups.

2.4 The Types of Errors of Heritage and Non Heritage Learners

Errors were classified into four categories (e.g., substitution, omission, addition, and word order). Forty-seven percent of the total errors were in the ‘substitution’ category. Mainly wrong particles were substituted, as shown below:
Twenty-four percent of the total errors occurred in the ‘omission’ category. In natural spoken Korean, subject particles, topic markers, and object particles can be dropped. Therefore, students are often encouraged to drop these particles in their speech. However, there are cases when the particles are obligatory even though the meaning of the sentence can be conveyed when they are omitted, as shown in (8):

(8)  

a. Omission of the time particle;

6si0[e] ilenayo.  
I wake up at 6 o’clock.

1wele[e] yehayng an hayssseyo.  
I did not travel in January.

b. Omission of the obligatory subject particle;

Q: nwuka pang chengsolul hayyo?  
Who cleans the room?

emenio[ka] haseyyo.  
My mom does.
We have already noted one reason why learners habitually drop topic, subject, and object markers: they are encouraged to do so in their speech. Two other reasons can account for these types of errors. First, there is sometimes a tendency by instructors to neglect the absence of the obligatory particles in learners' speech. Second, the learners might be unaccustomed to using these case markers because they are absent from their native language. The cause of the errors could be accounted for the following reasons: learners drop the particles habitually because they are encouraged to drop the topic markers and the subject and object particles in their speech; teachers tend to neglect the absence of the obligatory particles in learners' speech; the learner is not accustomed to using these particles in his/her native language.

2.5 Sources of Errors of Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners

To enumerate all possible sources of second language errors would be an impossible task. However, there are potentially two sources of transfer: interlingual errors of interference from the native language, and intralingual errors within the target language. Taylor (1975) claimed that learners at an elementary level produced more transfer errors (interlingual errors) and learners at an intermediate or advanced level produced more intralingual errors. Contrary to Taylor's findings, in this study, fifty-nine percent of the total errors were intralingual errors, while thirteen percent of the total errors were a result of interference from English. The following are examples of the interlingual errors collected from the students:
(9)  a. 10sikkaciccum [10sikkaci] kongpwuhaysseyo. I study until ten o’clock.”

b. 4siccum[o] ieyo. It is around 4 o’clock.

c. Swuepul[i] isseyo. I have a class.


e. 25myeng haksayngi[haksayng 25myengi] hankkwukmalul kongpwuhayyo. 25 students study the Korean language.

f. osulo[yo]? Today?

Notice in (9a) that it is correct to say in English “I studied until around 10 o’clock.” However, in Korean, the correct form is “han(around) 10si(10 o’clock) kkaci(until)”. In English, the copula ‘be’ is used for the following sentences:

b.1 It is 4 o’clock.

b.2 It is around 4 o’clock.

In order to say (b2) in Korean, another verb must be used: “4siccum twaysseyo( literally, ‘it became around 4 o’clock’)”. In (9c), since ‘a class’ is an object in English(I-subject have-verb a class- object), students used the object particle when forming the Korean sentence. However, in Korean, ‘a class’ in this sentence must be accompanied by the particles ‘I’. In (9d), students are mistranslating the English particle ‘in’ in the sentence “It is crowded in Vancouver”. When they translated this sentence into Korean, it became “Vancouver is crowded”. In this case they used the particle ‘-ey’ incorrectly. The natural way to say (9d) in Korean is with the topic marker ‘nun’: “peynkhwupenun pokcaphayyo (Vancouver is
crowded). The word order was the problem in (9e): “haksayng(student) 25myeng( 25 person - number classifier for person)” is the correct order in Korean. (9f) is a case where students have omitted the polite addressee honorific ender ‘-yo’: “onul(today)y0?” (‘yo’-the polite addressee honorific ender). In short, these examples are a clear case of first language interference in second language acquisition.

Students often make sociolinguistic errors because of a misleading or insufficient explanation from the teacher or textbook. In this study, the following errors in this category were identified:

(10) a. insufficient explanation of ota/kata (come/go);

   e.g.: kachi wayo[kayo]. Are you coming?

b. insufficient explanation of the sociolinguistic dimensions of the proposetive grammatical pattern;

   e.g.: (to teacher) sinaye kapsita Let’s go downtown.

No textbooks adequately explains the fact that the Korean usage of ‘come’ and ‘go’ is different from the English use of the same verbs. The example in (10b) is grammatically correct, but in Korean it is sociolinguistically inappropriate to say “kapsita (Let’s go)” to a superior or senior. In Korean, in order to suggest to one’s superior to do something, one should use other verb endings to ‘soften’ the expression; for example, “kasiciyo”. Neither the teacher nor the textbook provided this information to the class. Teachers sometimes ignore this problem area because the expression is grammatically correct in certain circumstances, but not in all. The Korean language is sensitive to social position and
hierarchy and this cannot always be conveyed in a classroom situation where the students learning tend to come from similar social and age background.

