"You Should Marry Me Now. This is a Director's Order":
Politeness and Discourse Strategies by Korean Women in Non-Traditional
Authority Positions

by

Jee-Weon Shin

B.A. Ewha Women's University. Seoul, Korea 1992
TESOL Diploma. University of British Columbia 1996

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

(Department of Asian Studies)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

The University of British Columbia
August 1998

© Jee-Weon Shin, 1998

Department of ___Asian Studies___

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date ___Aug. 28, 1998.___

DE-6 (2/88)

ABSTRACT

The subject of language and gender has been a central problem for linguists and social scientists for much of the last century. Yet in all this time the study of Korean language and gender has been largely undeveloped. This study contributes to that neglected area of Korean language and gender by examining how working women in positions of power employ politeness in their request speech acts, and what type of discourse strategies they utilize to enact their authority in non-traditional domains.

This study compares the use of various speech levels and honorifics by both male and female executives as observed in several Korean television dramas. Results show that female superiors use fewer polite directives than male superiors, thereby confuting the traditional claim that women's speech is more polite than men's. The second major finding is that female superiors modify and defeminize their speech in order to enact their authority. On the whole, female superiors embodied the status difference with their subordinates by use of less polite directives, whereas male superiors minimized an asymmetrical alignment with their subordinates by use of more polite directives. These unexpected findings are explained through a consideration of three social variables involved in the interaction; social distance between superior and the subordinate, differences in age, and differences in status. The study thus proves that the context of interaction is the key to explaining why members in one sex group utilize more polite directives than the other, and that sex of the speaker is only a partial determinant in the language choice made by women and men.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES   104

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was the year that truly tested my patience and energy. But on each step of the way I have been helped and inspired by many people, without whom, I would not be able to write this paragraph today.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Ross King who guided my broad sociolinguistic interest in Korean language into a line of academic pursuit and who instructed me with critical comments and feedback on my thesis. I also would like to appreciate Dr. Donald Baker and Dr. Sharalyn Orbaugh for being examiners in my defense and for providing me with helpful suggestions on the thesis. Also, I thank Dr. Tineke Hellwig for chairing the defense.

Thanks also goes to James Flath for his editorial work, many useful suggestions on the thesis and inspiring advice in my academic life. I also owe a lot to Greg Daniels who edited part of the thesis and always added humor and encouragement to the life. I also appreciate Ms. Insun Lee and my friends in Center for Korean Research as well as in Asian Studies Department for their friendship and advice.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their unconditional support and patience throughout my MA. This thesis is especially dedicated to them.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Problems

Since the 1970s, the field of language and gender has garnered increased attention from a wide variety of linguists and social scientists. Studies in this area have generally been concerned with either phonological and grammatical differences between women's and men's speech (Trudgill 1974; Cheshire 1978) or the investigation of gender-linked speech styles in natural interaction (Goodwin 1980; Brown 1980; West and Zimmerman 1983; Edelsky 1993; James and Drakich 1993). This study is concerned primarily with the latter subject -- how Korean women in powerful positions of non-traditional domains employ politeness and utilize discourse strategies to enact their authority in request speech acts.

Early work on this subject was often concerned with how and why women and men use different linguistic forms as well as interactional styles in actual discourse (Cang 1969; Lakoff 1975; Bak 1983; West and Zimmerman 1983). These interpretations of feminist linguistic approaches can be categorized into two models of language and gender; *a dominance model* and *a difference model* (see note 1). As an explanation of gendered language, the first model emphasizes men's dominance over women (Lakoff 1975; West and Zimmerman 1983), whereas the second model focuses on men's and women's cultural differences (Maltz and Borker 1982; Tannen 1990). However, a significant amount of this work has been criticized due to its non-empirical nature and because it made far too many inaccurate generalizations about female and male speech.

Contemporary studies on language and gender have emphasized that language and reality cannot be separately perceived. As a result, research on language and gender has progressed from understanding how sex determines language use, to understanding how and when language use constructs gender difference as a social category. Furthermore, researchers have begun to show interest in understanding under what circumstances men's and women's speech are similar and different rather than in discussing the differences between men's and

1

women's speech (McElhinny 1995; Bergvall 1996; Freed and Greenwood 1996; Greenwood 1996).

This new perspective on the study of language and gender challenges stereotypes of women's speech because it demonstrates that the same individuals talk differently when they move from one situation to another. Moreover, in addition to gender *per se*, other variables in the study of women's language like status and age of the speaker may also be partially responsible for generating gendered language. Freed and Greenwood (1996), for example, found that it is the conversational setting that largely elicits particular discourse forms, not the sex of the speaker. They also emphasized the importance of context in order to study other variables such as which group is studied under what circumstances, what role the individual plays in the group, and what the relationship is between speaker and addressee.

Linguistic research in the workplace provides a good setting for contextualized language and gender study. Some researchers have investigated how women and men interact with each other in the workplace (Case 1988; Woods 1988; Edelsky 1993; James and Drakich 1993; Markle 1994) and others have focused on how professional women and men of high status exercise authority (Case 1988; West 1990; Horikawa et.al.1991; Smith 1992; Ainsworth-Vaughn 1992; Markle 1994; McElhinny 1995). The problem is that women face a double bind regarding professionalism and femininity when they enter the public domain. Women are urged to adopt more assertive, more masculine discourse styles in the public sphere since the masculine discourse style has been considered a norm in the workplace; yet when they do so, they are often perceived as aggressive and confrontational. As women participate in the public domain in greater numbers and encounter more problems in the workforce, more studies on this topic should be conducted, particularly regarding the increasing differentiation of women's gender identities in non-traditional domains.

The study of language and gender in the Korean language, however, is still in its infancy with, previous studies generally being restricted to describing a number of linguistic forms used by women and men, or to describing different language use between the two sex groups (Cang

2

1969; Bak 1983; Koo 1991,1993; Min 1996). As a result, analyses of Korean men's and women's speech have been isolated from their interactional contexts, causing a range of linguistic characteristics to be placed into the broad category of 'women's speech', and leading to the mistaken conclusion that none of the traits of women's speech are shared by men. Such analyses fail to explain complex and highly contextualized linguistic and interactional styles.

In recent years Korea has experienced a sharp increase in the status and number of women in the work force (Roh 1994) and the variety of new roles that they are playing in the private domains of society as well as in the public domain is bringing about a major transformation in women's gender identities. Consequently, women's speech is also changing and the nature of women's speech can not now, if ever could, be summarized in a couple of sentences.

1.2. The Present Study

This thesis will examine Korean women's speech in a contextualized study of interaction within one specific setting and one speech act -- the workplace and the request speech act (see note 2). The request speech act was selected in order to observe how women in a powerful position use directives to their subordinates. The study will collect data from two fictional TV dramas, and will explore the linguistic and interactional practices of Korean women in positions of authority who give directions to subordinates in non-traditional domains, and compare them with the directive forms chosen by men in similar positions. The focus will be on how speech styles and honorifics are realized when each of the two sex groups in power gives an order to a subordinate and on what different strategies of discourse men and women employ. Also, in examining women's work related authority management I will consider whether or not women in authority positions use discourse strategies in such a way that creates symmetrical alignment with subordinates.

In Korean, politeness comes in various forms, such as honorifics, speech styles and indirect speech using long mitigators or hedges. In this thesis I will pay specific attention to

3

honorifics and speech styles as an indication of politeness in Korean language. In order to measure the degree of politeness and make an effective comparison of politeness between two different sex groups, a variety of verb endings used when making an order will be arranged on a continuum from the highest to lowest degree of politeness. The study will be approached through the following two research questions and four related hypotheses.

Research Question 1: How do Korean women in power utilize politeness when making a request to their subordinates with comparison to men in the similar position?

Hypothesis (1): In terms of the use of speech styles and honorifics, female superiors in the workplace are more polite than male counterparts in making requests to their subordinates .

Hypothesis (2): Female superiors in the workplace are more indirect than male counterparts due to the use of such linguistic devices as whimperatives, hedges and adverbials.

Research Question 2: With comparison to men in similar positions, how do women in power exercise their authority when making a request to their subordinates?

Hypothesis (1): Female superiors in the workplace adopt male speech, and thereby defeminize their speech when exercising their authority.

Hypothesis (2): Female superiors in the workplace exercise their authority by using language strategies that create a symmetrical alignment, whereas male counterparts use language strategies that maintain an asymmetrical alignment that is traditionally associated with authority.

1.3. Organization of the Thesis

The thesis is composed of five chapters. Chapter 1 provides a general overview of the field of language and gender and a synthesis of the studies done in the same area in the Korean language, and then demonstrates problems inherent to the field. Chapter 2 provides background information on the subject area through a review and critique of all the related literature. Chapter 3 introduces the politeness continuum in Korean imperatives, describes the procedures of data collection and analysis, and demonstrates the study's methodology. Chapter 4 elaborates

4

on the data analysis and demonstrates the results of the study based on the data analysis. The concluding chapter discusses the results drawn from the study with reference to the initial research questions and related studies, and finally draws attention to some of the study's limitations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Studies on Language and Gender

2.1.2. The Term 'Women's Language'

There have been many inquiries into what characterizes the use of language by women, and how particular features of 'women's language' are linked to the gender relations of a given society. The term 'women's language' was first introduced by Robin Lakoff in 1973 in connection with the idea that women and men speak differently, thereby generating gender inequity (Crawford 1995:23). Lakoff (1975) defined the term as "...meaning both language restricted in use to women and language descriptive of women alone" (p.7). She explains that 'women's language' submerges a woman's personal identity by denying her the means of expressing herself forcefully, and encouraging expressions that suggest triviality and uncertainty in subject matter.

In Lakoff's definition of the term, 'women's language' is distinguished by the use of mitigating devices which reduce the force of utterances, and by the avoidance of strong or aggressive language. Lakoff identified a set of features which she claims occurred more frequently in women's speech than men's. In a subsequent book, *Language and Women's Place* (1975), she claimed that women are more likely to use:

(1) specialized vocabulary such as color terms

(2) 'empty' adjectives like divine, charming, cute

(3) tag questions and rising intonation in statement contexts

(4) hedges

(5) the use of the intensive "so"

(6) hypercorrect grammar

(7) superpolite forms of language

(8) less jokes and humor

(9) mild forms of language such as "oh! dear" (p.53-56), etc.

6

Lakoff's descriptions of 'women's language', however, were based mainly on her own nonempirical intuition and anecdotal observations of other peoples' language use. Lakoff has also been criticized for taking white and relatively privileged anglophone women in suburban America as the norm for all women in the English speaking community, and for overlooking the fact that even within the same society women are likely to belong to different classes and races.

Like Lakoff, Min (1996) defines 'women's language' in the Korean speech community as consisting of two kinds of language; the language that describes women, and the language that women use. Thus, a word like *cengswukhata* 'be chaste' belongs to women's language because it is an alleged feature of women, while the polite speech verb ending *-yo* is categorized as women's language because it is supposedly used more commonly by women than men.

Jorden (1990) provides a different definition for the term 'women's language' in the context of Japanese language. She writes; "Depending on the user, it may refer to the vast spectrum of language actually used by women today, to a language style used more commonly by women, to a variety or to individual features used exclusively by women, or even to the kind of Japanese women are instructed prescriptively to use" (p.1). Nevertheless, she points out that the term can be perceived differently by each individual, thereby resulting in confusion and even contradiction.

Since Lakoff, many other researchers have used a variety of other terms. Instead of 'women's language', for example, Crawford (1995) uses Crosby and Nyquist's (1977) 'the female register' and Kramer's (1974) 'genderlect' by analogy with such sociolinguistic terms as 'ideolect' and 'sociolect'. Cameron (1997), however, points out that the term 'genderlect' is problematic because women and men do not form distinct speech communities as do people living in certain regions and belonging to certain classes. Crawford (1995) later introduced the term 'gender-linked language' used by Mulac and others (1986), while clarifying the term by stating that "...what was meant by 'women's language' in English was a system of sex-linked linguistic signals, a set of features used by both sexes but more by women than men" (p.22).

Whatever the terms adopted by individual scholars, they basically have the same meaning, and represent researchers' awareness of differences in men's and women's speech, and their efforts to discover explanations for the differences in the language of women and men. Nevertheless, careful considerations should be followed before these, or any other single terms are used in doing research since the social group 'women' contains complicated and variational aspects which cannot be generalized into any simple form of language.

2.1.2. Women's Language: Explanations
2.1.2.1. Robin Lakoff's Work

One of the earliest and most influential scholars to explore the topic of language and gender was Robin Lakoff. Lakoff's influence on the field was so significant that most subsequent researchers have started their own investigations with the so-called 'Lakoff hypothesis'. Cameron, McAlinden & O'Leary (1988) explain 'Lakoff's hypothesis' in two ways; substance and explanations. The substantive claims are related to the 'typical' female speech style. This style is marked by the use of certain linguistic features such as hesitations, intensifiers and qualifiers, tag questions, rising intonation on declaratives, 'trivial' lexis and 'empty' adjectives, all of which mitigate the force of an utterance. Thus, under 'Lakoff's hypothesis', qualifiers and intensifiers function as hedges in conversation, rising intonation in statement contexts demonstrates tentativeness, and tag questions are related to a wish for confirmation or approval which indicates a lack of self-confidence in the speaker.

However, 'Lakoff's Hypothesis' was criticized by many later researchers and many subsequent studies have failed to substantiate her claims. For example, studies on sex difference in the use of tag questions have shown inconclusive results. Fishman (1980) shows that women use tag questions more often, while others have found the opposite (See Graddol and Swann 1989:83; Crawford 1995:28). Furthermore, Graddol and Swann suggested that tag questions do not always indicate hesitancy or uncertainty. Holmes (1986) examined the use of the hedge *you know* to determine whether it is more frequently used by women, as Lakoff claimed, but found

no significant difference in the overall distribution of *you know* between women and men in her sample, except to say that men used it slightly more often to express linguistic imprecision, and women used it slightly more to express emphasis or to attribute knowledge to another speaker. Holmes also found that *you know* could both function to show the speaker's certainty (e.g. emphasizing a speaker's confidence) and, as Lakoff suggested, uncertainty.

Another problem with 'Lakoff's Hypothesis' is that Lakoff related unassertive female speech to women's subordinate social position. Cameron et.al. (1988) challenged this, asking whether 'women's language' is in fact a consequence of being female, subordinate, or both. O'Barr & Atkins (1980) studied the speech of male and female witnesses in a Carolina courtroom and found that the linguistic features associated with 'women's language' are not necessarily confined to women's use of language or women's speech, but are also related to the speaker's status, both in general and in relation to local courtroom norms. For example, several professional women who appeared as expert witnesses used less 'women's language' than most men, while unemployed and blue-collar male speakers used more 'women's language' than most women. O'Barr & Atkins concluded that a better name for this style of speaking is 'powerless language' rather than 'women's language' and suggested that "the tendency for more women to speak powerless language and for men to speak less of it is due, at least in part, to the greater tendency of women to occupy relatively powerless social positions. What we have observed is a reflection in their speech behavior of their social status" (p.104).

Finally, 'Lakoff's Hypothesis' is flawed in that Lakoff focused on linguistic forms that seemed to be used as signals of 'women's language', rather than looking at the ways gender is constructed in interaction. Cameron et.al. (1988) argue that multifunctionality should be viewed as 'the unmarked case' since one linguistic form functions in a variety of ways in each different context:

...it seems to us problematic to suggest that the communicative function of a syntactic form is either invariant or analytically transparent in all cases. Studies like our own, which deal with natural data, indicate the absolute necessity of considering forms in their linguistic and social context, not in general, and suggest that we should regard multifunctionality as the unmarked case - that is, in real talk most utterances do many things at once (p.77).

9

In other words, 'Lakoff's Hypothesis' assumed male and female analytic categories without questioning when gender is relevant and how gender interacts with other social identities in shaping interactional style.

2.1.2.2. The Dominance and Difference Models

Interpretations of gendered language use can generally be categorized into a *dominance model* which emphasizes men's dominance over women, and a *difference model* emphasizing men's and women's cultural differences. The *dominance model* attributes women's linguistic inadequacies to their political and cultural subordination to men, retaining a negative evaluation of women' speech. This model is exemplified by West and Zimmerman's work on interruptions (1983) and by Fishman's study of heterosexual talk (1983). West and Zimmerman argued that 96% of conversational interruptions were made by males to females, and that these interruption phenomena are not merely due to power differences between the two sexes but due to the way of performing power in face to face interaction generated by the social norms of what it means to be a man and woman. On the other hand, Fishman studied the differences in the use of language between professional couples, finding that women used 2.5 times as many questions as men, and men used twice as many statements as women. She also found that women tried more, but succeeded less often in initiating conversations, and that topics introduced by men were treated more often as topics to be pursued so that men continually establish and enforce their rights to define the subject of an interaction. Fishman concluded that these differences in language use result from the socially structured power relationship between females and males.

Lakoff's 'women's language' can also be interpreted as a *dominance model* since she argues that gendered language is rooted in the power relationships between women and men, and states that women experience linguistic discrimination in two ways; "the way they are taught to use language and the way general language use treats them" (1975:4). According to her, these linguistic discriminations relegate women to certain subservient functions, thereby generating a double bind whereby certain lexical items mean one thing to men, but another to

10

women. Thus, it is impossible to explain gender differentiated language without a consideration of the different roles each sex plays in society.

Woods' study (1988) is another good example of a *dominance model*. Woods examined dominance in the workplace and showed that gender is a key determinant of who holds the floor. Male speakers interrupted more often and were interrupted by others less often than female speakers. Moreover, male speakers held significantly longer turns and received less minimal responses such as *mhm* and *yeah*. The case whereby a woman has higher status than a man, but linguistic measures fail to allow her to dominate her male subordinate supports the theory that a gender variable overrides the status of the speaker.

Nevertheless, the *dominance model* has been criticized for overemphasizing the power that men have over women and for failing to acknowledge that women have many options for resistance. It also fails to take into account the ways in which some women benefit from the power of hegemonic men and the ways in which some subordinate men are disadvantaged by hegemonic masculine norms (Freeman and McElhinny 1996). Furthermore, certain aspects in a given interaction, like individual differences in behavioral style, context choices in behavior, or differences among persons of the same sex tied to ethnicity, race, class, or sexual orientation cannot be explained by the *dominance model*. Failure to account for such variations can lead to oversimplified links between gender and power (Cameron 1997).

While acknowledging that women speak differently from men without condemning men's speech styles, the *difference model* interprets women's speech more positively as a reflection of women's culture (see note 3). In this model, gender differences are viewed as stemming from the pervasive segregation of boys and girls in the peer groups of childhood, and are treated as similar to the cultural differences that complicate intercultural communication. Maltz and Borker (1982) argue that each sex interprets the responses of the other in light of their own cultural roles and that when communication breakdown occurs each sex interprets the other's action in terms of gender stereotypes. Their interpretation of gender-differentiated language use focuses more on:

11

cultural differences between men and women in their conceptions of friendly conversation, their rules for engaging in it, and probably more important, their rules for interpreting it... American men and women come from different sociolinguistic subcultures, having learned to do different things with words in a conversation, so that when they attempt to carry on conversations with one another, even if both parties are attempting to treat one another as equals, cultural miscommunication results (p.200).