2.6 Summary

The distribution of errors of heritage and non-heritage learners is given in table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE LINGUISTIC LEVEL</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>H &amp; NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%*</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>30%*</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. &amp; Pragmatics</td>
<td>31%*</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%*</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH: Non-Heritage Learner  H: Heritage Learner

In this sampling of students at the beginning level (Korean 102), intralingual errors predominated over interlingual errors. Although both groups did poorly in lexicon, most of the errors were associated with the verbs ‘to come/to go’. Both heritage and non-heritage learners experienced quite similar weaknesses in the use of honorific suffixes, the misuse of particles, and the misuse of honorific and humble speech. Most errors made by heritage learners occurred in the sociolinguistic area, and the misuse of particles; heritage learners
had more trouble using honorific suffixes at this level. Non-heritage learners demonstrated their weakness in listening competence.

Errors included the substitution of incorrect particles and the dropping of obligatory particles. The major problem was the substitution of wrong particles. Word order was the least problematic area at this level.

3. LEARNERS IN KOREAN 200

3.1 Linguistic Errors of Heritage Learners

At the Korean 200 level, one-hundred-thirty six errors were collected from nine students. The distribution of errors is given in figure 3.

Figure 3
The Distribution of Errors
Heritage Learners (K200)
Errors were most frequently found in the syntax area. Fifty percent of the total errors were related to syntax. Misuse of the particles (62% of the syntactic errors) was the major problem, as shown below:

(11) a. misuse of the particles;

swuepcwungeyse[ey] sayntuwichlul pekumyen an twayyo.
You are not allowed to eat a sandwich in the middle of the lecture.

cipey[eyse] naolttay mwunul camkesseyo.
I locked the door when I left home.

hankwuke paywunun kesi[ul] kyelsimhaysseyo.
I decided to learn Korean.

hankwukeyun nemwuteweyo. Korea is too hot.

swukceyka[lul] halkeeyyo. I will do my homework.

chipeyse[ey] amwuto epsesseyo. Nobody was at home.

b. omission of obligatory particles;

UBCoka] ceyil khun ke kathyo. UBC seems to be the biggest (university).

Johno[hako] iyaki han taumey swukcwyhaysseyo.
I did my homework after I spoke with John.

hankwuk yelumo[i] te teweyo. The Korean summer is more hot.

uysao[hanthey] kan ili epseyo. I have never gone to see a doctor.

The Korean particles contribute to forming a functional meaning unit by being attached to each word. In general, misuse of the particles are attributable to syntactic or semantic interference to a considerable extent. The fact that English does not have case markers like
Korean seems to be responsible for the difficulty in using appropriate particles.

Appropriate use of the clause conjunctions also posed problems (21% of the syntactic errors) for students, as shown below:

(12)  hankwukey kassnuntey[kassulttay] acwu teweseyo.  \(\text{(NH)}\)

It was very hot when I went to Korea.

cipey nuckey wassultey[omyen] honnayo.  \(\text{(NH)}\)

I am in trouble when I get home late.

sihemi kkuthnantey[kkuthnamyen] tosekwanpwuthe kalkeeyyo.  \(\text{(NH)}\)

I will go to the library when the exam is over.

sihemi kkuthnalttey[kkuthnamyen] khalkalipwuthe kalkeeyyo.  \(\text{(H)}\)

I will go to Calgary when the exam is over.

Non-heritage learners made more errors than heritage learners in this category.

Problems with lexicon accounted for 20% of the total errors. Most of the errors occurred in the use of verbs and adverbs, as in (13):

(13)  a. the misuse of verbs;

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pwulphyehayse[aphase]} & \text{ uysahanthey kanili isseyo.}  \\
\text{momsali isseseyo[nasseyo]}  & \text{My whole body is aching.}
\end{align*}
\]

b. the misuse or absence of adverbs;

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{0[chal]} & \text{ kkesseyo.}  \\
\text{Mwuesitunci chal[acwu] coahayyo.}  & \text{I like almost everything.}
\end{align*}
\]

Some verbal and adverbial errors were due to the similarity of the meanings. Perhaps insufficient information about the usage of the words might be responsible for the confusion.
3.2 Linguistic Errors of Non-Heritage Learners

Eighty-six errors were collected from four non-heritage learners. The distribution of errors is given in figure 4.

The most problematic area was in Syntax; among the syntactic errors, 66% occurred in the use of particles, and 20% occurred in the use of clause conjunctions, as shown below:
a. errors in the use of particles;

(the misuse of particles)

emmaka[hanthey] honnasseyo.
My mother gave me a hard time.
cipeyse[ey] amwuto epsesseyo.
No one was at home.
chinkwukathi[hanthey] han thek nayn ilisseyo.
I treated my friend.
The light was on when I left home.
swukceyka[lul] hal keeyyo.
I will do my homework.