Thus, from their perspective, minimal responses such as *mhm* and *yeah* mean " I agree with you" to men and "I am listening to you" to women, thereby generating miscommunications between the two sex groups. Maltz and Borker further argued that people learn a wide variety of rules for interacting in different situations and thus male and female differences in patterns of language use should be explained by examining these differences in the social organization of play and accompanying differences in the patterns of male and female social interaction.

Deborah Tannen has adopted a difference model to explain miscommunications between women and men. In her popular book, *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation* (1990), she argues that many men approach the world as individuals in a hierarchical social order in which they are either one up or one down whereas women approach the world as individuals in a network of connections. Using a *difference model*, Tannen investigated a wide range of speech acts such as advice giving, storytelling, reactions to another's problems, asking for and giving information, compliments and gossip in which she claims that men and women display these different ways of understanding the social world.

However, there have been some criticisms of Tannen's work as well, such as Troemel-Ploetz's (1991, cited in Cameron 1996) criticism that *You Just Don't Understand* turns feminist linguistics into a branch of the self-improvement industry, reduces the complexities of gendered behavior to unrefined generalization, and glosses over systematic problems of gender inequality, urging that those problems be addressed through individual adjustment rather than collective political action. Cameron (1996) however, gives credit to Tannen's popular book:

..the problem of feminist work being co-opted by popular advice discourse is too general and deep-seated to be dealt with at the level of criticizing individual authors..... it might be said that the authors of self-help texts about language and gender are not just harnessing linguistics to reactionary trends outside the academy: they are carrying certain trends in language and gender studies to what is arguably their logical conclusion (p.35).

On the other hand, Freed (1996) evaluates Tannen's work in both a negative and a positive light, saying that such genres of writing reinforce stereotypes and mask the fact that female and male language and behavior overlap considerably in a form of continuum rather than function as two distinctly different categories. Tannen's contributions to the academic field of language and gender, however, are still valuable in that she brought the topic of gender-linked speech styles to the attention of the general public.

The *difference model* has been criticized for its dismissal of power and dominance relations as an important element in understanding men's and women's interactional styles, thereby failing to address the unequal effects of interactional differences of the two sex groups (Freeman and McElhinny 1996). In addition, this model tends to over-generalize gendered behavior, and to further privilege the white middle-class norms on which the generalizations are based (Cameron 1995). Graddol and Swann (1989) point out that the *difference model* "fails to take into account the fact that many of them operate to the advantage of men and are associated with a difference in power between men and women, and the fact that men can use certain conversational features to dominate mixed-sex talk" (p.90-91).

2.1.2.3. New Perspectives in Language and Gender Studies

The traditional questions that early researchers explored tended to reinforce rather than to weaken the prevailing female-male dichotomy. Dichotomous notions of gender and theoretical frameworks like the *dominance* and *difference models* have proved to be unable to account for the complex phenomena that occur when people speak to each other in a real setting. By asking how women speak differently from men, Lakoff, for instance, presupposes women and men *do* speak differently, thus implying that men's speech is the norm and women's is deviant, and also leading to a deeper dichotomization between the two sex groups. Consequently, exploring the linguistic differences between men and women entails bigger gaps in the language use between the two sex groups and reinforces gender polarization, categorizing the speech of women and men into entirely different forms of language. Bing and Bergvall

13

(1996) state that the old approach to language and gender tends to oversimplify differences between the two sex groups so that all members of one group do not have certain characteristics shared by members of the other group.

Freeman and McElhinny (1996) point out that there are two mistaken assumptions in the early work on language and gender; gender is always relevant and gender is best studied when it is maximally contrastive. These false assumptions have led to the false conclusions that interactional differences are always due to gender, and the misapplication of findings to all men and to all women. Actually, Freed (1996) explored an experimental situation in which other variables such as setting and communicative tasks rather than sex are the index to a gendered speech style. Such a finding suggests that in order to completely understand differences, it is important to control many potentially intersecting variables and not simply to assume the categories of female and male.

One of the notable changes in the recent language and gender study is a contextualization of the specific interaction studied. Freeman and McElhinny (1996) support this recent trend in the field by stating that researchers must turn to more highly contextualized studies of interaction in order to determine whether to emphasize differences or similarities between the two sex groups in a given situation:

The current challenge facing language and gender scholars is how to discern when gender is relevant, without reinscribing heterosexist assumptions about gender in ever-smaller domains (i.e. moving from saying that gender is relevant for a whole interaction to saying that gender is relevant at the moment in an interaction when the participants seem to be flirting, say) (p.244).

For a contextualized study, they presented the notion of *activity* as a unit of analysis rather than gender or individuals. The concept of activity was explained in detail by their quotation of Levinson (1992) as follows:

The notion of an activity type [refers] to a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions. Paradigm examples would be teaching, a job interview, a jural interrogation, a football game, a task in a workshop, a dinner party, and so on (p.244).

14

According to Freeman and McElhinny, a crucial point when discussing the concept of activity is that it is not just speech which varies across context but also the gender identity portrayed by individuals. When various interactions in a range of activities are investigated, stereotypes about women's speech fall apart because the same individuals articulate speech differently as they move from one activity to another. Goodwin (1980), for example, examined African-American boys and girls in a range of speech acts like directives and argument to show how girls and boys build systematically different social organizations through their language use .

This focus on activities has changed the traditional research question from "What are the differences between men's and women's speech?" to "When, if, and how are men's and women's speech similar and different?". Thus, a new direction in the linguistic research on gender has moved toward how particular language practices contribute to the production of people as women and men. Likewise, Eckert and McGonnell-Ginet (1992) have emphasized the importance of investigating gender alongside other aspects of social identity by studying how gender is constructed in communities of practice. Freeman and McElhinny (1996) explain a community of practice as "an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations -- in short, practices -- emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor" (p.464). According to them, studying communities of practice allows us to perceive a social identity not as something fixed or given but dynamic; it permits an investigation of how gender interacts with other aspects of identity, and shows how the two different sex groups in one community of practice are composed in terms of their class, age, and ethnicity as well as their gender. Greenwood (1996) investigated a series of conversations within one particular community of practice -- a group of adolescent siblings and their friends, and found no evidence that the sex of the speakers was ever a significant variable in this setting, in spite of its important role in explaining who holds the floor or interrupts. Her study provides further support for the idea that researchers should consider the entire context of interaction rather than simply regarding gender as an index to explain how and why women speak differently from men.

2.1.3. Language and Gender in the Workplace

Since an increased number of women have begun to participate in the public domain of society and even to occupy important positions in companies, the workplace has evolved into an important site that provides an excellent source for language and gender studies. The workplace setting offers one of the best communities of practice, allowing researchers to observe how gender relations are constructed in conversation. The majority of research on language and gender studies in the workplace has focused primarily on interactional differences between females and males through task-related talk (Woods 1988; Case 1988; Edelsky 1993; James and Drakich 1993; Markle 1994) or the enactment of authority of professional women and men in a high status (Case 1988; West 1990; Horikawa et.al. 1991; Smith 1992; Ainsworth-Vaughn 1992; Markle 1994; McElhinny 1995). Nonetheless, it should be noted that the distinctions are not clear, and that published studies often deal with both aspects in one and the same paper.

2.1.3.1. Interactional Differences between Women and Men

Research in the first category of language and gender studies in the workplace setting has explored how women and men interact differently based on the work roles assigned to them in terms of turn taking, interruption, politeness and so on. Woods (1988) investigated the interactions of triads of higher ranking and lower ranking women and men colleagues to determine the relative influences of gender and occupational status on patterns of interruption and floor holding. She found that the subordinate men interrupted women in a higher status more than they interrupted men in a higher status, and that the men succeeded in gaining the floor more often than women, although both powerful women and men held more turns than their subordinates. She concluded that gender is a stronger influence than status in these interactions even though the power base of occupational status did affect the pattern of interruption and floor holding.

Edelsky's study of university faculty meetings (1993) also demonstrates that gender functions as a key determinant of interruptions and floor holding in the ongoing interaction. Her

16

findings show that men took longer turns than the women although during the more structured segments, few interruptions were made by men. Nevertheless, Edelsky's study suggests rather a different research question in the language and gender studies in the workplace. She argued that the traditional question -- how do women and men carry out their socially designated and differentiated power positions as they carry on oral discourse -- is too simple to explain the complexities of the findings and thus, researchers should consider under what conditions men and women do or do not interact more or less as equals.

With regard to the *amount* of talk, James and Drakich (1993) demonstrated a pattern that alludes to the connection between institutionalized interaction in the workplace and male norms of interaction. They reviewed the literature on gender differences in amount of talk, and showed that men talk more in formal task-oriented contexts, whereas women tend to talk as much or more in informal contexts. Case (1988), on the other hand, found that female and male managers are likely to make different types of contributions in groups; a facilitative and personal style, used mostly by women, appears to be more relational and integrative while an assertive and authoritative style, used mostly by men, appears to be more direct and commanding. Gender-related speech was also expected to correspond with influence in the group, with masculine style speech being regarded as more influential.

In summary, studies that examine how women and men interact with each other at work suggest that men tend to keep the floor and to interrupt more often than do women and that women and men tend to use different language strategies which make different contributions to the interaction.

2.1.3.2. Authority Management of Professional Women and Men

The other body of studies of language and gender in the workplace focus on how women and men enact authority in professional positions, based on the relationships among the speakers as well as on the gender identity that each individual possesses in performing his or her work roles. West (1990) examined how physicians formulate their directives to patients and

17

how patients respond to those directives. Her findings show that female and male physicians issue their directives in different ways, with female physicians employing more directives which are likely to elicit compliant responses and tending to mitigate their commands more than male physicians do. Therefore, male physicians establish status differences whereas female physicians minimize status distinctions between themselves and their patients.

Case (1988) and Ainsworth-Vaughn (1992) also drew a similar conclusion to West's study. Case showed that men in managerial positions attempted to assert status and establish dominance in interpersonal situations by more direct, informational, and action-oriented language use and to frequently use imperative forms in making requests or commands. Moreover, male managers sounded more challenging with their informal pronunciation whereas female managers used more refined enunciation, sounding more polite and indirect in their speech. Ainsworth-Vaughn examined the ways topic transitions are made in twelve physician-patient encounters between female and male physicians in private practice settings, and found that there are two types of transition; reciprocal and unilateral. Female physicians downplayed status differences by using reciprocal topic shifts that share interactional power between physician and patient, whereas male physicians tended to shift topic unilaterally, without waiting for patient agreement.

Tannen (1994) and Smith (1992) investigated how superiors give orders to subordinates. Tannen notes that the women in positions of authority tended to give directives to subordinates in a more face-saving way than the men of similar positions. Smith found a similar result in her study of the linguistic practices of Japanese women and men in giving directions to subordinates when they play both non-traditional and traditional gender roles. Her study confirms that women are more polite than men regardless of the domain they are in, whether it is non-traditional or traditional.

However, Markle (1994) found contradictory results in her examination of ongoing interchanges amongst female and male politicians during the question period in the Canadian House of Commons. Her findings demonstrate that women politicians appear to engage in more

variable linguistic work, not only upgrading their face-threatening acts by uttering many accusations and criticisms of the government, but also by performing more redressive action in the form of positive politeness strategies. Men politicians, on the other hand, showed a less variable linguistic pattern, preferring to downplay face-threatening acts and to distance themselves through the use of negative politeness strategies (see note 4).

Markle suggests that since the political realm has been the exclusive domain of men until recent years, women, as a minority in parliament, have to work harder to establish their credibility and assert their authority. It is inevitable that female politicians had to use more assertive and aggressive interactional styles in a male dominated domain in order to ensure their authority. Also, the social distance between politicians is a factor explaining female politicians' more direct and aggressive language. The social distance between men in politics may be less than that between women and this causes women politicians to use more face-threatening acts in their interactions with other women politicians than with men politicians. Furthermore, female politicians in Markle's data showed a tendency to interpret certain acts as more face threatening, particularly if they are delivered by men, and tended to rate questions by men as having greater face threatening value and so adjust their speech accordingly.

Nevertheless, such an interpretation does not seem to go beyond Markle's own subjective views, and more refined analysis of the study should be complemented by further research. The social distance factor, for example, could be interpreted as causing women politicians to use more face-saving acts due to the fact that the interlocutors in the interaction are relative strangers to them. Also, more importantly, we have to consider the specific setting in which the interaction took place -- parliament. The conflicting results of Markle's study presumably arose from the different work roles of the females in power. Unlike the ordinary company which values employees' well-rounded relations with other workers, in politics expressing one's opinion and succeeding in gaining consensus are considered fundamental tasks. Moreover, the interlocutor with whom the speaker is conversing is likely to be an important determinant of the politeness level the speaker utilizes; interaction between superiors

and subordinates in the private company is more unilateral and less competitive than that between co-equal politicians in politics.

Horikawa et.al. (1991) examined the effects of request legitimacy on the directness and politeness of women and men managers' compliance-gaining tactics by asking women and men managers to report what they would say if they had to cancel a subordinate's vacation in one of two scenarios (see note 5). They found that both men and women managers used less direct and more polite requests when they needed to gain the subordinate's compliance, thereby confirming that request legitimacy is a more substantial factor affecting the directness and politeness of men and women managers than sex, *per se*. Nonetheless, when the same managers did not need to gain the subordinate's compliance, the women managers used less direct and more polite requests than the men, thereby supporting the claim that women in authority use more linguistic practices that save the face of the subordinate. However, the findings from Horikawa's study should be supplemented by other research methods because the subjects of the data might respond differently in an actual situation with regard to the actual wording used or the semantic formulas employed. Ellis (1994) pointed out the disadvantages of this type of research method as "These differences raise questions about the extent to which the elicited data can serve as evidence of learners' pragmatic competence, as they may not accurately reflect actual language use" (p.164).

Studies by Smith (1992) and McElhinny (1995) examine how gender identities of women working in non-traditional domains, that is, as authority figures in male dominated institutes, influence their speech when performing their duties in the workplace, and whether women enact authority in powerful positions in ways similar to their male counterparts. The data for Smith's study (1992) were drawn from detective/police action television programs. She investigated how women police officers give directives while performing their roles, and found that instead of defeminizing their speech, women police officers attempt to resolve the conflict by empowering their own speech using such means as the 'Motherese strategy' (adopting the way a mother speaks to a child), and by creating new strategies on a female power continuum

distinct from the male power continuum. In contrast, McElhinny's findings (1995) suggest that women adopt some of the normative practices associated with the male speech styles. She discussed how women working as police officers have learned to project a masculine gender identity in their interactions with the public after analyzing two conversational interactions in which a female and male police officer took a report from a victim of domestic assault. McElhinny's study is similar to Smith's in that the female subjects in both studies created their own images as authority figures by moving away from the definition of male-dominated policing centered on exertion of physical force and aggressiveness. Female subjects in Smith's study employed a different form of discourse strategy from the ones that male police officers have traditionally used while female police officers in McElhinny's study demonstrated an alternative definition of policing that centers on intellect, calm and collected efficiency.

In summary, studies that focus on how women and men enact authority in non-traditional domains generally suggest that women tend to minimize status differences between themselves and their subordinates or patients, whereas men tend to reinforce status differences. However, before we reach any conclusions on this subject matter, two important variables should be considered; the type of work role women in power play in the workplace and the kind of setting in which the interaction occurs. We have already observed rather different results from the studies on how women perform powerful roles as politicians or police officers.

In the next section, I will review and critique how earlier work on language and gender in the Korean speech community has dealt with the issues of women's language. Sociolinguistic research in the Korean language and gender field is underdeveloped compared to other language areas and therefore, sources for a literature review on this topic are fairly limited. Therefore, the literature review will cover studies related to the topic of language and gender in general, including women's changing roles in modern Korean society, as well as new identities gained through performing new roles in public domains.

2.2. Studies on Korean Language and Gender

2.2.1. Cang Thaycin's Study

Cang Thaycin (1969) is one of the few early linguists to have written about Korean women's speech. He demonstrated the characteristics of Korean women's language in terms of four different aspects; phonological, grammatical, interactional and a special language used by a specific group of women. According to him, at the phonological level, a click sound more often uttered by Korean women in the southern province of Kyengsang, (e.g. *kulay*! 'OK') is a good example of women's language (see note 6). On the grammatical level, men may use either polite (*hay yo*) or intimate (*hay*) speech styles when addressing their wives, mothers and grandmothers. The reverse case, however, is never found, since wives use only polite speech styles when addressing their husbands (see note 7). Nevertheless, this phenomenon is slowly disappearing due to egalitarian trend in modern Korean society.

Thirdly, Cang argues that during the Cosen dynasty (1392-1910), women were not allowed to have face-to-face interactions with strangers and needed a mediator who could transfer messages from visitors to women or from women to visitors. In the following example of indirect speech, an imaginary mediator is assumed to be between the two speakers and to transfer the messages from man to woman and from woman to man;

Man: *yepwala*!

            'Is there anybody here!'

Woman: *nwukwusinya yeccwuela*!

            'Ask who he is'

Man: *twis kol Kim cinsa tayk eyse osin sonnim ila yeccwuela.*

            'Tell her that I am a guest from the household of Mr. Kim's in the back valley'

Woman: *mwusun sokwan inka yeccwuela.*

            'Ask what brought him here'

Man: *nay atul ey kwanhan illo osyessta yeccwuela.*

            'Tell her that I came here because of the matter about my son' (Cang 1969:57)

This linguistic device is understood in reference to the traditional patriarchal ethics that prohibited social interaction between men and women except husband and wife. Cang stated that this phenomenon could still be seen in the countryside of Korea as late as the 1960's, but it is rarely found in contemporary Korean. Even during the period that this linguistic device was in use, it was used mostly by women of the upper class as a way of communicating with strangers. Hence, categorizing such a linguistic form as women's speech tends to privilege upper class norms in the interpretation of women's language.

Finally, Cang perceived the special forms of language used by certain groups of women as one type of women's speech. For example, during the Korean War (1950-1953), prostitutes having mainly Western soldiers as their clients used a jargonized language mixing Korean with broken English, thereby creating a new type of language akin to a pidginized English (e.g. five years love *ka* this is *nya*? 'Is this the love that I had for you for five years?'). However, whether such a specialized language used by a specific group of women can be categorized as women's language should be questioned because it does not represent language spoken by the majority of Korean women. Cang's work is also vulnerable to criticism because the descriptions of women's language that he draws upon do not consider the context in which the language is used and because it was based mainly on his own observations.

2.2.2. Address Practice between Spouses

Many researchers have reported on the nonreciprocity of the address practice between husband and wife in Korean language; wives generally use the polite speech style (*hay yo*) to their husbands, while the husband replies in intimate (*hay*) or blunt speech style (*hao*) (Cang 1969; Bak 1983; Lee 1987; Koo 1991). Bak (1983) argues that the source of this non-reciprocal use of speech levels reflects the status inequity between husband and wife in Korean society. Koo (1991), who collected data from 1989-1990, also examined how recent language changes in modern Korean society have influenced the terms of address used for women. From his study, he concluded that the system of Korean address terms reflects the subordinate position of

women in a society where a woman's role has been considered to be that of loyal servant to her husband and family, firmly defined by the patriarchal structure that Korean society has kept for many centuries. Koo also perceived that a husband's unilateral use of the second personal plain pronoun *ne* to his wife and use of his wife's first name reflect the unequal status between husband and wife (see note 8). Few Korean men receive the second personal pronoun *ne* from their wives, nor do most wives call their husbands by their first names. In Koo's subsequent study of Korean language use in China (1993) he reported non-reciprocal use of the request endings between husband and wife by providing the example of wives' unilateral use of the honorific formal speech style *-(u)sipsio*, a highly deferential speech style, to their husbands. However, Koo's interpretations of non-reciprocal address terms between husband and wife should be reconsidered along with an age variable, because in Korean society it is very common for husbands to be older than their wives, presumably causing wives to use more honorifics and higher levels of speech style to their husbands.

In modern times, non-reciprocal use of address terms between spouses is decreasing in Korean society. Koo (1991) himself acknowledges this trend:

One of the most noticeable linguistic changes is the widespread adoption of more egalitarian speech patterns, including address terms, by the younger generation. Reduced use of the exalted address terms is thus reflective of a decrease in social inequality. This trend has also led to the introduction of such new address forms as *caki* 'self' and *hyeng* 'older brother' in addressing one's boyfriend. The number of varieties of address terms is decreasing in tune with the loosening of family structure and rapid socio-economic changes (p.138).

Bak (1983) states that men and women in modern Korean society increasingly view each other as equals, thereby moving slowly toward an egalitarian society. Young couples reciprocally use intimate speech style (*hay*) to each other regardless of the spouse's age. Moreover, newly married wives now rarely use the polite speech style (*hay yo*) to their younger in-laws.

Finally, Lee (1987) examined the address system of different generations of spouses in modern Korean society and compared the differences in use of address practice before and after marriage. He found no significant difference in the use of address terms between couples in either older or younger age categories, but suggested that the presence of a third person is an

important factor in influencing a choice of more or less respectful address term for their spouses. Koo (1993) also stated that Korean people are 'the other conscious', that is, sensitive to the presence of a third party. Thus, in the presence of a third party, many Korean speakers use a speech level more deferential than the one they use when they are alone. Koo further reported that it is female speakers that tend to shift to a more deferential speech style and to use honorific suffix -(u)si- more often in the presence of a third party.

2.2.3. Verb Endings

Koo (1993) claimed that verb endings are one of the linguistic features manifesting women's subordinate position in Korean society. He examined the language behavior of Korean men and women residing in three provinces in northeast China -- Jilin, Heilongjiang and Liaoning -- focusing on their use of verb endings, and found that many Korean communities in those areas are still subject to very strong discriminatory language features, resulting from traditional patriarchal values. Also, he discovered that rules concerning which verb endings are to be used between women and men are subject to modification depending on their age category, age difference, level of intimacy, presence of a third party and regional peculiarities rather than on gender *per se*. Such a finding provides further support for the idea that choice of verb ending is highly context laden, and not simply determined by the sex of the speaker.

In Korean, there are certain verb endings used more often by women than men. The -(u)sey yo ending is one of these verb endings. Bak (1983) explains that the -(u)sey yo ending is generally used by female speakers; for example, a wife or *kisayng* (women who entertain men in a drinking place with their singing or dancing skills [during the Cosen dynasty]) when addressing her husband or customer (see note 9). Bak further points out that the polite speech style (*hay yo*) is used by women more often compared to its formal counterpart -- *hapnita* -- which is more commonly observed in men's speech. He provided two reasons for women's extensive use of polite speech style. First, the polite speech style (*hay yo*) expresses the speaker's deference to the addressee, in accordance with women's inferior status in Korean

society. Second, a majority of women in Korea are still confined to their home and family, and consequently they are not fully integrated into the vertical hierarchy of the society where the formal speech style (*hapnita*) is more often used (see note 10).

However, Bak's first assumption does not appear to be an appropriate explanation for women's more frequent use of polite speech style in that the formal speech style (*hapnita*) shows a higher degree of deference to the addressee than the polite speech style (*hay yo*). If Bak's interpretation is legitimate, women would be expected to use formal speech style more frequently than polite speech style. Likewise, Bak's interpretation of men's more prevalent use of the formal speech style (*hapnita*) should be questioned too. He argued that in mixed sex conversations other than the interactions between husbands and wives, women still tend to use polite speech style *hay yo* while men prefer formal speech style *hapnita*. He attributed this phenomenon to a certain degree of social distance between women and men which he claims would not be as large as if they were same sex speakers. However, if Bak's claim is correct, we should expect women to use the formal speech style (*hapnita*) as much as men do in a mixed sex conversation, but this does not seem to be the case.

Min (1996) argues that in modern Korean society, men of the younger generation tend to use the polite speech style (*hay yo*) just as often as women do. Min explained this linguistic phenomenon in terms of three aspects. First, men in relatively younger age groups have received more speech influence from their mother. Second, the modern Korean egalitarian movement has produced fewer gaps between women's and men's speech, and fewer differences in the use of polite or formal speech style between the two sex groups. Finally, some men purposefully adopt women's linguistic strategies for the sake of personal benefits. Nevertheless, Min's interpretations of young Korean male speakers' use of polite speech style *hay yo* have some weaknesses in that he simply assumed certain influential factors to be responsible for the changes without making any detailed analysis; for instance, one would like to know why the speech of men in younger generations has been influenced by their mother's speech more in recent years.

26

2.2.4. Defining Politeness in Korean

Bak (1983) examined how politeness is realized in both Korean and English. He argued that women's speech is characterized in terms of politeness and expressiveness in both languages, and perceived that the power relations between women and men are the main factors characterizing politeness in speech. He states that politeness can be expressed either through showing deference to the addressee by using elevated speech styles or honorifics, or through not imposing one's views on addressees and leaving decisions to them. Bak's notion of politeness is comparable to the concept of 'negative politeness' suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987), for whom 'face-saving activity' comes in two types -- 'positive politeness' and 'negative politeness'. Politeness in Korean is likely to be expressed by means of 'negative politeness' more than 'positive politeness', since politeness is conveyed by showing respect to the addressee through the use of elevated speech levels or honorifics. Hwang (1990) explains that politeness in Korean language is realized as negative politeness more than positive politeness because of the 'reservedness' which has traditionally typified politeness in Korean society.

With regard to "expressiveness", Bak (1983) notes that it represents various linguistic expressions, including emphatic ones that transmit such feelings as surprise or cheerfulness, experienced by women. Bak demonstrated several examples of Korean women's speech showing expressiveness such as *-ke issci* 'you know', *-ke alci* 'you know' and *isscanha yo* 'as you know'. Bak also perceived the frequent use of hyperbole accompanied by strong emphasis patterns as another characteristic of Korean women's speech. Such intensifiers as *cincca* 'truthfully', *cengmal* 'really' and *nemwu* 'too much', as well as interjections like *aykyaykyay, ayko, aikwu* are also regarded as typical women's speech.

However, Bak's study on Korean women's language is subject to similar types of criticisms that Lakoff's work has received. Bak's work simply categorized words typically used by women into 'women's language', and the descriptions of women's language and the examples given to demonstrate it were mainly from his own observations without any empirical

basis. Moreover, studies done without consideration of the context in which the interaction occurs have already been shown to have considerable shortcomings.

There is little literature on defining politeness in Korean compared to the work done on the same area in other languages (Leech 1983; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984; Ide et.al. 1986; Brown and Levinson 1987). Hill et.al. (1986) stated that politeness in Korean, as in any language, is mainly the conformation to and observation of socially construed linguistic forms. Hwang (1990) defined politeness in Korean as "a linguistic strategy the speaker uses for various pragmatic purposes: for example, 'to facilitate interpersonal contacts by removing a conflict of interest between the interlocutors, and promoting their cooperation" (p.48). Hwang presented several prominent politeness markers in Korean; indirect speech such as whimperatives (see note 11), hedges, longer utterances, hyper-respectfulness and Chinese loan-words. According to Hwang, hyper-respectfulness, which he defines as "when the speaker uses a level of deference that is higher than the one he or she really needs to use in order to speak properly" (p.51), is a unique way of expressing politeness in a language with finely stratified levels of deference. Using hyper-respectfulness as a politeness marker, Korean people can use the polite speech style (*hay yo*) to their subordinates even when the subordinate is in a position to receive intimate speech style (*hay*).

Hwang (1990) argues that the concept of 'deference' should be treated separately from the notion of 'politeness'. He elaborates the difference between deference and politeness as follows:

Deference levels are encoded by honorifics which are 'based on a closed, language-specific system consisting of a limited set of structural and lexical elements', but politeness markers are 'based largely on universal pragmatics and are from an open-ended pattern of language usage that is applicable, in principle, to any speech participants regardless of their age, sex, kinship or social status' (p.49).

According to Hwang, politeness is subject to the speaker's psychology, thereby generating a possible situation in which one can be polite without showing any deference to the addressee, in other words, without using any linguistic items indexing deference such as person deixes (personal pronouns and address terms), speech levels or sets of lexical pairs (see note 12).

28

Hwang further stated that deference levels denote the power-code relationship and the relative statuses between the participants on a hierarchical social dimension, and that the choice of an appropriate deference level is what society imposes upon its members. In contrast, politeness is a linguistic strategy the speaker uses for various pragmatic purposes.

However, in actual interactions it is not always clear how to distinguish between deference and politeness. In many cases linguistic markers showing deference can also convey politeness expressed by the speaker, and linguistic devices indicating politeness can also carry deference to the addressee. What is presently clear from Hwang's interpretation is that deference is realized by means of certain obligatory linguistic markers that members of a speech community should follow. Politeness is characterized by means of optional linguistic devices which native speakers naturally utilize in their speech in accordance with the pragmatic and intuitive knowledge that speaker and hearer use in ordinary communication. Therefore, in Korean language the concept of politeness is much broader in scope than deference. In the present study, the concept of politeness will be used as an umbrella term covering the notion of deference; linguistic devices such as speech levels and honorifics which, Hwang argued, denote deference, will be broadly dealt with as politeness makers.

2.2.5. Min Hyensik's Study

Recently, Min (1996) has attempted to synthesize the features of Korean women's speech, reviewing most of the Korean language literature as well as some of the English literature on this topic. Min subcategorized Korean women's speech into language that only refers to and describes women, and language that women actually use in a real context. The former definition of women's language is further classified into three categories; language that indicates woman (e.g. *emeni* 'mother', *chenye* 'unmarried woman'), language that describes what woman should be and what women do (e.g. *cengswukhata* 'to be chaste', *sicipkata* 'to get married'), and language that is related to women's possessions or to types of events that only

women attend (e.g. *hwacangphwum* 'cosmetics', *kangkangswullay* 'traditional play that only women join in').

A notable aspect of Min's approach is that he produced two distinctions in the concept of women's language; 'absolute' and 'relative' (see note 13). The distinction between these two concepts depends on the frequency and the degree to which the language is used by women. Therefore, the word *miin* 'beautiful woman' belongs to the category of 'absolute' women's language because the word only refers to women, whereas the word *hwacangphwum* 'cosmetics' is categorized into 'relative' women's language because cosmetics are an object mostly used by women, but also occasionally used by men.

Min discusses the phonological, grammatical, lexical and pragmatic features of women's language. At the phonological level, women's language includes the features of rising intonation in declaratives and use of 'standard language'. Nevertheless, rising intonation has been found increasingly in men's speech since the Korean War (1950-1953), and Min explained that this phenomenon was due to three factors; boy's imitation of mother's speech, egalitarian trends in Korean society and men's purposeful adoption of women's linguistic strategies.

Min stated that at the grammatical level an 'excessive' use of interrogative sentences and the polite speech style (*hay yo*) can be characterized as women's language. He explained that women use more interrogative sentences because they put more effort into maintaining a conversation than men, and also attempt to receive more confirmation from the hearer. He also stated that women try harder to eliminate social distance between the speaker and the hearer in the conversation. Female speakers' common use of the retrospective quotative in *-telakwuyo* (lit. 'the fact has been observed that...') is a good example of this. According to Min, use of the retrospective suffix *-te* in the structure *-telakwuyo*, meaning 'it used to be that way but I am not sure about it now', is likely to make a speaker's utterance sound more like personal experience, thereby making the hearer feel more involved. Moreover, he interpreted the *-telakwuyo* as a hedge representing women's subconscious desire not to be held responsible for the contents of the statement that they have made.

Women's language at the lexical level, according to Min, consists of the use of expressives, less use of swear words and taboo words, and more emotion-related nouns that women are positively associated with. There are distinct differences between the words that women and men evaluate positively; women often associate positive values with something to do with the emotions, e.g. *salang* 'love', *hayngpok* 'happiness', whereas men often associate positive words with sports. Moreover, Min observes that women use more adverbs to soften their utterances or to emphasize the meanings that they convey through the utterance, as in *com* 'a little, please' or *nemwu* 'too much', and exclamations such as *ememe* 'oh my gosh' and *seysang ey* 'oh my goodness'.

Finally, Min demonstrates pragmatic features of women's speech such as verbosity, hedges, compliments and polite speech, cooperativeness in conversation, and frequent use of minimal responses such as *mhm* and *yeah* to show agreement. He argued that women's politeness is characterized by a rising intonation in declaratives, polite speech style *hay yo*, tag questions, hedges through words such as *com* 'a little, please', *mwe* 'just', *kulssey* 'well...', minimal responses, avoidance of interruption and indirect requests by means of questions or suggestions.

Min's work is an important contribution to the body of literature on Korean language and gender in that it explored a wide range of linguistic aspects of Korean women's speech, and provided empirical data for each linguistic item discussed at the phonological, grammatical, lexical and pragmatic levels. He also synthesized all of the previous literature on Korean language and gender, and supported his claims by providing evidence from earlier work in the English language. However, Min's work also contains shortcomings. Like most other Korean linguistic research on gender, this study also sought to show how women speak differently from men, and described women's language by demonstrating words about women and language used mainly by women. As already demonstrated, the problem with this type of research is that it makes broad generalizations about women's speech, polarizes gender differences in speech,

31

and perceives women as static and fixed, rather than dynamic. Moreover, Min's theory of feminization of young Korean men's speech is not supported by legitimate empirical reasoning.

Secondly, as most other Korean linguists did before him, Min attributed most gender differences in language to the power relations between women and men. Although it is true that patriarchal doctrines are still dominant in Korean society and power differences still exist between women and men under the notion of *namconyepi* 'men superior, women subordinate', Korean society is slowly moving toward egalitarianism and, as a result, people in younger generations have been influenced less by such ideologies. Therefore, interpretations of gendered language now need to challenge the *dominance model* that most traditional researchers in Korean language and gender studies have taken. It is time that the ideas associated with the *difference model* were explored for a new explanation of Korean language and gender with a consideration of the context of the interaction.

2.3. Changes of Korean Women's Role, and Transitions in Their Language and Social Identity

2.3.1. Korean Women in Transition and their Language

As the patriarchal ethics which have dominated Korean society for hundred of years have begun to slowly erode and an egalitarian movement between women and men has gained a foothold in society, more and more women have the opportunity to participate in the public domain and to contribute their talents to a variety of fields. As numerous studies show, these positions are steadily increasing, and women can often be found in high status positions such as company executive, school principal or civil servant in the government (Roh 1994; Sohn 1994; Palley 1994; Korean Women's Development Institute 1994). Roh (1994) states that there has been a 264 percent increase in the economically active female population fifteen years old and above between 1960 and 1990. The Korean Women's Development Institute (1994) also reports that the proportion of female employees in professional, technical, and administrative jobs increased from 4.3 percent in 1983 to 9.8 percent in 1992. Moreover, there has been a steady

32

increase in women's participation in politics and government administration since the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1988 (see note 14) and a revised Ordinances for the Employment of Civil Servants (1989) prohibited sexual discrimination in the civil service (p.32).

As a result, Korean women have more opportunities to interact at a variety of social levels playing multiple roles both in private and public domains. Thus, the language that they speak has also become too complex and multifaceted to be referred to simply as 'women's language'. The notion of 'women's language' originating with traditional roles can no longer be supported, leaving a need for more thorough re-evaluation of the concept. Reynolds (1990) noted that there is a similar need for the reinterpretation of Japanese women's language in terms of shifting roles as well as changing language of Japanese women:

The asymmetric linguistic division may not have created serious problems in a sex-segregated society, where the wife, a woman in the only legitimate female category, occupied "the lowest rung on the entire social ladder, subordinated within the feudal hierarchy and within the family hierarchy as well" (Pharr 1984:224). There was no need for women to talk assertively/forcefully/ authoritatively since they were defined as subordinate to others. With the legal and economic changes after the war, however, the barriers between women and men were removed in most social and educational institutions: women are no longer confined to the home but are taking up various social/public roles which used to belong to men (p.134-135).

Reynolds argued that conflict can develop when a woman in a superior position, as defined within a male-established hierarchy, fails to signify her authority through what has traditionally been considered female speech. Therefore, when women take non-traditional roles in public domains they might face conflicts from their language as well as from the new status assigned to them. Reynolds explains this situation as follows:

There is no doubt that social changes during the post-war era have had an incalculable impact on women's perceptions of reality, giving rise to "status conflict" (Pharr 1984) in various areas of social life. Language use is one such area: the female/male speech dichotomy stands in obvious contradiction to the new social order based on egalitarian ideology. As shown in Reynolds (1985), language use reflects Japanese society of the past, in which women were viewed as the inferior, weaker sex and were expected to talk accordingly. Women may perceive themselves as equals of men but women's language calls up the older image of women. Here exists an "objective condition for conflict" (Pharr 1984) (p.129-130).

33

Extrapolating from this perspective, it is possible to project the Japanese experience with change in women's language in the context of post-war social, economic and cultural change onto Korea as well, since that country has undergone a similar process of change over recent decades. It seems valid, therefore, to assume that studies of Japanese woman's language may also have valuable applications for Korean, so long as distinct circumstances are taken into account.

2.3.2. Women's Identities and their Sex Roles

In the discussion of changes in women's language, an investigation of the speakers' identity becomes more important since each speaker speaks differently depending on the roles that he or she is playing in a specific interaction, and because the speaker's perception of his or her role in the interaction reflects the speaker's identity. Meyerhoff (1996) states that the uniqueness of individuals lies in their blend of multiple social and personal identities, and each individual's identity becomes a crucial factor in shaping the linguistic forms of the communicative event and in providing speakers with the social and cultural knowledge necessary for making basic sociolinguistic and pragmatic choices. Meyerhoff cites Condor's work (1986) on perceptions of what it means to be a traditional and non-traditional woman. According to Condor, traditional women saw their feminine identity as complementary to men's masculine identity, whereas non-traditional women perceived their identity as a woman in a more competitive perspective and related it to an identity of economic independence and of having high status and high prestige. Meyerhoff (1996) states:

We would expect that the language associated with the identities Women-t (the identity of being a woman for a traditional woman) and Women-n (the identity of a non-traditional woman) will differ to the extent that the linguistic markers indexed with the other identities mentioned can be found in the two groups of women's speech. Thus, in addition to finding shared markers of womanly identity (which might contrast with markers indexing male identity in this culture), the speech of the Women-t identity should differ from the speech of a Women-n identity in that the former will include markers consistent with indexing a caretaking identity, and these markers will be absent in the speech of the latter (p.221).