(the omission of particles)

hankwukyelumo[i] te teweyo.
The Korean summer is more hot.
tholontho tayhako[i] te kheyo.
The University of Toronto is bigger.
khun hyengoi] thi pilul pokol issesseyo.
My big brother was watching TV.

b. errors in the use of clause conjunctions;

nuckey wassulttay[omyen] hon nayo.
I am in trouble when I arrive late.
swukceylul hayse[hako] yenghwalul kalkeeyyo.
I will do my homework and then go to a movie.
Sihemi kkuthsantay[kkuthnamyen] tosekwaney kalkeeyyo.
I will go to the library when my exam is over.
hankwukey kako[kase] yenge sensayngnili toyko sipheyo.
I want to go to Korea and become a English language teacher.
For non-heritage learners, like heritage learners, the misuse of particles and the omission of the obligatory particles were the most problematic areas. As already pointed out, this is due to the fact that English does not have case markers and the Korean language does.

In their second year of study, non-heritage learners begin to experience problems with word order. See the following example:

(15) *sukceylul ta hay nohassese phathiey kakeysseyo.
(1) (2)

[phathey khaki ttaymwuney sukceylul ta hay nohasseyo.]

(2) (1)

I finished my homework because I am going to a party.

(1) (2)

Furthermore, pragmatic errors started to appear in their speech, as shown below:

(16) hanpenman kyelsekhaysseyo. [hanpenpakke kyelseyhaci anasseyo.]

I only missed one class.

conun hakkyoeyse cal moshayse kulayyo. [kongpwulul chal moshayse kulayyo]

I did not do well at school.

sihemi manhumyen coyonghayyo. [sihemi manhumyen malul an hayyo.]

If I have a lot of exams I am very quiet.

acikto kyelsekhaci anhasseyo. [hanpento kyelseyhaci anhasseyo.]

I never missed a class.

Improvements in fluency in Korean tend to result in more frequent pragmatic errors.
3.3 Linguistic Errors of Heritage Learners and Non-Heritage Learners

The results are given in table 7.

TABLE 7
THE PERCENTAGE OF ERRORS IN EACH CATEGORY (K200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE LINGUISTIC LEVEL</th>
<th>H &amp; NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>50.5%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>18.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. &amp; Pragmatics</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H: Heritage Learner  NH: Non-Heritage Learner

Syntax was found to be the most problematic area. This was followed by lexicon. Both heritage and non-heritage groups showed similar weaknesses in the following syntactic categories: the proper use of particles, and clause conjunctions. In pronunciation, both groups still had problems with the tensed sounds, and aspirated sounds (e.g.: kk/kh, pp/ph, tt/th, cc/ch) as well as the ‘I’ sound followed by another ‘I’ sound, as shown below:

(17) amwutto[to] molayo[mollayo]. Nobody knows. (NH )
    pwulul khyesseyo[kkyesseyo]. I turned the lights on. (NH, H)
    pwulul kyesseyo[kkesseyo]. I turned the lights off. (NH, H)
    tu/yese[tullycse] kathi kayo. Let us drop by and go with [him or her]. (NH )
    10pwun ke/yo[kellyeyo] It takes 10 minutes. (NH, H)
For some vowels, both groups made similar types of pronunciation errors (e.g.: 'hay' instead of 'ha', 'wu' instead of 'o'). However, heritage learners showed more errors than non-heritage learners in mispronouncing vowels. Both groups showed very similar difficulties in learning Korean. The increase of pragmatic errors, however, was more prevalent among non-heritage learners. Heritage learners also has constant problems with the use of particles and clause conjunctions. Although heritage learners had problems constantly in the use of particles, they made less errors in other areas compared to non-heritage learners. However, heritage learners were not strongly motivated to learn Korean, and did not seem to put their effort into learning the language.

3.4 The Persistent Errors of Heritage and Non-Heritage Learners

In both K102 and K200, persistent errors occurred in the misuse or omission of particles. Although students' pronunciation and fluency improved over the course of 2 years, they still had problems with the tensed and aspirated sounds and with the '1' sound followed by another '1' sound. Difficulty experienced in 1st year with the use of the subject honorific suffix tended to disappeared in 2nd year. However, in 2nd year, problems in pragmatics and word order started to increase.
3.5 The Types of Errors of Heritage Learners and Non-Heritage Learners

Fifty-five percent of the total errors occurred in the ‘substitution’ category. Wrong particles were substituted, as shown in (14 a.1).