34

There are rather few studies about how the gender identities of women playing roles in non-traditional domains are constructed. McElhinny (1995) studied how female police officers identify themselves in a professional domain where masculine characteristics have been regarded as the norm. She demonstrated that women adopt some of the practices associated with the profession that have been established by men but also adapted interactional norms of policing by adopting a less physical middle-class image of a police officer than that of the stereotypical and more forceful working-class image. Bergvall (1996) studied one community of practice -- a university engineering class -- and showed how language reflects the conflicts between professional and traditional gender expectations of women studying to be engineers. Academic expectations in engineering classes are androcentric rather than androgynous, partly due to the military origins of the field and partly due to its male-dominated nature. Thus, conflict arose from expectations that women in the engineering field meet both traditional female social role expectations and male professional role expectations, as well as from gender stereotypes associated with each sex group.

Sterling and Owen (1982) conducted a study in which college students heard police officers persuading a student to relinquish an alcoholic beverage that the student was consuming in public. The officers spoke in either a demanding style or a reasoning style. Female police officers using a demanding style were rated as less feminine but male officers' masculinity was not influenced by their speech style. Similar gender stereotypes are also found in the study of Schein et.al. (1989), who examined the relations between sex role stereotypes and management characteristics among college students. They found that students still associate successful management with attitudes ascribed to men rather than to women. Furthermore, such stereotypical images of successful managers were more common in the perceptions of male students than females, showing that gender stereotypical images persist more in men's minds.

Due to the prevalent gender stereotypical images associated with each sex group, many women in authority face a 'double bind' regarding professionalism and femininity. Lakoff (1990) explains that the 'double bind' as follows: "when a woman is placed in a position in

which being assertive and forceful is necessary, she is faced with a paradox; she can be a good woman but a bad executive or professional, or vice versa. To do both is impossible" (p.206). Thus, in order to help the women in authority resolve the conflicts from the 'double bind', we need to eliminate the gender-role stereotypes and to continue investigation into the shifting construction of multiple gender roles.

2.4. Summary

This chapter has reviewed and critiqued related literature on the topic of language and gender including the most influential, Robin Lakoff's work. New questions were raised in the study of language and gender which challenge rather than reinforce gender polarization. Pursuing gender differences in language use only leads to a deeper dichotomization between the two sex groups and therefore, a new approach is required to examine women's language. Contextualizing interaction in a *community of practice* provides new perspectives on women's language, allowing us to explore how gender interacts with other aspects of identity as well as how gender is constructed *through* the interaction.

Research on language and gender in the workplace focuses on two main areas; how women and men interact with each other at work, and how women and men enact authority in professional positions. The former line of research suggests that men tend to get and keep the conversational floor more often and longer than do women, and that women and men tend to use language strategies that perform different interactional functions - integrative vs. commanding. Work in the latter area suggests that women tend to expend linguistic effort to minimize status differences between themselves and their subordinates or patients, whereas men tend to use strategies that reinforce status differences.

The field of research on language and gender in Korean has not developed as far as the same area in other languages. This is most clearly observed in the fact that Lakoff's *Language and Women's Place* (1975) was only translated into Korean in 1991. Furthermore, few studies in Korean language have progressed beyond Lakoff-style interpretations and analyses done by

simply enumerating alleged characteristics of women's language and demonstrating gendered language forms. Furthermore, many studies in Korean lack empirical evidence, since most of the studies' data depend on the researchers' personal observations and anecdotes. These types of linguistic studies on gender tend to generate excessive generalizations of men's and women's speech, and ignore the context in which the interaction occurs.

Second, the application of research conducted in languages other than Korean should be carefully considered, since the linguistic and social circumstances in any two speech communities are not identical. The sex of the speaker might be a crucial factor affecting gendered language in one speech community, but this is not always the case in other speech communities. For example, age is one of the fundamental variables in the Korean speech community owing to the highly stratified hierarchical structure of Korean society. This does not seem to be the case in English speech communities, but may apply more to the Japanese speech community.

As more and more Korean women participate in the public domain the roles that they play in both public and private areas have significantly increased. Consequently, one can possess many social identities at one time (e.g. mother, caregiver, company manager and team leader). Under this consideration, the concept of 'women's language' disintegrates due to the various and multifaceted roles that women play and because of the multiple social identities that they possess. Therefore, in discussing women's language, researchers need to consider many variables such as role and status of the speaker and speaker identities.

In the next chapter, I will demonstrate the procedures of data collection and analysis for this thesis, and the research methodology used for the study, focusing on an explanation of the independent variables set in the research design. Data for the research will be explained in detail along with the problems arising from the use of fictional sources and the rationales for their use in linguistic research. Moreover, Korean directives used in the contemporary Korean language will be analyzed with regard to the politeness level associated with each directive.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data

3.1.1. Data: Korean TV Dramas

Data for the present study were drawn from *Yengwung Sinhwa* 'Mythical Hero' and *Yeykam* 'Hunch', -- two contemporary Korean television dramas -- both of which portray women and men in high status positions within a company. *Yengwung Sinhwa* contains 24 episodes of 60 minutes each. This drama focuses mainly on conflicts in love relationships between the man and woman of two different couples. In this drama, the speech of three female superiors and four male superiors has been selected as a source of data. Table I introduces the subjects from *Yengwung Sinhwa* and their profiles (see note 15 for further detail).

Table I: subjects from *Yengwung Sinhwa*

Females	Company	Position	Age	Comments
Mrs. Choy	Thayil Co.	president	early 50's	Mrs. Choy replaces her husband as president after he is hospitalized.
Choy Hyeyyeng	Thayil Co.	manager	early 30's	Choy Hyeyyeng replaces her mother as president after Mrs.Choy is jailed.
O Cinswu	hotel	president	early 40's	O buys a hotel from Mr. Kang.
Males				
Mr. Kang	hotel	president	early 50's	
O Sengcwu	Olyun consruction	senior president	late 30's	
Kim Inwu	Olyun construction	junior president	middle 30's	O Sengcwu hires Kim Inwu for his construction expertise, but Kim has no practical power
Kim Thaywu	hotel	manager	late 20's	Kim is hired by O Cinswu

The story of *Yeykam* consists of 16 episodes of 60 minutes each, centers on the workplace more than the family, and involves many office scenes with a hierarchical structure. This drama is about a gregarious young woman (Kim Yulim) who starts as a factory worker in a cosmetic company, and later succeeds in becoming a career woman with a fairly high status in the main office of the same company. In this drama, the speech of three female superiors and

five male superiors has been chosen as data for the study. Table II shows the subjects from *Yeykam* and their personal profiles (see note 16 for further detail).

Table II: subjects from *Yeykam*

Females	Company	Position	Age	Comments
Cang Seyyeng	Sinseng Cosmetics	manager	middle 30's	
Ko Sungmi	Sinseng Cosmetics	senior team	early 30's	
Ms. Kwu	Sinseng Cosmetics	junior team leader	early 30's	
Yi Mikyeng	Sinseng Cosmetics - factory	team leader in the sales dept.	early 30's	
Kim Yulim	Sinseng Cosmetics	team leader	late 20's	Kim was an ordinary team member under Yi Mikyeng's supervision in the factory and later gets promoted as a team leader in the main office.
Males				
Kim Tonghwun	Sinseng Cosmetics	president	late 50's	
O Ilto	Sinseng Cosmetics	executive director	middle 50's	
Kim Sengho	Sinseng Cosmetics	director	early 50's	
Choy Kyengmin	Sinseng Cosmetics	director	middle 30's	Choy was owner of a construction company but was later scouted by Sinseng.
Mr. Co	Hanto Cosmetics	director	late 40's	Hanto is in a rival relationship with Sinseng

3.1.2. Rationale for Using TV Dramas

Korean TV dramas reflect contemporary Korean values, culture, and current social realities more or less faithfully in so far as they portray probable situations and people in Korean society. Reality might not necessarily contain the situations or characters presented in these dramas but there is a high probability that situations and characters similar to those portrayed in the dramas do occur and exist in reality as well. More importantly, the TV

dialogues in contemporary dramas can be taken to represent a reliable snapshot or cross-section of modern Korean as currently spoken by Koreans in Seoul.

Nonetheless, using dramas as data for linguistic research raises interesting and challenging problems with regard to authenticity; Korean TV dramas may not necessarily represent 100 % authentic Korean speech as used by contemporary Koreans in spontaneous real situations or contexts. Furthermore, one might object that the language used in dramas is potentially limited in that it might be subject to a writer's own language habits or to preferences affected by the writer's social class, age, gender, and origin.

There are two possible responses to these arguments. First, language in TV drama still represents one aspect of contemporary Korean language and shows one possible way of expressing Koreans' values and ideas through Korean language because the actual speech community and the language used in TV dramas of that speech community mutually influence each other. In other words, TV drama does not depict authentic speech patterns of any one specific individual, but rather shows a sample or composite of contemporary language use in modern Korean society. Second, if the language used in any specific speech community is worth researching, then it is clearly legitimate to investigate dramatic language, since the dramatic community also comprises a speech community with its own characteristics in its language use. In this sense, exploring the dramatic language of Korean TV soap opera is no different from, say, studying the Korean language as used by Koreans in Manchuria.

3.2. Design

3.2.1. Making Requests in Korean

Korean has a complex set of verbal inflectional suffixes that indicate imperatives in six different speech levels; plain *hayla*, intimate *hay*, familiar *hakey*, blunt *hao*, polite *hay yo* and formal *hasipsio*. Sohn (1994) explains that at the familiar and polite levels, the addition of the subject honorific suffix -*(u)si*- increases politeness (*hasikey, hasey yo*) while its use in the blunt level does not affect the degree of politeness (*hasio*). Sohn further explains that the honorific blunt imperative (*hasio*) simply sounds more contemporary than the plain blunt imperative

(*hao*) because the honorific suffix -*(u)si*- in the blunt level might not function as an honorific but as a requestive mood suffix instead (see note 17).

Sohn (1994) demonstrated three other means of expressing imperatives in Korean. The use of the indirect quotation of an imperative sentence without the main quoting predicate is one way to express imperatives (e.g. *cikum kot ttenalako* '[I am telling you] to leave at once'). This device often mitigates assertiveness, changing an order to a request. Another imperative device is to use a nominal form, including adnominalized clauses, as in the sentence, *tule kaci mal kes* 'do not enter'. This consists of the head noun *kes* 'fact, that, thing' preceded by an adnominal clause with the prospective modifier -*(u)l*. The third imperative device that Sohn introduced was the indirect speech act in which this linguistic device can either tone down utterance forces or strengthen them. The most common indirect speech act is imposing a request on the addressee by using interrogative sentences -- by use of 'whimperatives' (Hwang 1990). One can distinguish various degrees of indirectness in the question forms of requests, as in the following examples:

(a)   chwum ul chwu si keyss eyo?
       dance-AC-do-SH-will-POL
       'Will you dance?'

(b)   chwum ul com chwu si keyss eyo?
       dance-AC-please-do-SH-will-POL
       'Will you please dance?'

(c)   - chwum ul com chwu e cwu si keyss eyo?
       dance-AC-please-dance-INF-give-SH-will-POL
       'Will you please dance for me?'

(d)   chwum ul com chwu e cwu si l swu iss usey yo?
       dance-AC-please-dance-INF-give-SH-PRS-way-exist-SH-POL
       'Can you please dance for me?

(e)   chwum ul com chwu e cwu si l swu iss usi keyss eyo?
       dance-AC-please-dance-INF-give-SH-PRS-way-exist-SH-think-POL
       'Do you think you could please dance?'

Although all five examples utilize a request force, the degree of indirectness in each sentence is different, (a) being the least and (e) the most indirect. The adverbials like *com* 'please, just' (see note 18), the modal suffix *-keyss-* 'will, intend, think', the benefactive auxiliary verb *cwu-* 'give... for me', the possibility expression *-(u)l swu iss-* 'can (lit. 'there is a way to...')', etc. are used to mitigate or attenuate illocutionary forces -- the utterance force achieved by the performance of a particular language function (see note 19) -- thereby resulting in ever more indirect request forms.

Some verbal directives have a special form and do not fit comfortably into the typical structure of six speech styles. Imperative sentences using verbal suffixes such as suspective-casual *-ci*, projective *-tolok*, and plain subjuctive attentive *-(u)la* are good examples (see note 20):

(f)   mence ttena *ci* [kulay]
          first-leave-SUS
          'You'd better leave first'

(g)   ppalli ha *tolok* [hay]
          quickly-do-PRO
          'Do it quickly'

(h)   macnun tap ul kolu *la*
          correct-NM-answer-AC-choose-PSA
          'Pick the correct answer'

-Ci in example (f) is termed differently depending on each different scholar. Sohn (1994) perceived the *-ci* to be a suppositive mood suffix and stated that in declaratives, the verbal suffix *-ci* denotes the speaker's supposition or proposition (e.g. *nay ka haci* 'I'll do it'), whereas in interrogatives it denotes asking for the addressee's supposition or assurance, like tag-questions in English (e.g. *sensayng nim un pelsse kasyess ci [anh a]?* 'The teacher already left, didn't he?'). In imperatives and propositives it denotes the speaker's proposition, showing a mild request rather than a command, as seen in the example (f). Sohn further notes that this verbal suffix only occurs in the Intimate (*haci*) and Polite (*haci yo*) levels, and only marginally

in formal levels (*hapciyo*) used by old people (see note 21).

According to Sohn, question sentences with the suppositive *-ci* are regarded as having derived from complex negative sentences with the main clause deleted, as noted in the interrogative sentence above (see note 22). Although Sohn only discussed the possibility of the ellipsis in *-ci* structure in the context of interrogative sentences, it is also likely that the imperative sentence with *-ci* is an elided fragment from the complete sentence as seen in the example (f) which contains a deleted main clause, *kulay* 'that's so'.

On the other hand, Martin (1992) termed the *-ci* a suspective and explained: "the -ci forms are *commital*: they express the speaker's commitment to the truth of the information conveyed with varying degree of certainty ranging from probable to certain" (p.302). He described the use of *-ci* in six *casual*-style sentences as follows:

(i) a casual statement anticipating agreement
    kongwen ey ka ci?
    park-LM-go-SUS
    'I suppose we are going to the park, aren't we'

(ii) a casual suggestion or proposition
    kongwen ey ka ci!!
    park-LM-go-SUS
    'I suggest we go to the park'

(iii) a casual reminder question
    UBC ey pakmwulkwan i iss ci?
    UBC-LM-museum-NM-exist-SUS
    'Didn't you say UBC has a museum?'

(iv) a casual informative statement
    sensayng nim to ka ci
    teacher-HS-too-go-SUS
    'Teacher is going too, you know'

(v) a casual command
    kongpwu com ha ci
    study-a little bit-do-SUS
    'Why don't you study a bit'

(vi) a casual question.
    kongwen ey ka ci?

park-LM-go-SUS
'I suppose we are going to the park?'

Martin (1992) further explained that in imperative or propositive contexts, the suffix expresses suggestion for an action which the speaker believes to be proper in a given context, while in interrogative contexts, the suffix expresses asking confirmation on information the speaker is committed to (quoted from Yi Hyosang [1991]).

The -tolok in example (g) is termed a 'projective' by Martin (1992). This verbal suffix is a fairly blunt form of imperative and is often found in the speech of soldiers when the soldiers in superior position make a command to their subordinates. Also, this verbal suffix indicates the speaker's assertion of authority having a meaning 'do in such a way that....'. Like the suspective -ci, it is assumed that the projective -tolok is an ellipsis with a deleted main clause as is in the example (g).

Finally, -(u)la is a special form of imperative distinguished from the plain imperative -e/a la which Sohn (1994) categorized as the so-called 'neutral' level, a category which he added to the traditionally recognized six speech levels. According to Sohn, this neutral imperative form is often used as a non-quotative request in written contexts such as exam papers as is in example (h) or in demonstration placards, as in the sentence, *chongcang un mwulle kala* 'We are asking the university president to resign!' In this case, the imperative illocutionary force is not so much a command as a conventionalized formal request, and is not used toward a specific addressee. In contrast, Martin (1992) termed -(u)la as a 'plain subjuctive attentive' and classified it into the same category with a plain imperative -e/a la (see note 23).

One often finds that requests are made by means of propositive sentences, as if the speaker were participating in the requested act with the addressee. Here is an example:

(i) ppalli ha p si ta.
     quickly-do-AH-RQ-PR
     'Do it quickly' (lit. 'Let us do it quickly'.)

This sentence functions both as an imperative and a propositive, depending on who the addressee is and in which context this utterance occurs. If the speaker has a higher status than the addressee, this utterance becomes more of a request. If the speaker is in the same status as the addressee, this utterance will function more as a propositive, and if the speaker has lower status than the addressee, he or she does not usually make this utterance as either an imperative or propositive -- it is perceived as inappropriate for speakers of lower status to make suggestions or propositions ('let's...forms) to speakers of higher status in Korean language (Sohn 1994:45).

Frequently, grammatical subjects in imperative and propositive constructions do not surface unless they are emphasized, and this makes distinguishing between these two sentence constructions difficult. This is even more the case when the forms of the verbal suffixes for imperative and propositive are exactly the same at the intimate and polite speech level -- *hay* in the Intimate and *hay yo* in the Polite. Consequently, in order to determine the illocutionary force of an utterance, i.e. whether it is an imperative or a propositive, one must consider context in which the utterance occurs.

On the other hand, imperative sentences do not always function to make a request. The following examples demonstrate other non-imperative functions of imperative sentences.

(j)   ese o sey yo
       quickly-come-SH-POL
       'Welcome!' (lit. come quickly)

(k)   annyeghi ka si p si o
       peacefully-go-SH-AH-RQ-IM
       'Good Bye' (lit. go peacefully)

In the examples above, although the verbal endings of both sentences indicate imperatives, (j) simply has a meaning of greeting and welcome and (k) shows a conventionalized farewell without any imperative imposition on the addressee.

Finally, we should note how negative commands are constructed in Korean. The negative command in Korean is made by adding the auxiliary verb *ma-l-* to the suspective *-ci* as in example (1):

(1)   ku umak ul tut-ci mal-ayo
        that-music-AC-listen-SUS-NEG-POL
        'Don't listen to that music'

The auxiliary verb *ma-l-* varies its verb form according to the six speech levels just like other ordinary verbs do: plain *malla/malala*, intimate *ma/mala*, familiar *malkey*, blunt *mao*, polite *maseyyo*, formal *masipsio*.

3.2.2. Distinguishing Degrees of Politeness in Korean Directives

First, the degree of politeness increases with the addition of honorific elements such as the honorific suffix *-(u)si-*, honorific equivalents to certain lexical terms (e.g. *pap* (plain) - *cinci* (honorific), 'rice') and honorific (or deferential) forms of personal nouns (e.g. *na* (plain) - *ce* (deferential), 'I'). Also, certain terms of address elevate the degree of politeness, as shown in word pairs like *sensayng-nim, i kes com hay cwusipsio* 'Respectful person (lit. 'teacher'), could you do this for me?' vs. *ya, i kes com hay* 'hey! do this! will you?'. The *-nim* of *sensayng nim* is an honorific suffix attached to personal names or titles.

Secondly, hedges are another way of increasing politeness in Korean because they make the utterance indirect, giving a choice to the addressee in performing the speaker's request. Hwang (1990) explains three hedges in Korean; lexical hedges such as *kkway* 'pretty much', *keuy* 'almost, virtually, for the most part', *ama* 'perhaps', phrasal hedges such as *ilcong uy* 'a sort of, a kind of', *malhacamyen* 'so to speak, as it were', *ettehkey pomyen* 'in a sense, somehow' and structural hedges like questions used as a softened statement, e.g. *ku kel talun kel lo pakkwe ponun key ettel kkayo?* 'I am suggesting that we should change that into a different one [but it's OK if you do not want to do]...'

46

Thirdly, the longer an utterance, the more polite it becomes. Hwang (1990), however, argues that politeness does not come from the sheer length of an utterance so much as from the various pragmatic components or additives that contribute to the overall politeness effect. Observe the following examples:

(m)   mwul han can cwu e.
        water-one-COU-give-IM
        'Give me a glass of water'

(n)   mian ha ci man, mwul han can cwu l lay?
       sorry-do-SUS-but-water-one-COU-give-PRS-WH
       'I'm sorry but will you give me a glass of water?'

(o)   pappu n tey mian ha ci man mwul han can cwu l lay?
       busy-AM-place-sorry-do-SUS-but-water-one-COU-give-PRS-WH
       'I know you're busy, and I'm sorry, but will you give me a glass of water?'

All three examples show the speaker's request to the addressee. However, each sentence contains a different degree of politeness. Sentence (m) sounds blunt because the speaker did not use any mitigator while making his or her request. On the other hand, sentence (n) has a short mitigator *mian haciman* 'I am sorry but...', thereby making the utterance more indirect, and sentence (o) has an even longer mitigator than (n), *pappuntey mian haciman* 'I know you're busy, and I'm sorry but...', thereby making the utterance even more indirect and polite.

Hwang (1990) further argues that 'hyper-respectfulness' is a sign of politeness in Korean. Showing hyper-respectfulness to the addressee, a superior may use the polite *-yo* ending to his or her subordinate although it is still appropriate to use the intimate *-a/e* ending. However, in considering hyper-respectfulness as a sign of politeness, other sociolinguistic factors should be taken into consideration, including social distance between superior and the subordinate, whether the superior and the subordinate are the same or different sex, and whether the superior is older or younger than the subordinate.

3.2.3. A Politeness Continuum for Korean Directives

Directives in Korean, generally shown as a set of verbal inflectional suffixes, can be identified and defined in terms of the degree of politeness which, in this case, simply shows the tendency for one verb ending to be relatively more polite than the other. The degree of politeness can be conceived of as a form of continuum, where one type of directive is considered relatively more polite than the next in terms of its politeness degree.

Korean sentences can be classified into four major types; declarative (statement), interrogative (question), imperative (command) and propositive (proposal) (Sohn 1994:8). All of these sentence types can function as a means of making requests depending on the context in which the verb endings are used; relatively blunt and direct requests by imperative and declarative sentences, and more polite and indirect requests by interrogative and propositive sentences. The request form expressed by an interrogative sentence -- whimperative -- is a very indirect way of imposing the request on the addressee. Benefactives 'do it for me' and desideratives 'I want you to do' are other verb endings used to make a request in Korean language. Benefactives are a very polite way of requesting a favor of the addressee while desideratives show the speaker's desire in a direct but polite manner.

Broadly speaking, forms increase in politeness or degree of attenuation as one moves down the chart, with the exception that forms under 'others' do not always participate in the speech levels system (or rather, are difficult to accommodate within it), and at best allow mitigation with the addition of honorific -(u)si- and/or polite yo. The honorific forms in propositives 'let's...' and desideratives 'I want you to do...' were not stated here because the subject in these two sentence types includes the 'speaker's person' and it is not acceptable to use an honorific for oneself.

sample sentence: *hoyuy ka l cwunpi hay*   (intimate imperative)
conference-go-PRS-preparation-do-IM
'Prepare to go to the meeting'

48

	Imperative (do it)	**Honorific**	**Propositive** (let's do it)
Plain	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hayla*	-*hasila*	-*haca*
Intimate	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hay*	-*hasye*	-*hay*
Familiar	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hakey*	-*hasikey*	-*hasey*
Blunt	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hao*	-*hasio*	-------
Polite	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hay yo*	-*hasey yo*	-*hay yo*
Formal	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hasipsio*	-*hasipsio*	-*ha(si)psita*

	Declarative (one does this)	**Honorific**	**Whimperative** (request as a form of question)	**Honorific**
Plain	-*hanta*	-*hasinta*	-*hani*	-*hasini*
Intimate	-*hay*	-*hasye*	-*hay*	-*hasye*
Familiar	-*haney*	-*hasiney*	-*hao*	-*hasio*
Blunt	-*hao*	-*hasio*	-*hana*	-*hasina*
Polite	-*hay yo*	-*haseyyo*	-*hay yo*	-*haseyyo*
Formal	-*hapnita*	-*hasipnita*	-*hapnikka*	-*hasipnikka*

	Benefactive (do it for me)	**Honorific**	**Desiderative** (I want you to do)
Plain	-hay *cwela*	-hay *cwusyela*	-(l)ul *palanta*
Intimate	-hay *cwe*	-hay *cwusye*	-(l)ul *palay*
Familiar	-hay *cwukey*	-hay *cwusikey*	-(l)ul *palaney*
Blunt	-hay *cwuo*	-hay *cwusio*	-(l)ul palao
Polite	-hay *cweyo*	-hay *cwuseyyo*	-(l)ul *palayyo*
Formal	-hay *cwupsio*	-hay *cwusipsio*	-(l)ul *palapnita*

Others: hoyuy kal cwunpi *hatolok*
hoyuy kal cwunpi *haci*
hoyuy kal cwunpi *hako*
hoyuy kal cwunpi *hayya tway*
hoyuy kal cwunpi *halan maliya*
hoyuy kal cwunpi man *hamyen tway*
hoyuy kal cwunpi *hayya hal keya*

Indirect Speech Acts:

whimperative:	hoyuy kal cwunpi *hal kka(yo)*?
	'Shall I/we....?'
hedge:	hoyuy kal cwunpi hayss u *myen hanun tey...*
	'It would be good/nice if....'
use of adverbial:	hoyuy kal cwunpi *com* hay(yo)

Combinations of two or more imperative devices:

hoyuy kal cwunpi *com* hal kka hanuntey *kwaynchanh keyss eyo*?

(combination of adverbial *com* and whimperative) - seeks approval, hence also a desire

The forms shown above suffice to give a sense of the morphological complexity of, and the multiple devices available for expressing, commands in Korean in varying degrees of politeness. Since Korean possesses a broad range of forms for issuing orders or imposing an imperative illocutionary force, forms are arranged in order from least to most polite within the politeness continuum. Directives in Korean can be located at one place in the continuum between blunt (associated with and asserting relatively high authority) and attenuated (related to a relatively low assertion of authority):

Blunt   **Attenuated**
Low degree of politeness   **High degree of politeness**

<--->

hayla	hay	hakey hao		hayyo	hasipsio	**Imperative**
	hay haca	hasey		hayyo	hapsita	**Propositive**
	haycwe	haycwukey haycwuo		haycweyo	haycwusipsio	**Benefactive**
	hakipalaney	hakipalao		hakipalayyo	hakipalapnita	**Desiderative**
		halkka?			halkkayo?	**Whimperative**
hatolok		hako haci		hakoyo		**Others**
hayyatway				haciyo		
halanmaliya hayyahalkeya						
hamyentway						

It should be also reiterated here that this politeness continuum simply demonstrates a tendency for one verb ending to be more polite than the other, and the politeness degree presented here might be slightly different depending on each native speaker of Korean.

3.2.4. Variables

Since the subjects from each sex group for this study are not exactly in the same age and status category, other social factors need to be controlled in order to obtain more accurate comparisons of female and male superiors' request speech. In this study, two social variables -- status and age of the superiors -- will be controlled and used as independent variables. The data analysis controlling the status of the superiors will only select the subjects who are in the position of company president and compare the request speech made by female and male presidents. For the data analysis controlling the age of the superiors, the analysis will be conducted in two parts; subjects in the younger generation and subjects in the older generation -- more specifically, superiors under age forty and the superiors over age forty. The focus here will be on what different aspects may be observed in the request speech between superiors in younger and older generations.

The data of the present study contain a limited number of subjects, meaning that social variables such as sex of the subordinates, age and status gaps between superiors and subordinates could not be controlled. Nevertheless, I include discussion of the interactions between superiors and subordinates regarding these social variables because these social variables did influence the interaction. My discussions of these social variables will consider the context in which the request force is employed because the same superior does not make an order to the same subordinate in exactly the same manner in every situation, and because the nature of the interaction can vary depending on the social variable involved in that specific interaction.

3.3. Procedures

Using two TV dramas as a data base, each request speech act between the fourteen superiors and their subordinates was recorded. This included 188 request speech acts from *Yeykam* and 43 from *Yengwung Sinhwa*. These statistics for request speech acts were obtained by counting the number of speech acts made in one particular situation and by one particular

speaker. The request speech acts from the dramas were then transcribed in both Korean and Yale Romanization.

All the directives used by the eight female and nine male subjects used in the present study were categorized into a few ranges centered around the six speech levels in imperatives as well as in propositives, benefactives (*-e cwu*), desideratives (*-a/e pala-*) and other patterns with an illocutionary force of a request. Directives observed in the data were classified by sentence types and speech styles, and were calculated for each individual subject and for the female and male superior groups. Each directive used by female and male subjects in the data was then analyzed according to its degree of politeness, which was determined in accordance with the politeness continuum demonstrated above. Finally, these categorized directives were compared to see what type of imperatives each gender group employed and in which context the subjects used the specific imperative. Also analyzed were utilization of honorifics between female and male superiors, along with the use of address terms and adverbials and other linguistic devices such as whimperatives, hedges and hyper-respectfulness.

The present study controls two social factors as independent variables -- superiors' status and age. In the analysis which controls subjects' status, only the subjects in the position of president -- three female and four males -- were selected. The data analysis which controls subjects' age divided the subjects into two different age categories; subjects over forty and the subjects under forty. Two female and five male subjects were classified as the superior group in the older age category and six females and four male subjects were categorized into the younger age group. Each request speech act in the two different sex groups was compared and contrasted, focusing on the degree of politeness utilized by the subjects in each age group.

Finally, I have analyzed how female and male superiors enact their authority in the workplace by exploring their discourse strategies as well as politeness strategies; whether they minimize or reinforce status differences with their subordinates and what kind of differences in enacting their authority can be found between the two sex groups.

In the next chapter, I will analyze the data collected and report the results from the investigations of how superiors in each sex group make requests to their subordinates, how they utilize politeness in each request speech act, and how they enact their authority as powerful figures.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1. Female and Male Superiors' Request Speech Acts

4.1.1. Verb Endings, Honorifics and Adverbial *com*

4.1.1.1. Imperatives

Table III: comparisons of imperatives

Imperatives	Male	Female
plain (hayla)	0	1
intimate (hay)	43	150
familiar (hakey)	8	0
honorific blunt (hasio)	3	0
polite (hay yo)	28	16
honorific polite (haseyyo)	33	7
formal (hasipsio)	0	1

In the use of imperatives, distinct differences between female and male superiors were observed in the use of intimate (*hay*) and polite speech level (*hay yo*); female superiors used far more intimate imperative speech styles than male superiors (f 150 vs. m 43) whereas male superiors used more polite imperative speech style than female superiors (m 28 vs. f 16). It should be noted that more than two thirds of the collected intimate imperative speech styles of female superiors were made by Cang Seyyeng and Yi Mikyeng. This reflects their close relationship with their subordinates and frequent contacts with their team members in the same office. Also, both female superiors' leadership and supervisory roles contribute to an intimate relationship with their subordinates.

The drama *Yeykam* has many scenes in which superiors scold subordinates for making mistakes on the job. A prominent aspect of these scenes is that both Cang and Yi use exaggerated speech styles when scolding subordinates, as the following examples show:

(1) in the office of the products planning department in Sinseng cosmetic company

Cang Seyyeng:	........*Kim Yulim, com chaca pwass na?*
	'Kim Yulim, did you look for that document?.'

Kim Yulim:	*coysong hapnita. ta chaca pwass ciman...*
	'I am sorry. I have searched everywhere but...'

Cang Seyyeng:	*Kim Yulim, icey pwuthe epmwu eyse son ttey.... nen il ul ppayskinun kil pwuthe paywe.* (to other team members) *Kim Yulim eykey amwu il to cwuci mala. poksa na kongmwu swupal to an tway. nay cisi ka issul ttay kkaci nen coffee na kkulhinun keya.*
	'Kim Yulim, you are to do no office work from now on... You'd better start learning how your jobs are taken away. Don't give any work to Kim Yulim. Not even copying or helping someone else with their work is allowed. All you are to do is make coffee till you have my further orders.'

(2) in the office of a sales team in Sinseng cosmetic factory

Yi Mikyeng:	(to all team members) *ala tulesse?.... kulay, twuko pokeysse. sakwa hako ttwulhe wa. nehuy tul kathcanhun caconsim ttaymwun ey ppayskil swun epse. swukye, mwucoken swukye. tasi hanpen mal hanta. swukye. haysan.*
	'Do you understand?....OK, I will see how it goes. Apologize to them and get their patronage. We don't intend to lose them because of your stinking pride. Be deferential. Be deferential under all circumstances. I will say one more time. Be deferential. Dismissed.'

In both of these examples, Cang and Yi make extensive use of intimate imperatives (underlined forms) when speaking to their subordinates. Cang's way of speaking to Kim Yulim in example (1) is very direct and even insulting, with no consideration of face -- e.g. *coffee na kkulhinun keya* 'all you are to do is make coffee'. The same applies to Yi's speech to her team members in example (2). Both female superiors use the second personal pronoun, *ne* (plain, singular 'you') and *nehuy* (plural of *ne*), and address their subordinate with the person's full name without any honorific suffix, *-ssi*. This makes their speech blunt, authoritative and very impolite. Moreover, in dialogues (1) and (2), both Cang and Yi adopt militaristic speech styles like .... *chaca pwassna?* 'Have you looked for?' and *haysan* 'dismissed'. In the data, this type of language is *not* found in male superiors' speech, but only in female superiors'.

It was observed that male superiors used honorifics more often than females. Moreover, Choy Kyengmin and Kim Thaywu used more honorifics than other male superiors, totaling 5/6 of all male use of the honorific polite imperative (*hasey yo*). The likely reason for this is that both Choy and Kim were new employees in the company and not really acquainted with any of their subordinates -- the social distance between speaker and listener. For example, Cang Seyyeng, Choy's major subordinate interlocutor in his request speech acts, had been working for Sinseng company before Choy was hired as a director and it was only recently that Cang became Choy's direct subordinate, thereby creating social distance between them and causing Choy to use polite language to Cang. Another factor is the relative age of the subordinate. For example, Kim Thaywu mainly used honorific polite imperatives (*hasey yo*) when he made requests to Manager Pak, who is a direct subordinate of Kim but also much older.

In the data, familiar and blunt imperatives (*hakey, hao*) were found only in male superiors' speech, verifying that these two speech levels are a feature of Korean men's language. Blunt imperatives (*hao*) were not found in female superiors' speech, and the familiar imperative (*hakey*) was observed only once in Cang Seyyeng's speech to the department members -- *censa-cek ulo imhay cwukey* 'I am asking you to be responsible for your job in a combative manner'. Only two of the male subjects in the data, Kim Tonghwun and O Ilto, employed the familiar imperative (*hakey*) (Kim 6, O 2). This seems to support the claim that the familiar imperative (*hakey*) is generally used more by older Korean men.

Another notable aspect is that when male superiors used the blunt imperative (*hao*), they always used the honorific suffix *-(u)si-* with the blunt imperative form (*hasio*). This supports Sohn's (1994) argument that *-(u)si-o* sounds more contemporary than *-(u)o* and that the *-(u)si-* in the blunt level (*hasio*) might *not* be the honorific suffix but instead the 'requestive mood' suffix. The use of the honorific 'requestive' suffix *-(u)si-* is also found in the benefactive imperative of male superiors, resulting in *cwusio* instead of *cwuo*.

4.1.1.2. Propositives

Table IV: comparisons of propositives

Propositives	Male	Female
plain (haca)	3	4
formal (hapsita)	21	2

For propositives, there were only two speech levels observed in the data; plain (*haca*) and formal (*hapsita*). The number of plain propositives used between female and male superiors was close (f 4 vs. m 3) whereas the number of formal propositives used between them was much different (f 2 vs. m 21). Formal propositives were found most frequently in formal context, such as a high level meeting. Presumably, men's more frequent use of formal propositives can be attributed to the fact that male executives generally occupy higher status than female executives attending company meeting (sometimes, no female executives were found in the meeting). Therefore, men have more opportunities to make requests to other participants by the use of formal propositives since status inferiors do not normally make any type of suggestions to status superiors in the Korean speech community. Example (3) shows O Ilto's use of formal propositive (*hapsita*) as a way of making a request with a form of proposition:

(3) in the directors' meeting room

O Ilto: *Yi Cwunsep-ssi Phulangsu chwulcang swuko hayssko piyong mwuncey nun nay ka cikcep cheng hay se cosahal theynikka onul un ikes ulo machipsita.*
'Mr. Yi, thank you for the business trip to Paris. I will check the expenses on my own so let us finish today's meeting.'

Contrary to the above, in example (4), Choy Kyengmin's use of formal propositive (*hapsita*) simply shows an indirect manner of making a request. In this request speech act, Choy makes

57

his utterance even more polite by the use of an adverb *com* which functions as a mitigator to soften the imposition force of the request:

(4) in the research center
Choy and Cang are walking into the center

Choy Kyengmin: *Yi Cwunsep-ssi, tokseng test <u>com pwuthak hapsita.</u>*
                    'Mr. Yi, if you don't mind, I would like to ask you to do a toxicity test.'

Yi Cwunsep: *tokseng test yo? etten sample ipnikka?*
                    'A toxicity test? What type of sample do you have?.'

4.1.1.3. Benefactives

Table V: comparisons of benefactives

Benefactives (Imperatives)	Male	Female
intimate (hay cwe)	1	7
familiar (hay cwukey)	7	1
honorific blunt (hay cwusio)	1	0
polite (hay cweyo)	5	2
honorific polite (hay cwuseyyo)	22	9
formal (hay cwusipsio)	7	0
Benefactive (Propositives)		
familiar (hay cwusey)	2	0

Differences between female and male superiors' use of the benefactive *-a/e cwu-* were found in the intimate, familiar and polite speech styles; female superiors used more intimate benefactives *hay cwe* (f 7 vs. m1) than male superiors and male superiors used far more familiar *hay cwukey* (f1 vs. m7) and polite benefactives *hay cwe yo* (f 2 vs. m5 and honorific polite *-a/e cwu sey yo* (f 9 vs. m22) than females. Females' intimate benefactives were observed mainly in the speech of Cang Seyyeng, Ko Sungmi and Yi Mikyeng. Once again, the main factor here is the close relationship between the female superiors and their subordinates.