Twenty-two percent of the total errors occurred in the ‘omission’ category. In their first year, students tended to drop the obligatory particles in their speech. This problem was repeated in 2nd year. Examples are provided in (14 a.2)

Twelve percent of the total errors occurred in the ‘addition’ category, as shown below:

\[(18) \quad \text{a. hakyoeypwuthe}[o] \text{kayo.} \quad \text{Go to school first.} \]
\[\text{b. ecey cipey}lul[o]\text{kassulttayyo.} \quad \text{When I went home yesterday...} \]
\[\text{c. cenun}[o] \text{cipey nuckey tulekassulttay emmahathey honnasseyo.} \quad \text{When I got home late my mother gave me a hard time.} \]

Non-heritage learners tended to add unnecessary personal pronouns as in (18c).

3.6 Sources of Errors of Heritage learners and Non-Heritage learners

Seventy-three percent of the total errors were identified as intralingual errors, while twelve percent were interlingual errors. There were ambiguous errors which were not traceable to English or Korean. However, most of the interlingual errors and the intralingual errors were traceable. Examples of interlingual, and intralingual errors are as follows:
(19) a. the interlingual errors;

enuil[amwuil] inayo.  Any kind of work.
hankwukey[un] nemwu teweyo.  Korea is too hot.

[more examples are provided in (15), and (16)]

b. the intralingual errors;

[examples are provided in (11), (12), (13), and (14)].

3.7 Summary

The distribution of errors of heritage and non-heritage learners is given in table 8.

TABLE 8

THE PERCENTAGE OF ERRORS IN EACH CATEGORY (K200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE LINGUISTIC LEVEL</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NH &amp; H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>18.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>51%**</td>
<td>50%**</td>
<td>50.5%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio. &amp; Pragmatics</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-heritage learners and heritage learners showed very similar difficulties in learning Korean in 2nd year. Most errors made by both groups occurred in the syntax area, especially in the use of particles. Furthermore, errors in the word order started to increase after relative clauses were introduced. Pragmatic errors appeared in students’ errors, particularly in non-heritage learners’ speech.
Most of the errors were related to over-generalizing the rules of Korean grammar; as in 1st year, intralingual errors were more prevalent than interlingual errors in 2nd level.

4. SUMMARY

In this chapter, the difficulties of learning Korean were identified at the 1st (K102), and the 2nd (K200) levels. The possible sources of errors, and the persistent errors were discussed. Two groups, heritage learners and non-heritage learners, were compared in terms of their weaknesses at each level.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores the results of the research and the limitations of the study. A section examining the implications of this project for further research will be followed by a discussion of the significance of the study.

2. QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

The following are the answers to the study questions posed at the outset of this thesis:

1. What kinds of errors do students make in a conversational context?

   In K102, learners showed weaknesses in the use of honorific suffixes, the misuse of particles, and the misuse of honorific and humble speech. However, non-heritage learners were much weaker in listening competence, and heritage learners had more problems in the use of honorifics compared to non-heritage learners. In K200, learners showed continual weakness in the use of particles. Non-heritage learners, unlike heritage learners, produced pragmatic errors as they gained fluency in speaking Korean.

2. Are errors traceable to L1 and/or other-than-L1 sources?

   Both K102 and K200, most of the errors were caused by the interference of
English, and an over-generalization of the rules of Korean. Although some errors had ambiguous root causes, it was very clear that both groups produced far more intralingual errors than interlingual errors.

3. What errors are more persistent than others?

In syntax, students’ ability to use honorific suffixes, and honorific and humble speech tended to improve over the course of this study. However, learners persistently produced errors by using wrong particles and omitting obligatory markers. In pronunciation, learners demonstrated constant difficulties with tensed sounds, aspirated sounds, and ‘l’ sounds followed by another ‘l’ sounds. Furthermore, heritage learners’ fossilized mispronunciation was improved only marginally over the years.

4. Why are some errors so persistent?

Two reasons can be given: first, learners showed extreme difficulty with some grammatical features that were absent in their native language (i.e.; case markers); second, some approximate systems (i.e.: pronunciation, patterns, vocabularies, and so on) were fossilized before receiving formal instruction of the language, and it is extremely hard to break these habits.

5. Is there a ‘system’ in learners’ errors?

In this study, such a system was not detected; no structural patterns in their errors were found.
6. Do students who learn Korean as a FL (non-heritage learners) make different errors than those who learn Korean as a HL (heritage learners)?

Although both groups showed very similar difficulties in learning Korean, they made slightly different errors at the different levels. In K102, heritage learners showed more difficulties in using honorific suffixes, while non-heritage learners showed their weakness in listening competence. In speaking, heritage learners were more fluent than non-heritage learners. Although non-heritage learners spoke very slowly, but showed more accuracy in pronunciation and using grammar. In K200, non-heritage learners, as they started to gain fluency in speaking Korean, produced more pragmatic errors than heritage learners.

3. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Error Analysis is limited by its inability to provide a complete picture of learner language (Ellis, 1994). Ellis pointed to two main categories of the criticism: weakness in methodological procedures, and limitations in scope. Error analysis has a descriptive and explanatory focus rather than a prescriptive one. Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977) identified six weaknesses within the two main categories: because of its focus on errors, error analysis produced only partial accounts of ILs, and said little about what the learner was doing that was correct; analysts often classified errors subjectively, sometimes underestimating the L1 as a source of error because of lack of familiarity with the range of
native languages represented in their sample; analyses were often unquantified; explanations of errors were often impressionistic and vague; error analysis studies suffered from biased samples, with over-representation of certain L1s, certain types of subjects, and certain types of (performance) data precluding valid generalizations; by focusing on what the learner did (wrongly), error analysis ignored avoidance (Schachter, 1974). According to Ellis, this latter category represented a more substantive problem. He argued that since the methodology focuses on what learners do, it is difficult for the investigator to examine avoidance. This study attempted to minimize this problem by designing situations in which the student could not avoid the utilization of certain patterns and vocabulary items. However the data base of this study is a limited one and the issues raised by Ellis and Schachter and Celce-Murcia need to be considered.

Everyone makes mistakes in their native language and in second language situations. Corder (1981) suggests the importance of distinguishing between 'mistakes' and 'errors' in order to analyze learners' errors properly. He refers to 'mistakes' as slips of the tongue (or pen) that often occur because of memory lapses, physical states such as tiredness, and psychological conditions such as anxiety. However, it is extremely difficult and potentially misleading to make this type of distinction between 'mistakes' and 'errors'. In this study, to avoid such faulty assumptions, possible mistakes students made were counted as errors. However, to minimize students' 'mistakes', sufficient time to respond to questions was given, and when students asked, questions were repeated.

Performance errors, as mentioned previously, are related to such factors as fatigue,
memory limitations, and anxiety. The interviewer tried to provide as pleasant and relaxing an environment as possible to lower students’ anxiety levels. However, anxiety still might have affected students’ performances.

In pronunciation, fluency was not considered. However, substitution of wrong vowels or consonants was counted as an error, although the message was understood by the hearer.

There are developmental errors, interlingual errors, intralingual errors, and unique errors. In this study, the focus was on the interlingual errors and intralingual errors only. Developmental errors and unique errors were ignored, because no sources were available positively to identify these errors.

Communicative competence includes sociolinguistic competence and grammatical competence. Sociolinguistic competence is related to the ability to send and interpret signals appropriate to the specific situation in its social context; it is also called nonverbal communication competence. Nonverbal language includes facial expressions, eye contact, silence, touching, gestures and postures, distancing, body space, and so on. In nonverbal communication, there are distinctive differences between North America and Korea. In Korea, sometimes nonverbal language says more than the spoken language. In this study, however, the nonverbal language was not taken into account because of the formal way in which the research was conducted.

All of the non-heritage learners’ first language was considered as English because all of them attended secondary school in Canada; there was 1 Spanish-Canadian, 1 Japanese-Canadian, and 3 Chinese-Canadians.
This study includes 23 heritage learners and 10 non-heritage learners. Due to the small number of subjects, the results should not be generalized. More data is needed to make more conclusive findings.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS

The findings of this study suggest several recommendations for Korean language educators. Generally speaking, most of heritage learners have integrative motivations, and most heritage learners have instrumental motivations. Whether it is an integrative or instrumental motivation, motivation is an important factor in determining success in learning a foreign language. However, while the study was conducted, it was noticed that heritage learners were less motivated than non-heritage learners. The reasons can be various: the textbook dialogues and vocabulary were too elementary for them; the course content did not interest them; the teaching methodology was unsatisfactory, and so on. The factor of motivation has a significant role in second language acquisition. In order to motivate students, the course content should be derived from students' needs, interests, and goals. The content for learning should be drawn from the students themselves -what their concerns are, and what they want to express- rather than being prescribed externally by teacher or text; language that is meaningful to the students supports the learning process. There must be self-investment on the part of the learner. This investment will promote the positive motivation associated with improved retention. Furthermore, increasing learners' involvement in structuring formal language learning experiences will bring about greater...
motivation and more effective language acquisition.

In Korean society, where status relationships are linguistically coded, a foreigner’s failure to choose a speech level and other linguistic forms appropriate to the particular context often leads to a very embarrassing result. Native speakers acquire the sociolinguistic rules in the process of growing up. However, the case is quite different for foreign students who learn Korean in a limited time and in situations circumscribed in most cases to classroom interactions. Both groups in this study, heritage and non-heritage learners showed difficulties in the sociolinguistic area. Teachers should have a plan for a variety of inputs from different people, so that students can learn to understand both formal and informal speech, different speech functions, and individual differences in style and register. Role play is a useful and even crucial method of teaching appropriate speech registers and levels in a variety of social situations to students; activities that involve real communication promote learning.