The formal benefactive imperative *hay cwusipsio* was not found in any of the female superiors' speech, whereas it was observed in the male superiors' speech on seven occasions.

However, it is difficult to conclude that formal benefactive *hay cwusipsio* is a feature of Korean men's language because all seven occasions were found in Choy Kyengmin's request speech. Nevertheless, the familiar propositive benefactive *hay cwusey* was only observed in male superiors' speech, supporting the claim that this verb ending along with the familiar imperative *hakey* and the honorific (requestive) blunt imperative *hasio* can be categorized as older generational Korean men's speech (see note 24).

4.1.1.4. Desideratives in -ki pala-

Table VI: comparisons of desideratives in -ki pala-

Desideratives (Imperatives)	Male	Female
intimate (-ki palay)	0	2
polite (-ki palay yo)	1	0
formal (-ki palapnita)	2	0
Desideratives (Declaratives)		
plain (-ki palanta)	0	4
familiar (-ki palaney)	1	0

In desideratives, three different speech styles were observed; plain *palanta*, intimate *palay* and polite *palayyo*. Plain and intimate desideratives were found only in female superiors' speech whereas the polite desiderative was observed only in male superiors' speech. The main factor here is that female superiors maintain closer relationships with their subordinates, thereby causing them to use plain and intimate desideratives more frequently than polite desideratives. Let us examine the following examples:

(5) in the office

Cang Seyyeng:　　(to all team members) *kakca nakase mathun pwupwun ul chaca pwa. mwenka caphil keya. ani capa ya tway. i pen il elmana cwungtayhan il inci cal al keya. motwu nolyekhay <u>cwu-ki palay</u>. isang.*
'Everybody will go out and search for the parts for which each is responsible. You will find something. No, you *should* find something.

59

You must be well aware of how important this is. I want you to do your best. Dismissed.'

(6) in the directors' meeting

O Ilto: (to Choy) ....*Choy isa nun aph ulo pantusi nay kyelcay lul patko wumcikye cwu-ki'l palay yo.* (to other directors) *ca, onul un yeki kkaci hapnita.*
'I want Director Choy to take action after getting my permission under any circumstances from now on. Well, let's call it a day for today.'

In (5), Cang Seyyeng chose to use the intimate desiderative *cwu-ki palay* when making requests to her department members since the intimacy level between Cang and her subordinates is fairly high. By contrast, in example (6) male executive director O uses the polite benefactive *cwu-ki'l palay yo* to director Choy, even though it is also appropriate for O to use the intimate benefactive *cwu-ki'l palay* to Choy due to Choy's younger age and inferior position. O's purposefully elevated speech styles to his subordinate can be perceived as a 'hyper-respectfulness' resulting from the social distance that O has with the newcomer Choy.

4.1.1.5. Whimperatives

Table VII: comparisons of whimperatives

Whimperatives	Male	Female
intimate	0	3
polite	6	5
formal	2	0

Interrogative sentences are often used as a polite way to express a request to the addressee rather than to seek information. Here is an example:

(7) in the office

Mrs. Choy: (to temporarily hired man) *wuli'n tasi pol il epskeyssci yo?*

60

'We won't have an occasion to meet again, will we?' (meaning: you are relieved of your duties and I don't want to see you again)

In example (7), Mrs. Choy requests that the man whom she hired for a special purpose not show up any more. By the use of a whimperative, she insures how the addressee should act and what she wants from him, making the request force of her utterance indirect and polite but forceful.

Three whimperative speech styles were found in the present data; intimate, polite and formal. Female superiors used intimate whimperatives more often than male superiors, and males used more formal whimperatives, while polite whimperatives were used equally by females and males. What stands out here is that whimperatives used by male superiors in the data were all drawn from the group of men under forty and never used by men over forty. Such an age distinction in the use of whimperatives did not occur in the case of female superiors and therefore, we can assume that whimperatives are one of the features of Korean women's language since men over forty did not use this linguistic device whereas women in the same age category did. If this is the case, the use of whimperatives by men under forty reflects the feminization of male speech.

4.1.1.6. Other Patterns with the Illocutionary Force of a Request

Table VIII: comparisons of other patterns with the illocutionary force of a request

Others	Male	Female
plain	1	2
intimate	8	8
polite	6	2
formal	12	7

Some of the verb endings observed in the data do not fit into any of the major sentence types and thus are categorized under "others". Yet, many of these verb endings are recognized as a form of declarative and for the sake of convenience will be analyzed in the six speech

61

styles. The data contain four different speech styles; plain, intimate, polite and formal. The number of plain (*hanta*) and intimate (*hay*) speech styles used between female and male superiors was close but male superiors utilized far more polite (*hay yo*) and formal (*hapnita*) speech styles than females (polite f 2 vs. m6, formal f 6, vs. m11, honorific formal f 1 vs. m1). Here are some examples:

(8) Cang Seyyeng: (to Ko Sungmi) *amwulayto kihoyk 1team eyse yunung han salam han myeng ul chacwul hay cwe ya keyss e*
'Anyway, I am asking you to do me a favor and pick one capable person from Planning team 1.'

(9) Cang Seyyeng: (to Kim Yulim) *nay cisi ka issul ttay kkaci nen coffee na kkulhi nun keya.*
'All you are to do is make coffee till you have my order.'

(10) Choy Kyengmin: (to Kim Yulim) ...*etil com kathi kass umyen hayseyo. kenchwuk hyephoy moim i issnuntey Yulim ssi ka Ceycwuto seminar eyse poye cwun caychilo nal com towa cwess umyen hanuntey*...
'If you don't mind, I am suggesting that you go somewhere with me. There will be a construction association meeting and I dare to ask you (Yulim) to help me with the wisdom that you showed me at the Ceycwu island seminar.'

(11) Choy Kyengmin: (to Cang Seyyeng)...*aphulo Cang silcang i kayin kyosup ul com hay cweya hal kes kath un teyyo*
'It seems that you (Cang Seyyeng) should do me a favor to give me private lessons from now on.'

(12) O Ilto: *cinan sinmwun eyse chelem twithongswu chinun cakphwum ul hana mantul e potenka*
'(I am not imposing this on you but) If you like you can drop another bombshell like you did in the last newspaper.'

Director Son: *alkeyssssupnita.*
'I will follow your words.'

(13) Finance Department Manager: *ip i mwukepko cektang han salam ul hana kwuhay*
nwasssupnita.
'I already got the perfect person who is not talkative.'

           O Ilto: *silswu nun epse ya hal keya*
'What I expect from you is avoid all mistakes.'

-Nun keya in (9) and *-eya hal keya* in (13) have the same basic root *ke* (thing) + *(i)ya* (to be) and mean 'what you should do is..(what you have to pay attention to is...)'. These verb endings show that the speaker has certain expectations about how the addressee should act and also strongly impose the speaker's expectations on the addressee. The use of this intimate style of verb endings reflects a certain intimacy level already formed between the superior and the subordinate.

The verb endings shown in (8) and (12) make the utterance sound more polite and indirect. The *-cweya keysse* in (8) contains the benefactive pattern *-a/e cwu-* 'does as a favor' while the *-a/e potenka* in (12) shows the speaker's indirect proposition without imposing his or her point of view on the addressee and offers open-ended choices.

Choy Kyengmin's request speech to his subordinates is generally very polite, raising the average degree of politeness employed by male superiors of the data. Both examples (10) and (11) were uttered by Choy Kyengmin to his female subordinates and contain linguistic structures which make the utterance more indirect and polite. The *-(u)myen hanuntey....* in (10) can be interpreted as a hedge, meaning 'I would like you to do something for me, but if you mind, that's OK, too'. This type of hedge is observed only in the speech of male superiors, but only two occasions were found, thereby making it difficult to generate a solid conclusion from this finding. Also, *-myen hay se yo* in the example (10) shows more of the flavor of a proposition than a directive, denoting a careful and indirect suggestion without imposing the speaker's will on the addressee. The example (11) has benefactive *-a/e cwu-* 'does as a favor', and *-kes kath-* 'it seems/ looks like (as if)' which demonstrates the speaker's hesitation in making his or her remark and also functions as an attenuator.

63

Choy Kyengmin's polite request to his subordinate is due mainly to the social distance between him and his subordinates. This speculation is supported by the presence of female superiors' use of request speech made through declaratives in the formal speech level, as used extensively by Kim Yulim in team meetings with her team members and by Mrs. Choy with an executive director, Mr. Cang. Both female superiors recently obtained positions of power, one as a team leader and the other as presidents, and are not well acquainted with their subordinates, thus tending to speak more formally to them using verb endings in the formal speech level.

4.1.1.7. Other Patterns with the Illocutionary Force of an Imperative

Some imperative verb endings which do not fit into the typical structure of the six speech levels are categorized separately in this section. One example is as follows:

(14) in the rehearsal for the event

Yi Mikyeng: (to Kim Yulim) (after Cang leaves the scene) *iltan hwicang ta ala se sataka tala nohko thoykun hatolok.* (in a sarcastic tone) *mwullon honca se hayya keyssci. wuli'n kulen ccok'ey mwunoyhan inikka.*
'First, buy the curtains and put them up and after everything is thoroughly done, go home. Of course, you have to do it by yourself because we don't know anything about it.'

The projective command *-tolok* in example (14) is quite a blunt form of imperative and demonstrates a speaker's assertion of authority, generating more of the character of a command rather than a request. In my data females used *-tolok* in this way more often than males in making request speech acts (f 8 vs. m1). This *-tolok* command does not consider a hearer's face, and in order to use this imperative the speaker needs to be in a close relationship with the addressee. Seven out of the eight utterances by female superiors were made by Cang Seyyeng and Yi Mikyeng. This extensive use of the *-tolok* command results from their supervisory positions, and also from their social intimacy with subordinates.

The verbal suffix -*ci* in (14) denotes Yi Mikyeng's assumption that Kim Yulim would work alone, and demonstrates her casual but insistent command meaning 'I suppose...'. My data contain one variational imperative ending derived from the verbal suffix -*ci*; -*e yaci*. This verbal suffix breaks down into -*e ya*- 'must do, has to do' and the suspective -*(ha)ci* and thus contains the stronger imposition on the addressee than the imperative with only -*ci*. Now examine the following:

(15) in the copy room

Ko Sungmi: (walking into the copy room) (to Kim Yulim) -----*palphyo* <u>*cwunpi hayyaci.*</u> *sikan epse, ese.*
'You'd better prepare for the presentation. We don't have much time. Hurry up.'

Kim Yulim: *ney, team-cang-nim.*
'Yes, team leader (with an honorific suffix).'

(16) in the directors' meeting

O Ilto: *ney, alkeysssupnita. kuliko kak saeppwu kitha anken i issusimyen malssum tul* <u>*hasiciyo.*</u> *e, cakum pwucang mal* <u>*hay pokey.*</u>
'Yes, I will. And if any department has other subject matter to discuss, please do so. OK, manager of finance department, speak.'

The *hayyaci* in example (15) is found only in females' request acts (total two occasions) whereas imperatives with -*ci* are more frequently observed in the male superiors' speech (f 2 vs. m 8). Furthermore, the polite speech style with the verbal suffix -*ci* (*haciyo*) is also used more by male superiors (f 1 vs. m 5). It is not clear that male superiors' tendency to use -*ci* imperative indicates a kind of 'men's language'. Nevertheless, we can deduce why -*e yaci* imperatives were used only by women. The verbal ending -*e yaci* is observed very often in Korean mothers' speech when they make requests to their children; in this regard female superiors' use of -*e yaci* imperatives can be related to their adoption of mother's way of speaking -- the 'Motherese

65

Strategy' reported in Smith's study (1992); women police officers adopted the way that mother speak to their children when performing their role in the workplace.

Examples (17) and (18) present an imperative with *-ko* and *-kwu*:

(17) in the car

Mr. Kang: (phone) *alasse. naomyen tasi poko hako.*
              'OK, if it comes out, report to me again.'

(18) in the office

Ko Sungmi: ....*kulay, silcang-nim naylye onun taylo clinic center lo kaca. Ceng tayli nun*
              'OK, as soon as the manager (with honorific suffix *-nim*) comes down, let's go to the clinic. Ceng deputy manager....'

Ceng: *ney*
              'Yes.'

Ko Sungmi: *pikyo pwunsekphyo kacye okwu.*
              'bring the document for comparative analysis'.

Ceng: *ney, alkeysssupnita.*
              'Yes, I will.'

Martin (1992) explains that gerund *-ko* 'do and ....' is often pronounced as *-kwu* and softens a plain suggestion or command. Comparable numbers in the use of imperatives with *-ko* were found between female and male superiors (f 7 vs. m 8) but the use of polite *-yo* (*-koyo*) was observed more in male superiors' speech than in females (f 1 vs. m 4). On the other hand, the raised version in *-kwu* was not observed in the male superiors' speech at all, thereby suggesting the possibility that the *-kwu* and *-kwu yo* form might reflect Korean women's language.

The following examples present yet another type of imperative in *-e ya tway* 'must do, has to do' and *-(u)myen tway* 'suffices to do, will do if are in S'.

(19) in the office

| Yi Mikyeng: | *Kim Yulim, Yu Kyengswuk, Ceng Uncwu. nehuy nun cikum na lul ttala se ponsa ey kanta.* 'Kim Yulim, Yu Kyengswuk, Ceng Uncwu, you guys go to the main branch of the company with me.' |

| Female Subordinate: | *ponsa ey yo?* 'You said the main branch of the company?' |

| Yi Mikyeng: | *campaign calyo hako mokum swulyng hayya tway. ca, haysan.* 'We have to collect campaign resources and money. OK, dismissed.' |

(20) in the room at hospital

| Yi Mikyeng: | *....Kim Yulim, ney ka taysin ka.* 'Kim Yulim, you go instead of me' |

| Kim Yulim: | *eti 'lyo?...* 'Go where?..' |

| Yi Mikyeng: | *....kunyang ka se ilehkey calyo poko kunyang ilkki man hamyen tway. ppalli setwulle. ese. calyo cwunpi nun ta twayssci?* 'Just go and all you have to do is look at the paper like this and read. Hurry up, quickly. The preparation for the paper is already done, right?.' |

In example (19), the imperative function of *-e ya tway* can be interpreted in two ways depending on the subjects of the sentence. If the three female subordinates become the subject of the sentence, the illocutionary force of the utterance becomes more of the command. But if Yi Mikyeng is included in the subjects of the sentence with the three subordinates, the illocutionary force of the utterance becomes propositional; yet it is still a forceful suggestion due to the *-e ya-* 'must do'. On the other hand, the *-(u)myen tway* in (20) has the meaning of 'all you have to do is...' and it puts more of a request-like imposition on the addressee. No difference in the use of *-(u)myen tway* was found between female and male superiors, but *-e ya tway* is observed only in the female superiors' speech (total three occasions).

Likewise, the data show that the verb ending *-(u)lan maliya* is only found in the speech of male superiors. Let us look at example (21).

(21) in the office

Mr. Co: *.....eccaysstun soliph phayk kihoykan ul ppayskyessumyen wuli'n ku kes pota te han kes ul ppayse <u>ola'n maliya</u>. ala tulessna?*
'Anyway, once our planning paper for the pine needle mask was stolen by them, I am ordering you to steal far more important papers than that. Do you understand?'

Manager Pak: *alkeysssupnita*
'Yes, I will follow your order.'

The *-(u)lan maliya* in (21) demonstrates Mr. Co's angry emotions due to his subordinate's incompetence in meeting his needs. This imperative is fairly blunt, does not consider the listener's face and generally reflects the speaker's annoyance.

4.1.1.8. Adverbial *com* as Attenuator/Mitigator

In the use of adverb *com* 'please', no major difference between female and male superiors was found (f 16 vs. m 18). Nevertheless, higher ratios of female superiors used it than male superiors; 7 out of 8 females vs. only 4 out of 9 males. Furthermore, the data show that the use of *com* is distributed equally amongst the seven female superiors, but in the case of male superiors, Choy Kyengmin himself used this adverb 13 times out of a total of 18 utterances made by all male superiors included in the data.

Choy's request speech to his subordinates often tends to be too polite and sometimes shows a hyper-respectful tendency. His extreme polite speech may be due to his exposure to western egalitarianism (he received a degree in North America), thus influencing his attitude to his subordinates. His fairly young age may be another determinant in his use of more polite request speech to his subordinates, who are generally close in age with Choy.

The effect of the sex of Choy's subordinates on his polite request speech should be considered too, although the present study can not make any solid suggestion regarding the effect of the sex of the subordinates, since this study did not control the variable. When Choy worked as an owner of a construction company, he used intimate imperatives while making

requests to his male subordinates (e.g. *hay* 'do it', *setwulle* 'hurry up') but when he was transferred to Sinseng company, he mostly used polite speech styles to his female subordinates. However, Choy's use of intimate speech styles to his male subordinates can be also explained in terms of social intimacy between Choy and his male subordinates.

Finally, Choy's polite request speech may reflect the drama writer's intention to present women and men as equally capable workers in the workplace. The drama *Yeykam* portrays powerful women who have become successful company career women. This drama also transfers a specific message to the viewers. Although reality suggests that women are still discriminated against in achieving high status in the workplace, women's efforts to be successful will gain results in the future if they are confident enough to present themselves well in society and to work hard. Because of these underlying messages, the writer may have intentionally written male superiors' speech to be at least as polite as females in the same status.

4.2. Comparisons of Request Speech Acts between Female and Male Superiors

In this section, two social variables -- status and age of the superiors -- will be controlled in order to obtain more accurate comparisons of female and male superiors' request speech because the subjects from each sex group are not exactly in the same age and the same status category.

4.2.1. Status as an Independent Variable

The analysis in which the status of the superiors is controlled will consider only subjects who are in the position of the company president. In this section, we will investigate and compare the request speech acts performed by three female (Mrs.Choy, O Cinswu, Choy Hyeyyeng) and four male presidents (Kim Tonghwun, Mr.Kang, O Sengcwu, Choy Kyengmin). Kim Inwu was excluded from this comparison because he had no practical power to control the company even though he held the title of president.

First of all, the data demonstrate a wider variety of speech styles and sentence types in male superiors' request speech than in females'. For example, in the case of imperatives, male presidents used five different speech styles; plain (*hayla*), intimate (*hay*), familiar (*hakey*), blunt (*hao*) and polite (*hay yo*). In contrast, female presidents employed only one imperative speech style; polite speech style (*hay yo*).

Table IX: comparisons of request speech acts; status as an independent variable

Imperatives	Male	Female
plain (hayla)	1	0
intimate (hay)	20	0
familiar (hakey)	6	0
honorific blunt (hasio)	3	0
polite (hay yo)	4	10
honorific polite (haseyyo)	2	6
Popositives		
plain (haca)	3	0
formal (hapsita)	4	0
Benefactives (Imperatives)		
familiar (hay cwukey)	3	0
polite (hay cweyo)	0	2
honorific polite (hay cwuseyyo)	2	4
Benefactives (Propositives)		
familiar (hay cwusey)	1	0
Desideratives		
familiar (-ki palaney)	1	0
Whimperatives		
polite	2	5
Adverbials		
com	1	6

Second, male presidents' speech contains many imperatives in the form of propositives (*haca, hapsita*) but this type of imperative was not observed in female presidents' speech. The use of propositive imperatives was shown to be related to the formal context in which the utterance occurs -- male superiors attend more formal meetings and occupy higher status than

lul iman machipsita 'Let's call the meeting a day'). However, this interpretation loses its persuasion here because male presidents' use of propositive imperatives still remains high in number even though only one president out of four, Kim Tonghwun, uses these imperatives in the formal meeting context and the rest of them use the propositive imperatives in informal context. Moreover, Mrs. Choy and O Cinswu participate in the company executives' meeting as the most powerful figures but never use propositive imperatives in that context. However, the two dramas used for the data did not contain any scenes showing the female presidents opening or closing a meeting, when propositive imperatives were most often used by male superiors. Thus, in order to substantiate this finding, there should be comparable scenes from the drama.

Third, familiar benefactives *-e cwukey* and *-e cwusey* were frequently used by male presidents along with familiar desideratives *-ki palaney* but not by female presidents who use the more polite benefactive *-e cwe yo*, or the honorific polite benefactive *-e cwusey yo* instead. The polite benefactive *-e cwe yo* is not found in the male president's speech.

Finally, in the use of the verb endings in the category of 'other' imperatives, female presidents utilized more polite and formal imperatives such as *haci yo* and *hako yo* speech styles than male presidents who mainly used plain and intimate imperatives like *ha tolok, halan maliya* and *hal pa aniya*. The reverse, i.e. male presidents' use of polite and formal imperatives or female presidents' use of plain and intimate imperatives was not found in the data. Furthermore, both whimperatives and adverbial *com* were more prominent in the speech of female presidents (whimperatives f 5 vs. m 2, *com* f 6 vs. m 1).

4.2.2. Age as an Independent Variable
4.2.2.1. Superiors under Age Forty

In this section, the request speech of six female superiors under age forty (Cang Seyyeng, Kim Yulim, Ms. Kwu, Ko Sungmi, Yi Mikyeng, Choy Hyeyyeng) and four male superiors in the same age range (Choy Kyengmin, Kim Thaywu, Kim Inwu, O Sengcwu) will be examined and compared. One aspect that differentiates the speech of these two sex groups is

71

that male superiors are more polite than female superiors. It was observed that female superiors under age forty make extensive use of plain and intimate speech style whereas male superiors under forty generally use polite and formal speech styles, and utilize the honorific suffix -(u)si-, adverbial *com*, and hedges more than women, making their request utterances more indirect and polite.

Table X: comparisons of request speech acts; superiors under age forty

Imperatives	Male	Female
plain (hayla)	1	1
intimate (hay)	14	150
honorific blunt (hasio)	1	0
polite (hay yo)	20	8
honorific polite (haseyyo)	28	1
formal (hasipsio)	0	1
Propositives		
plain (haca)	3	4
formal (hapsita)	12	2
Benefactives (Imperatives)		
intimate (hay cwe)	0	7
familiar (hay cwukey)	0	1
polite (hay cwe)	5	0
honorific polite (hay cwuseyyo)	22	7
formal (hay cwusipsio)	7	0
Desideratives (Imperatives)		
plain (-ki palanta)	0	4
initmate (-ki palay)	0	2
formal (-ki palapnita)	1	0
Whimperatives		
intimate	0	3
polite	6	1
formal	2	0
Adverbials		
com	14	11

However, when five out of six female superiors under age forty are in a position to lead and supervise their subordinates and even share an office with their subordinates, the concept of solidarity becomes a key to explaining female superiors' extensive use of plain and intimate

speech styles. Unlike the female superiors in the data, male superiors have their own offices and work independently from their subordinates, and thus have little chance to build intimacy with their subordinates. A fundamental factor here is the social distance between superior and the subordinate. In this case, the social distance factor overrides the age variable since age did not affect the speech of the superiors as much as the social distance the superior has with the subordinate. Therefore, considerations of the context in which each superior makes a request, for example, to whom and in what relationships become more important in understanding what a real factor is in shaping the speech of the interlocutors in the interaction.

4.2.2.2. Superiors over Age Forty

In this section, the request speech acts made by two female superiors over forty (Mrs.Choy, O Cinswu) were compared with those of five male superiors in the same age category (Kim Tonghwun, O Ilto, Kim Sengho, Mr. Co, Mr. Kang). It was observed that in the speech of the older generation superiors, female superiors make requests more politely than male superiors.

In terms of speech styles, female superiors over forty generally used polite or honorific polite speech styles whereas male superiors frequently utilized intimate and familiar speech styles. Intimate, blunt and familiar speech styles are not found in female speech in the data. Moreover, formal propositive imperative (*hapsita*) and familiar benefactive propositive (*hay cwusey*) are only observed in male superiors' speech but whimperatives were never found in their speech. Finally, the adverbial *com* was also used more frequently by female superiors.

What stands out here is that female superiors used formal speech style (*hapnita*) as often as male superiors. If we assume that formal speech style is used mostly by men and polite speech style is used mostly by women, as Bak (1983) and Min (1996) argue, then women in power studied in the present data seem to adopt a certain degree of men's speech style so as to maintain their authority and to effectively participate in a male-dominated domain.

73

Table XI: comparisons of request speech acts; superiors over age forty

Imperatives	Male	Female
intimate (hay)	29	0
familiar (hakey)	8	0
honofic blunt (hasio)	2	0
polite (hay yo)	8	8
honorific polite (haseyyo)	5	6
Propositives		
formal (hapsita)	9	0
Benefactives (Imperatives)		
intimate (hay cwe)	1	0
familiar (hay cwukey)	7	0
honorific blunt (hay cwusio)	1	0
polite (hay cweyo)	0	2
honorific polite (hay cwuseyyo)	0	2
Benefactives (Propositives)		
familiar (hay cwusey)	2	0
Desideratives (Imperatives)		
polite (-ki palayyo)	1	0
Desideratives (Declaratives)		
familiar (-ki palaney)	1	0
formal (-ki palapnita)	1	0
Whimperatives		
polite	0	4
Adverbials		
com	4	5

Nevertheless, the findings in this section should be complemented by further study because the present data do not contain equal samples of female and male superiors' speech in the older generation. In addition, the positions occupied by male subjects over age forty varied from director to president, but the female subjects over forty in the data were all presidents. This difference in the positions of female and male superiors makes the comparison of their speech subject to the status variable. In further studies, the number of samples of female and male superiors' speech and their status should be controlled.

74

4.3. Politeness of Request Speech of Female and Male Superiors

On the whole, my data show that male superiors make requests to their subordinates more politely than female superiors. In the data, females used a high degree of plain and intimate speech styles whereas males used more polite and formal speech styles. Moreover, male superiors used more attenuators or mitigators to soften the utterances and to make them sound more indirect and polite. Attenuators such as the adverb *com*, the honorific suffix *-(u)si-*, the benefactive pattern in *-a/e cwu-*, propositive imperatives and hedges were found to be used more by male superiors. Both female and male superiors used the same number of whimperatives, although male superiors used more polite whimperatives and female superiors used more intimate whimperatives.

In the use of other imperative verb endings, females used more blunt forms such as *hatolok* 'do it!' and *hayya tway* 'you must do it' while male superiors utilized more imperatives with the honorific suffix *-(u)si-*. The tendency of male superiors to be more polite in their request speech is found in other imperatives, as well, as is shown in *hamyen hayseyo* 'I am suggesting that...', *hanuntey..* 'I wish you could do...' and *hatenka* 'why don't you do..'. In contrast, such an imperative as *hanun keya* 'all you have to do is...', is considered quite a direct and blunt way of making a request, and is found only in female superiors' speech.

The tendency for female superiors' request speech to be less polite should be understood in connection with other social variables such as social distance between superiors and subordinates and the context in which the request speech act occurs. In the data, less polite speech used by female superiors is mostly attributed to a close relationship with their subordinates, considering the fact that five out of eight female superiors are in a position where they keep in constant contact with their subordinates, while none of the male superiors in the data are in a similar position. This claim is supported by the increased level of female superiors' politeness observed when they were in a position to maintain certain social distance with their subordinates. Taking status of the superiors as an independent variable, I found that due to the

social distance with the subordinates, request speech made by female superiors was far more polite than male superiors'.

4.4. Enactment of Authority by Female Superiors

Female superiors show a variety of patterns and strategies to ensure their authority as a powerful figure. Cang Seyyeng, Ko Sungmi and Yi Mikyeng build their authority by the use of intimate speech styles. Their use of intimate speech styles was partly due to their close relationship with their subordinates but also partly due to their purposeful intention to maintain their authority. The following monologue of Kim Yulim, heard when she happened to go into an empty director's office, shows how she imagines how nice it would be for her to be the owner of the office, and clearly shows her purposeful use of intimate speech styles to express her authority as a director:

(22) in an empty director's office

Kim Yulim: (monologue) *e, na Kim isa ya. mwe? cohasse. tangcang kyeyyak hayyo. e, Cang silcang. i pen campaign nemwu cohasseyo. pwunpal hatolok. nukkim to sillyek inikka. e, Hwang pise, onul ocen cochan ul chwiso hay ya keysse. onul nay ka nemwu phikon hay se maliya. Thank you. Yi Cwunsep ssi, na Kim isa ya. tangsin na lang kyelhon hay ya keysse, cikum tangcang. iken isa uy myenglyeng iya.*
'Um, this is Director Kim. What? That's good. Sign the contract right away. ...Um, Manager Cang (referring to Cang Seyyeng), the campaign this time went so well. Try harder. Feelings can be a part of your capability. Secretary Hwang, I think you'd better cancel the breakfast meeting this morning. I am too tired today. Thank you. Yi Cwunsep, this is director Kim. You should marry me, right now. This is a director's order.'

Patterns such as *hatolok, hay ya 'keysse* and *myenglyeng iya* 'it's an order' in the example above are quite direct ways of making requests and show Kim's attempt to enact her authority through these request forms. In fact, female subjects in the data have a general tendency to make more direct requests than males. Less frequent use of attenuators by female superiors

proves their direct manner of making requests, which reflects their intentions to assure their authority.

Compare Kim's monologue with dialogue (23) between Kim Yulim as a team leader and her team members in the meeting.

(23) in the team meeting room

Kim Yulim: *wusen, Yi Yeywan-ssi, sol-iphphayk ey tayhan sicang cosa nayil ocen kkaci pwuthak hapnita.*
'First, Miss Yi, I am asking you to do me a favor by researching the market for pine needle masks until tomorrow morning.'

Yi Yeywan: *ani,* (in a sarcastic tone) *sicang cosa ka mwusun hwacangphwum myech kay phala nohtusi kulehkey swiwun ke'n cwul ana pwuciyo?*
'You seem to misunderstand that researching the market is just as easy as selling a couple of cosmetic products.'

Kim Yulim: *enu il ey elma manhan sikan ul halay hanunya nun team-cang i phantan hal mwuncey ipnita.*
'How much time is to be assigned to certain projects should be decided by a team leader.'

Pak Soyeng: (in a sarcastic tone) *he, mile pwuchi nun ke hana nun cal paywessney.*
'huh, she has learned well how to push other people.'

Kim Yulim: *kuliko, Pak Hyeyswuk ssi'n, kongcang yenkwuso ey uyloy hay nohun sol-iphphayk wenlyo ancen to check kyeysok com poko com hay cwuseyyo.*
'And, Miss Pak, please could you do me the favor of keeping me updated on the safety level of the pine needle mask that I have asked to the factory research center to check.'

Dialogue (23) between Kim and her female team members occurred during the first team meeting held since Kim was chosen as a team leader. In this meeting, Kim makes a request to the team members in an extremely polite manner when assigning jobs to them. She uses language forms such as *pwuthak hapnita* 'I am asking you to do me a favor..', polite honorific benefactive *hay cwusey yo* and overuses the adverb *com*. She also uses honorific suffix *-ssi* after each team member's full name whenever addressing them.

Kim's use of polite language can be attributed to two factors; her own insecurity about her authority and her own awareness of team members' unpleasant responses to her request. Team members are not happy about the fact that Kim was selected as their team leader because they think it is not fair -- Kim only just moved to the main office from the factory where she worked as a cosmetic sales woman before being promoted to team leader. Thus, team members' responses to Kim's request were not supportive and in this situation, Kim's insecurity about her authority has deepened, possibly causing her to use more polite request speech to her team members.

However, after Kim's project to produce pine needle masks turns out to be successful, team members' attitudes toward Kim also becomes more supportive. Nevertheless, even in this situation, Kim still makes the same polite request speech to the team members as in (24).

(24) in the team meeting

Kim Yulim: *kuliko....calyo to mantuleya toynikka ce Yi Hyeywen ssi ka ceyphwum selmyeng mwunan com cakseng hay cwuseyyo.*
'And, ... we have to make reference material too, so Miss Yi, could you please do me a favor and make a guide book for the products?'

Kim Cihyey: *nameci nun wuli hanthey mathkisiko naymwu check ey sinkyeng ssu seyyo.*
'Please leave the rest of the work to us and you can pay more attention to the inside work.'

Kim's continuing use of polite speech to her team members may be as a result of her closeness in age to them (Kim is younger than or the same age as other team members). Also, the factors involved in the first encounter, i.e. what type of speech style the speaker used to the addressee and in what relationship the speaker met the addressee in the first encounter (the team members were in a superior position to Kim when Kim started to work for the main office), also help to explain Kim's polite speech to her subordinates. In Korean, once people reach a certain age, it is hard to use intimate speech styles with each other even though they may become good friends. This shows that the circumstances under which a first encounter occurs are important to

understanding the speech styles that Korean people continue to use with each other thereafter.

Another way of enacting authority observed among female superiors was adopting the demanding military command style. Cang Seyyeng, Ko Sungmi and Yi Mikyeng use a considerable number of terms found in military parlance such as *haysan* 'dismissed' and *isang* 'adjourn'. Observe Yi's speech to her team members:

(25) in the office

Yi Mikyeng: ca, *moye......i pen event nun tanswun han ceyphwum palphyohoy ka anila ol hwupanki wa naynyen sangpanki uy maychwul kwa cikkyel toynun cwungyo han il ila' nun kes ul icci malala.....kak sosok pyello pikyo toyl swu issuni tewuk pwunpal hay cwuki palanta. ca, chwultong cwunpi.*
'Gather here! Do not forget that this event is not a simple products presentation but an important matter which is directly related to the sales of the last half of this year and first half of next year.... I want you to try hard because it is possible that each team can be compared. Be ready to move out!'

The plain imperatives like *icci malala* 'don't forget' and phrases such as *sosok* 'the team one belongs to' and *chwultong cwunpi* 'be ready to move out' can be seen in the commanders' speech when they make an order to their subordinates. The frequent use of commanders' speech by Yi and Cang functions as one way of maintaining their authority. In the present data, none of the male superiors used commanders' speech style to enact their authority.

The 'Motherese Strategy' which Smith (1992) reported from her research on the discourse of women in non-traditional domains was also observed in the speech of female superiors in the present study. Imperatives such as *-e yaci* 'must do' in the data are very often found when a mother makes a request to her child. Example (15) in this chapter is a good example of the adoption of mother's speech used by Ko Sungmi. In fact, this caregiver speech is often observed in the speech of female superiors when they interact with female subordinates. The adoption of caregiver's discourse strategy enables the speaker to build solidarity with the addressee by forming in-group relations with the addressee (see note 25).

79

Finally, some female superiors in the data extensively adopted the formal speech style (*hapnita*) instead of polite (*hay yo*). Mrs. Choy's frequent formal request speech is a good example as in the following:

(26) in the office

| Mrs. Choy: | *mwusun il i isse to kensel ccok un sallye ya hapnita.*
'We must save our construction department whatever happens.' |

| Executive Director Cang: | *haciman yocum kensel kyengki to cenpan-cek ulo pwucin hantey, ku cey sayngkak ipnita manun kensel ul phoki hanun ccok i....*
'But these days, the construction market is generally not good, well... this is my opinion but I dare suggest that you give up the construction....' |

| Mrs. Choy: | *kensel un Thayil silep uy mothay ka toynun hoysa eyyo. cey halapeci kkeyse nun notong hyencang mak notongca lo sicak hayse onul nal tay silep ul ilukhyesse yo. kensel ul celtay phoki mos hapnita.*
'Construction is the major component of Thayil corporation. My grandfather started from a lowly construction worker on the construction site, and today has built a large corporation. As for construction, there is no chance that I will give it up.' |

In dialogue (26), Mrs. Choy not only used formal speech style (*hapnita*) but also spoke to her subordinate in assertive and authoritative tones. In fact, female superiors' authoritative tones were very commonly observed as a way of presenting themselves as an authority figure.

4.5. Results

The present study found that male superiors utilized more polite request directives than female superiors; female superiors employed more plain (*hayla*) and intimate (*hay*) directives than male superiors and male superiors used more polite (*hay yo*) and formal (*hasipsio*) directives than female superiors. Also, male superiors utilized honorifics more than female superiors. However, before we conclude that the request speech style of men in power is more

80

polite than that of women in a similar position, one social variable should be considered. In the present study, less polite language use by female superiors generally results from more intimate relationships with subordinates. Earlier, the data showed that more female superiors were in positions which required them to supervise their subordinates through constant contact.

Distinct differences in the request speech acts between female and male superiors were observed in the familiar (*hakey*) and blunt (*hasio*) speech levels. These two speech levels were generally found in the request speech of male superiors and rarely observed in female superiors' speech, demonstrating that these two speech levels may be good examples of Korean men's language. In a similar fashion, *-kwu*, a raised variant of *-ko* which mitigates plain suggestions or commands, was found only in female request speech, suggesting that this linguistic form may be regarded as Korean women's speech. Language forms such as the familiar imperative (*hakey*), the familiar benefactive (*hay cwukey*) and the familiar propositive benefactive (*hay cwu sey*) were detected only in the speech of older men in power, partially supporting the claim made by Yi (1995) that the traditional six speech styles in Korean language show a tendency to be simplified into four levels excluding blunt and familiar speech styles.

With regard to whimperatives and the adverb *com*, both of which index politeness and indirectness in one's speech, a larger number of women subjects used these linguistic devices than men. The male superiors who used whimperatives were all age younger than forty, suggesting that powerful men at a relatively younger age show more politeness to their subordinates. Nevertheless, because the present study did not control superiors' age and status at the same time, it is difficult to determine whether age or status functions as the primary index of the politeness degree that the speaker employs.

The findings obtained after controlling status of subjects in the president position demonstrate that female superiors use more polite directives than male superiors. First of all, male superiors' speech showed a wider variety of directives than females; male superiors' directives covered all six speech levels from plain to formal whereas female superiors' directives were confined to polite and formal speech styles. With regard to whimperatives and

adverb *com*, it was observed that female superiors utilize these polite linguistic devices more frequently than male superiors. Furthermore, propositive imperatives such as *haca* and *hapsita* or familiar benefactives (*cwukey, cwusey*) were often found in the speech of male superiors but not in women's speech. However, these findings, once again, should be reconsidered in conjunction with an examination of the social distance factor. We can not simply conclude that women in the president position use more polite directives than men in the same position.