Error is a natural and a necessary part of second language acquisition. Although the error correction is not recommended by some researchers, except in cases of severe communication breakdown, the constant feedback is necessary for preventing fossilization in pronunciation and intonation, particularly at the beginning level. To improve students’ pronunciation, students in K102 were asked to record a dialogue or a reading passage every week, and were given feedback throughout the year. Over the period, non-heritage learners showed a significant improvement in pronunciation and intonation, whereas heritage learners showed only marginal improvement. Heritage learners’ mispronunciation, as well
as informal speech habits, were strong, and persistent. Therefore, corrections should be given properly and constantly to prevent students from building bad habits.

Non-heritage learners were much weaker in listening comprehension than heritage learners in K102. In order to accelerate the development of listening skills for heritage learners, consider the following suggestions: rather than demanding the accuracy of grammar in listening development, lots of comprehensible input should be provided; listening for the context or main idea is very important in listening stage; provide a variety of purposeful listening activities; more visual aids or visual images for key lexical items need to be used with exercises in order to make listening comprehension easier; 'capitalizing on the moment' is an excellent input for students; clearer articulation, and non-linguistic resources are required in the early stages; as well, shorter sentences and syntactic simplification should be considered in the early stages.

New vocabulary should be introduced in context with connotation of words (i.e.: positive, or negative, or both negative and positive connotative meanings), usage of words (i.e.: spoken or written language), and the semantic differences with the words which have similar meanings. Students in K200 started to show difficulties in semantics, especially in the use of lexical items. The consequences of not learning connotative meanings can be serious communication problems. Depending on the circumstances, one can insult, be insulted, offended, and be offended, or just not understand what is said. Therefore, teachers should be more aware of the nature and function of vocabulary, and the appropriate introduction of new vocabulary. Furthermore, teachers also should be aware of the different
concepts of a word between Korean and English; for examples, ‘chinkwu (friend),
‘tongmwun (alumni), ‘kohyang (hometown), and so on.

The role of pragmatic knowledge in communicative competence has been recognized
in recent years. Pragmatic competence is defined by Ellis (1994) as “the knowledge that
speaker-hearers use in order to engage in communication, including how speech acts are
successfully performed” (P. 719). Pragmatics is particularly concerned with appropriateness,
both with regard to what is said in a particular context and how it is said; learners have to
learn when it is appropriate to perform a particular language function and also how to
encode it. Pragmatics is closely related to culture; there is an intimate relationship between
the language structure of a culture and the modes in which people think and act. Cultural
barriers are much more difficult to overcome than linguistic barriers, although it is hard to
draw a sharp line between linguistic and cultural elements. They are so closely interwoven
that they are usually inseparable in most cases. When languages like Korean and English
are remote from each other not only in linguistic structure but also in cultural background,
cross-cultural communication is extremely difficult to effect. The greater the cultural
distance, the greater the language difference. Lado (1957) claimed that cultures are
‘structured systems of patterned behavior’. By comparing the two culture systems, as Lado
claims, we can predict what the trouble spots will be. There are a large gap in thought
patterns, communication styles, and speech behaviour between North America and Korea.
Therefore, students who want to learn to speak Korean should be encouraged to think and
speak like a Korean. Our job as language teachers is to help them not only to learn the
linguistic systems, but also to see a Korean way of viewing the world. Some suggestions can be given: the pragmatic patterns of English and Korean should be explicitly compared or contrasted; translation exercises from English into Korean should be minimized or avoided; providing pragmatically conventionalized expressions should be maximized.

With regard to materials and curricula, errors cannot be predicted precisely for each student of a foreign language. If developmental sequences are found to be predictable, the sequencing of materials could benefit from such ordering. However, such sequences are not found yet in Korean. Since the goal of learning a foreign language is to communicate with others, the functional aspects of language and the structural aspects of language should be considered together. Brown (1980) provides the list of communicative acts that are common everyday acts:

1. Greeting, parting, inviting, accepting;
2. Complimenting, congratulating, flattering, seducing, charming, bragging;
3. Interrupting;
4. Requesting;
5. Evading, lying, shifting blame, changing the subject;
6. Criticizing, reprimanding, ridiculing, insulting, threatening, warning;
7. Complaining;
8. Accusing, denying;
9. Agreeing, disagreeing, arguing;
10. Persuading, insisting, suggesting, reminding, asserting, advising;
11. Reporting, evaluating, commenting;
12. Commanding, ordering, demanding;
13. Questioning, probing;
14. Sympathizing;
15. Apologizing, making excuses (P. 195).

Korean language learners need to aware of the purpose of communication, and how to achieve that purpose through linguistic forms. Brown notes that a learner should not only acquire correct word order, syntax, and lexical items, but also understand how to achieve a desired and intended function through careful selection of words, structure, intonation, nonverbal signals, and astute perception of the context of a particular stretch of discourse (p.195). Korean language materials should include “the Korean way” to apologize, or make excuses, and so on with adequate information about speech behaviour; subtle differences between communicative acts must be specifically conveyed to learners.

4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Any study of errors involving a language is important for researchers and teachers. The systematic study of students’ errors which are produced by English speaking learners of Korean is necessary for understanding some aspects of the processes of second language acquisition, and for helping Korean language teachers understand the nature of students’ errors. A teacher who knows the cause of an error is much better equipped to deal with the problem than one who does not. Furthermore, an understanding of the cause of students’ errors helps in the development and improvement of teaching materials. Because this study compared the strengths and weaknesses of heritage learners with non-heritage learners, it
will provide a useful base of information for understanding the different needs of the two groups.

In this study, students showed difficulties in using appropriate particles. Particles play an important and crucial role in determining the function of a word in Korean. The misuse of particles can be attributed to syntactic or semantic confusion. The fact that English does not have the same kind of grammatical feature as Korean seems to be responsible for the difficulty in using appropriate particles. Eom (1989) reported that Indiana University students learning Korean as a foreign language or as a heritage language tended to acquire certain particles earlier than others; he found a sequence of acquisition of 7 Korean particle types. Further research is recommended to investigate the “natural sequence” in learning Korean particles. The discovery of such a natural sequence might help to provide more effective instruction in teaching Korean particles. Additionally it would support the theory of “a creative construction process” in second language acquisition.

Most heritage learners were exposed to Korean and Korean culture to some degree, so they were getting natural input from outside of the classroom. Heritage learners made strikingly similar types of structural and phonological errors. Are these errors similar in kind to errors made by heritage children? What can be done to help students overcome this type of fossilization? Further research on these issues will be helpful for understanding the process of second language acquisition.

One of the most difficult tasks in teaching Korean is to teach the sociolinguistic and
pragmatic rules that are particularly important in learning Korean. The sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and semantic disparity between Korean and English contributes to the difficulties of English-speakers learning Korean. We need a systematic presentation of these rules of Korean. How can we teach sociolinguistic and pragmatic rules of the target language through a more or less formalized, controlled and graded education process? Further research should provide the language teacher with more concrete and varied ways of developing such an educational process.
REFERENCES


Lee, O. Y. (1967). In this earth & in that wind: This is Korea. [Translated by D. Steinberg] Royal Asiatic Society: Seoul Computer Press.


## CATEGORIZING ERRORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The LINGUISTIC LEVEL</th>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF ERRORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH1 NH2 NH3...</td>
<td>H1 H2 H3...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXICON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns/Pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure/Sino-Korean collocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTAX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominalization (-ki)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementation (-kes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb ending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONUNCIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLINGUISTICS &amp; PRAGMATICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF ERRORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH: Non-Heritage Learner  
H: Heritage Learner
APPENDIX 2

THE TYPES OF ERRORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF ERRORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH1 NH2 NH3...</td>
<td>H1 H2 H3...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF ERRORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH: Non-Heritage Learner    H: Heritage Learner
## APPENDIX 3

### THE POSSIBLE SOURCES OF ERRORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE SOURCES OF ERRORS</th>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF ERRORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH1 NH2 NH3...</td>
<td>H1 H2 H3...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intralingual Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OF ERRORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NH: Non-Heritage Learner  
H: Heritage Learner
APPENDIX 4

Korean Oral Exam #1 (K102)

1. Annyenghaseyyo? Yocum ettehkey cinayseyyo?
2. Yocum hankwukmal paywusiciyo?
3. Etieyse paywuseyyo?
4. Caymiisseyo?
5. Nwuka hankwukmalul kaluchiseyyo?
6. Myech myengina hankwukmalul kongpwuhayyo?
7. Myech sipwuthe myech sikkaci hankwukmal swuepi isseyo?
8. Kulem myech sie hakkyoey oseyyo?
9. Cipi hakkyoeyse meleyo?
10. Ediey saseyyo?
11. Nwukwuhalo kathi hakkyoey wayo?
12. Ecey hankwukmal myech sikan kongpwuhaysseyo?
13. Cenyek ahopsiccum cipey kyeysilkeeyyo?
14. Apecinun myech siey cwumwuseyyo?
15. Kulem apecinun myech siey ilenaseyyo?
16. Apecinun achimul myech siey capswuseyyo?
17. Apeci yocum pappuseyyo?
18. (student's name)to yocum pappuseyo?
19. Cikum myech sieyyo?
20. Pelsse kal ttayka twayssciyo?
APPENDIX 5

Korean Oral Exam #2 (K102)

1. Yocum kuli pappuci anhayo?
2. Nahako kathi sinayey an kakeysseyo?
3. Pesulo kalkkayo?
4. Sinaykkaci pesulo myech pwunccum kellyeyo?
5. Neysiccum peynkwupeka pokcapahlkkayo?

**********

6. Chinkwuhanthey phyencilul cacwu ssayo?
7. Pothong han taley myech cangccum ssayo?
8. Chinkwuka tapcangul kot hayyo?
9. Chinkwunun etiey salayo?
10. Ilweley chinkwuhalako kathi yehaynghaysseyo?

**********

11. Pang chengsonun nwuka hayyo?
12. Chengsolul cacwu hayyo?
13. Nay samwusil chengsolum com towa cwukeysseyo?
14. Pwumonimto cal towa tulyeyo?
15. Encey pwumonimul towa tulyesseyo?
APPENDIX 6

Korean Oral Exam #1 (K200)

1. [ You do not want to do anything because you are tired. ]
   Swuep kkuthnan taumey yenghwa kallayyo?

2. [ You are going to write a letter, and then give the letter to me. ]
   Pyenci ta ssesseyo?

3. [ You do not want to go to Korea in August, because it is extremely hot in Korea. ]
   Way phalweley hankwukey an kayo?

4. [ Nobody knows what the teacher is going to ask in an oral exam. ]
   Sensayngnimi mwel mwule posilci nwuka alayo?

5. [ Tom keeps turning the light on and off. ]
   Thomi mwel hayyo?

6. [ You did your homework after you talked to Tom. ]
   Encey swukcey haysseyo?

7. [ You strongly feel that you must study hard, because you are a student. ]
   Kongpwuhayha hayyo?
   Way kongpwulul yelsimhi haci ashumyen an twayyo?

8. [ Your teacher would not allow students to eat sandwiches in the class. ]
   Swuepcwungey sayntuwichilul meketo twayyo?

9. [ When you went to Korea last summer, it was very hot. ]
   Hankwuki kulehkey tewesseyo?
10. [ You want to do your homework first before you go to see a movie. ]
   Cikum yenghwa pole kalkeeyyo?

11. [ You want to swim. ]
   You ask your friend to drop by when she or he is ready to go swimming. ]
   swuyenghale kapsita.

12. Nayilto pika olkes kathciyo?

13. Nalssika kaymyen mwel hallayyo?

14. Yekise supheyniswi peynkhukkaci elmana meleyo?

15. Peynkhwupe yelumi hankwuk yelum mankhum teweyo?

16. Khanata tayhakcwungeysey enu tayhaki ceyil kheyo?

17. Eysueyphuyunun yupisi mankhum kheyo?

18. I yecahako I yecanun nwuka te yeypun kes kathayo?

19. Pap mekun hwuey kot wuntonghamyen cohayo?

20. Hakkyoeyse cipey kamyen mwe pwuthe hayyo?
1. Yupisiey tuleonci elmana twaysseyo?

2. Ecey cipey kassulttay nwuka thipilul pokolokk Kosovo?

3. Onul cipeysey naolttay pwulul cal kkuko nawaessyo?

4. Ipen hakkiey hankwuke swuepul myech penccum kyelsekhankes kathayo?

5. [ You finished your homework early because you have to go to a farewell party. ]
   Way pelsse swukceylul ta hay nwasseyo?

6. Myech nyenmaney kwukminhakkyolul colephaysseyo?

7. Kumnyneney momi pwulphyenhayse uysahanthey kaneuki isseyo?

8. [ You like to drink coffee while you drive. ]

9. Olhay kyelsimhan kesi mweeyyo?

10. [ You like any kind of Korean food. ]
   Otten hankwu umsikul cohahayyo?

11. Cinantaley mwusun cohungili issock chinkwuhanthey han thek nayn ili isseyo?

12. [ One of your classmates keeps laughing. You want to tell her/him that if she or he keeps
    laughing, it will disturb others. ]
   Hal mal isseyo?

13. Cinanpeney etise cicini ilenasseyo?

14. Halwuey khephilul myech canina masyeyo?
15. Ommahanthey hon nan ceki isseyo?
16. Wayyo?
17. Hakkimal sihemi kkuthnamyen mwe pwuthe halkeeyyo?
18. Kotunghakkyo colephanci elmana twaysseyo?
19. Hankwukepaneyse nwuka ceyil nwunchika epsnun kes kathayo?
20. Tayhakkyo colephako mwepwuthe hako sipheyo?