Analysis taking the superiors' age as an independent variable was conducted with two groups of subjects; subjects under age forty and subjects over age forty. The analysis of the request speech of the younger superiors showed that female superiors have a tendency to use less polite forms of directives than males. Women superiors in the younger age category extensively used intimate (*hay*) and even plain imperatives (*hayla*), and utilized less polite (*hay yo*) and formal (*hasipsio*) imperatives. In contrast, male superiors made more frequent use of polite and formal directives and less use of plain and intimate directives. Moreover, the adverb *com* was found more in the speech of male superiors and no hedges were detected in any of the female superiors' speech. This less polite use of request language by female superiors under age forty can be attributed to the social distance factor, that is, to the more intimate relationships female superiors have with their subordinates.

On the other hand, data analysis of the request speech of superiors age forty or older indicates that the language use of female superiors was more polite than male superiors. Female superiors' directives were limited to polite (*hay yo*) and formal (*hasipsio*) speech style whereas male superiors' directives varied from intimate (*hay*) to formal (*hasipsio*) speech styles. No male superiors in this age group employed whimperatives while several polite (e.g. *halkkayo?*) whimperatives were observed in the speech of female superiors. Also, familiar and blunt speech styles were found only in the speech of male superiors. However, once again, the findings in this section can be more clearly answered by considering other social variables -- mainly social distance between superiors and subordinates.

Finally, the present study investigated a variety of strategies employed by women in powerful positions in order to project their authority as a powerful figure. First, some of the female subjects in the data employed either intimate (*hay*) or formal (*hasipsio*) imperatives to the subordinates. In Korean, intimate speech style is used between people in intimate relationships, from the old to the young, or from superiors to subordinates. In this regard, it was often observed that female superiors made requests to their female subordinates in the way that caregivers such as mothers or older sisters speak to children. It was already shown that such a caregiver's speech enables the speaker to build solidarity with the addressee.

Furthermore, some female superiors used the formal speech styles, often considered to be a feature of Korean men's language (see Bak 1983: Min 1996). This discourse strategy likely resulted from the female superiors' purposeful adoption of male speech as a way of projecting their authority. Such a defeminized discourse strategy was also observed in the female superiors' adoption of military command speech styles. In their imitations of army officers' ordering styles their utterances were observed to be blunt, direct and authoritative. Sometimes assertive and strong tones were employed along with the military command styles, thereby making their utterances more assertive and direct even when their speech contained many polite linguistic items.

In the next chapter, the findings from the data will be discussed in connection with previous studies on the same topic as well as with the research questions and hypotheses raised in the first chapter. I will also investigate what kind of results the present study generated for the language and gender field and how the present study contributed to this area. Finally, I will examine the limitations of the study and reach the conclusion, synthesizing all the points raised.

V. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Discussion

There are two important findings in this preliminary study. First, this study presents empirical support against the claim that women use more polite directives than men. Second, Korean women in non-traditional domains enact their authority in a variety of discourse strategies that allow them to perform their roles in the workplace even while maintaining power.

5.1.1. Politeness in Request Speech Acts

Results show that in request speech acts, male superiors use more polite directives than females, contradicting earlier claims that women's speech is more polite than men's (Lakoff 1973; Brown 1980; Ide et.al. 1986; Smith 1992). This result can be explained by considering a few social variables. First of all, the most fundamental factor that influenced less polite language use by female superiors was the social distance between the superior and the subordinate involved in the specific request speech act.

Earlier, it was demonstrated that female superiors in the data maintain more intimate relationships with their subordinates -- five out of a total of eight female subjects in the data had teams or department members under their frequent supervision. Some of the male subjects in the data -- O Ilto, O Sengcwu and Mr. Kang -- also maintain close relationships, and have casual interactions with their subordinates. However, as a whole, male superiors tend to participate in more varied types of interactions with their subordinates. The request speech acts during company meetings, for example, demonstrate that superiors like Kim Tonghwun and O Ilto used a certain degree of formality and politeness although their requests were made to their subordinates. This formality and politeness is likely due to the presence of third parties in the meeting as well as to the formal nature of the interaction itself.

On the other hand, male superiors such as Choy Kyengmin, Kim Thaywu and Kim Inwu made extensive use of polite (*hay yo*), formal (*hasipsio*) speech styles, and honorifics in their interactions with their subordinates. Their polite language use can be attributed to the social distance that they had with their subordinates because all of them were newly hired by the company and had not had enough time to become acquainted with their subordinates. In the case of Kim Thaywu, his relative youth also contributed to his polite language because the subordinate with whom he had most interaction was much older than Kim Thaywu.

Compared to the other male subjects in the data, the request speech acts made by O Ilto and O Sengcwu show fewer polite aspects. Their frequent use of intimate (*hay*) speech style results from their relatively intimate relationships with their subordinates, who are regular members under their close supervision; O Ilto had three specific directors and one finance department manager who were on his side when O plotted to take over as the company president. O Sengcwu also had several direct subordinates who always fraternize and were involved in fights with other gang members. These examples support the claim that social distance between superiors and subordinates -- and not age or gender -- is the key factor influencing a low degree of politeness in superiors' request speech.

Nevertheless, the social distance factor is often intertwined with other variables such as status and age, sometimes leading to situations where status and age override the social distance variable in the request speech act. For example, when Cang Seyyeng met Kim Yulim for the first time at the rehearsal of their company event show, Cang used polite speech style to Kim, which she later downgraded to intimate level (*hay*) after Cang found out that Kim is in a lower position within the company. Cang's shift of speech style occurred immediately following several instances of polite speech style within their first encounter. In this case, it is not social distance between the interlocutors that explains Cang's shift in the speech styles, but Cang's perception of either status or age difference with Kim. The present data contain a few instances where some of the female superiors use intimate speech styles even to subordinates whom they have just met for the first time. This is presumably due to the female superiors' intention to

strengthen their power as an authority figure in the company. Here, the key variable is power rather than social distance, since superiors would continue to use the polite speech style during the interaction if the social distance outweighed the power variable.

By contrast, such a dramatic reduction in the utilization of speech levels was rarely found in the male superiors' request speech. Male superiors generally used polite speech style in the first encounter with the subordinate and only after they had built up intimacy with the hearer did they use the intimate speech style while still blending it with the polite speech style. There are two exceptions to this; Kim Tonghwun's use of familiar speech style to Kim Yulim in the first encounter and O Ilto's downward shift from polite to intimate speech style when he met the man he hired for his special plan. Nevertheless, the cause of the male superiors' intimate speech styles seems to be different from that of the female superiors. Kim Tonghwun's use of familiar speech style to Kim Yulim results from two factors; the setting of the interaction and the differences in age and status. The interaction occurred outside of the work setting and the fact that Kim Yulim is around Kim's daughter's age might have resulted in his use of casual speech. On the other hand, O Ilto's shift in speech styles was likely caused by the fact that the hearer is not a regular employee in the company but just a temporary male employee with money. Through the use of intimate speech styles, O attempted to remind the man of his authority and power for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of successfully conducting his plan.

Status and age variables also play certain roles in determining the language choices of superiors of different sex groups in each interaction. My data analysis demonstrates that when superiors' status was controlled, women in power utilize more polite directives than do men in the same positions. Female presidents' polite use of directives may result from various factors involved in the interaction, including social distance with the subordinates and the relative status of the subordinates. The fact that all three female presidents in the data only recently took up their positions appears to be related to their more polite language use to the subordinates. Likewise, the social distance factor also explains the less polite language use of male presidents, since all four male presidents in the data have long established intimate relationships with their

subordinates. Also, the findings show that the higher the status of subordinates, the more polite the directives utilized by superiors. Therefore, when the presidents from both sex groups make requests to their secretary their language shows less politeness than when they make requests to the executive director of the company. In the case of Choy Hyeyyeng, her use of polite directives to executive director Cang can also be attributed to her relative youth.

In the present study, the age of the superior is not shown to function as the major determinant of the politeness level which superiors utilize to the subordinates. Actually, the data demonstrated that female superiors under the age of forty use less polite directives than superiors of the same sex who are over forty. However, as shown earlier, relatively younger female superiors' less polite use of directives can be explained by another variable -- social distance -- due to their more intimate relationships with the subordinates.

The opposite can be seen in the case of male superiors in that male superiors under forty used more polite directives than male superiors over forty. Once again, this phenomenon should be examined through consideration of the social distance factor. More polite language use by younger male superiors can be explained by the fact that the majority of subjects in this age group -- three out of four -- were recently hired by the company, whereas all of the five male superiors over forty had worked for the same company for a long period of time, thereby maintaining relatively intimate relationships with the subordinates.

Finally, the most important findings of this preliminary study refute the dichotomous view which takes the sex of the speaker as the most fundamental factor explaining language differences between women and men, especially in terms of politeness. The present study demonstrates that different degrees of politeness in request speech acts are not caused by the gender of the superior but rather by other diverse social variables involved in the interaction. The study of Ide et.al. on Japanese women and politeness (1986) shows similar perspectives. They state "sex differences in language should not be dealt with only as a direct consequence of sex of the speaker *per se*, but rather as a phenomenon determined by complex factors among which are speaker-addressee social distance or speaker-addressee interaction and its

frequencies" (p.35). From this perspective, the dividing line between language used by men and women becomes blurred. The present study, which investigated the interaction in the contextualized context, proves that diversely intersecting social factors in each interaction -- social distance, and differences in age and status between the interlocutors -- function as key determinants for so called gendered language and gendered use of language between the two sex groups. More specifically, this explains why women do, or do not make requests in a more polite manner.

5.1.2. Discourse Strategies Employed by Women in the Workplace

Korean women who acquire positions of authority in non-traditional domains appear to experience linguistic conflict, often producing forms of language different from those considered to be 'typical' Korean women's language (Cang 1969; Bak 1983; Min 1996). Smith's citation of Reynolds (1992) states that women in non-traditional domains are attempting, subconsciously, to resolve the conflict by defeminizing their speech within limits. However, Smith's study (1992) discredits Reynolds' claim by demonstrating that women in non-traditional domains empower their own speech by creating new and powerful discourse strategies. Smith suggests two ways of empowering the speech of women in non-traditional domains; by adopting 'Motherese Strategies' which was, in her corpus, used primarily by women when speaking to subordinates who are much younger, and by creating their own new strategies which she called 'Passive Power Strategies' which "..involves directives given in formal situations or in cases where there is little or no age difference between the issuer and recipient of the directive. In these cases, either no verb, and thus no overt directive morphology, is present...or a verbal form is present, but is followed by one or another of the auxiliary verbs/or receiving (favors), in its positive assertive form" (p.78).

The results of the present study essentially support both Reynolds' and Smith's findings. First of all, female superiors in the present study defeminize their speech by the use of formal directives. Earlier it was shown that formal speech style has been generally used by men and is

the speech style associated with formality in the public domains. From this perspective, female superiors' use of formal speech styles reflects their purposeful attempt to set their authority level at the same degree as men in a similar position.

On the other hand, some of the female superiors in the data adopted caregivers' speech such as that of a mother or an older sister when they made requests to their female subordinates. This discourse strategy is similar to Smith's 'Motherese Strategy', although there is a difference in that the caregiver's speech was found far more frequently when the subordinate is female than male. This seems to result from the specific quality of Korean language, the fact that the women outside the family are addressed with the terms for family members or relatives more often than outside men. This discourse strategy is an efficient way to build solidarity with the subordinates by forming in-group 'family-like' relationships with them.

Most of the women in power in the present study intentionally modified their own speech into assertive and authoritative tones. Some of the female superiors extensively used intimate (*hay*) directives as a way of projecting their authority. In some cases, these authoritative tones accompanied military command speech styles, which are observed as blunt and direct. Presumably, female superiors' imitation of these speech styles reflects the relative insecurity of women in powerful positions and their conscious or subconscious attempts to strengthen their authority by defeminizing their speech.

Female superiors' insecurity about their power in the public domains is demonstrated in the present study and can be presented more clearly by considering differences in status between female superiors and their subordinates. The data prove that the higher the status of female superiors, the more polite their language tends to be, although this situation can be also explained by social distance between the interlocutors as shown earlier in the study. What is clear is that women tend to become more secure about their language use when they gain positions of higher authority, since they are unlikely to be challenged at that level, whereas women in less powerful positions are more conscious of the language they use.

Many previous studies on language and gender in the workplace have reported that women in public domains speak in ways that minimize status differences and downplay their own authority (Case 1988; West 1990; Ainsworth-Vaughn 1992; Tannen 1994). Ainsworth-Vaughn's study (1992) demonstrates that women doctors downplay status differences by using reciprocal topic shifts, whereas men doctors shift topics unilaterally, without waiting for patient agreement. West (1990) also found that men doctors give aggravated directives that explicitly establish status differences, whereas women doctors mitigate their commands, using directive forms that minimize status distinctions between themselves and their patients.

However, the present study suggests something rather different; in many cases, female superiors enforce status differences through more direct and exacerbated directives to the subordinates, whereas male superiors made more indirect and polite requests to subordinates, thus mitigating status differences. However, some reverse cases were also found in the study; when the status of the superiors was controlled, women presidents showed more politeness while making requests to the subordinates, diminishing status differences with them whereas the men presidents became less polite by the use of a low degree politeness such as plain and intimate speech styles, thereby strengthening status differences with the subordinates.

Nevertheless, this finding should be considered preliminary because what it means to use intimate or polite speech style should be differently understood in each request speech act with a consideration of the social variables intersecting the interaction. Every interaction involves different social factors in terms of a level of social distance, status or age gaps between the interlocutors. Therefore, certain speech style has different meaning depending on the interlocutors and the relationship that they have.

5.2. Considerations of Research Questions

The results of this study are too varied to provide a conclusive answer to the first research question concerning how Korean women in power utilize politeness when making a request to their subordinates with comparison to the men in the similar position. Instead, the

findings of this study confute the claim that one sex group in powerful positions is more polite and indirect than the other regardless of circumstances. As shown earlier, in order to answer this question we should look at the context in which the interaction occurs and what social variables are present. Therefore, the findings of this study discredit the first two hypotheses - that women in power are more polite and indirect than men in power when making requests to the subordinates.

With regard to the second research question, this study found several different discourse strategies utilized by female superiors; use of intimate and formal speech styles, Motherese strategy and militaristic speech style. Therefore, this study supports the first research hypothesis in that female superiors defeminize their speech in exercising their authority. However, this study contradicts the second research hypothesis by demonstrating that female superiors use discourse strategies that create an asymmetrical alignment with the subordinates whereas male counterparts use discourse strategies that maintain relatively symmetrical alignment with them. Nevertheless the reverse case, that women presidents used more polite directives to the subordinates than men presidents, was also found when the only the superiors who are in the position of president were selected and investigated. Yet whether or not the use of polite speech style can be associated with the status minimization between superior and the subordinate requires further investigation.

5.3. Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations of the study will be discussed in this section. The first problem is that only a small number of appropriate television dramas were available as data sets for the study. The limited data thus make it difficult to reach a solid conclusion in the problem area or to apply findings to other studies. Moreover, the degree to which one may extrapolate from these special and fictional cases to the full range of directive possibilities for women in powerful positions is also limited. Ideally, these findings should be complemented by further

examinations of actual interactions between superiors and subordinates in the physical workplace.

5.4. Conclusion

This study has shown that Korean women and men in powerful positions utilize different levels of politeness in each request speech act depending on the context of the interaction; with whom they speak, intimacy level, and relative status and age. This confutes the stereotypical idea that women use more polite directives than men because they have been socialized as women. I have shown that sex of the speaker is not the one fundamental factor influencing the language choice made by the speaker. Instead, the diverse social variables involved in the interaction are the key determinants in the degree of politeness used by the speaker in each interaction.

The study demonstrated three major social variables affecting the interactions between superiors and subordinates in request speech acts; social distance, differences in age, and differences in status between the two interlocutors. The social distance factor was the most influential in determining the politeness degree that each superior employed in the interaction with the subordinates. The more intimate superiors were with the subordinates, the less polite were the directives they used. Two other variables -- differences in status and differences in age -- also frequently influenced the degree of politeness utilized by the superior. Sometimes, these variables overrode the social distance factor, thereby causing the superior to use an intimate speech style even in the first encounter with the subordinates.

This study also showed that Korean women in non-traditional domains enact their authority by modifying and defeminizing their own speech by adopting male speech. The discourse strategies used by women in non-traditional domains included intimate and formal speech style, Motherese strategy and militaristic speech style. Moreover, the data showed that women in power generally embody status differences with the subordinates by the use of less polite directives such as plain (*hayla*) and intimate (*hay*), whereas men in power tended to use

more polite directives, thereby mitigating status differences with the subordinates. However, women in president positions and in the senior age group tended to minimize status differences with their subordinates by the use of more polite directives, whereas men in the similar positions tended to strengthen an asymmetrical alignment with the subordinates by the use of less polite directives. Nevertheless, whether or not polite speech style can be associated with the status minimization with the subordinates should be reexamined due to the complex nature of the speech styles in Korean language.

Although the present study should be considered preliminary due to its small scale, this study contributes to the interdisciplinary fields concerning with Korean language and gender by addressing an undeveloped facet of the area, and by laying the groundwork for further, and more comprehensive research. As the roles and statuses of women in modern Korea continue to change, there is also a continuing need for much more work to be done on the linguistic changes that accompany these social changes. The gendered cultural norms of appropriate linguistic style that cause women to use nonassertive and polite language in certain contexts should not prevent us from creating various solutions to the problem of linguistic conflicts between these norms and the language forms that the women in power employ in real interactions.

NOTES

1. Besides these two models, Cameron (1995) introduces a third model for the interpretation of gender-linked language; *the deficit model* which she explains as one "...in which women are seen as disadvantaged speakers because of their early sex-role socialization" (p.33), and argues that Robin Lakoff is exemplary in utilizing this model in her study. Nonetheless, there is considerable overlap between the *dominance model* and the *deficit model* as well as between the *difference model* and the *deficit model*, and therefore, this paper omits detailed discussion of the *deficit model*.

2. "Speech act" is defined as follows: "speech acts constitute attempts by language users to perform specific actions, in particular interpersonal functions such as compliments, apologies, requests or complaints" (Ellis 1994:159).

3. The difference model is also referred to as *the dual cultural model* by Freeman and McElhinny (1996) and *the cultural difference model* by Cameron (1995).

4. The concepts of 'positive politeness' and 'negative politeness' were originally developed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Ellis (1994) explains that 'positive politeness' concerns an attempt to establish solidarity with the addressee by emphasizing commonality whereas 'negative politeness' involves performing the act in such a way that deference is shown to the hearer. Therefore, attending to another's needs and using in-group identity markers such as familiar forms of address are a type of positive politeness, whereas minimizing imposition and emphasizing respect and formality are one means of negative politeness. Any act that threatens a person's positive and negative face is referred to as an intrinsic face threatening act (FTA). These acts include interruption, complaints, request, criticisms or impositions (Markle 1994).

5. The method used in this study is called a 'discourse completion questionnaire' (Ellis 1994).

6. This paper will follow the Yale Romanization system in writing Korean words in English. The Yale Romanization is usually used in transcribing Korean language examples where phonetic details are not relevant (see Sohn 1994 for further detail).

7. Korean is usually analyzed as having six speech styles, denoted by certain sentence-final endings; plain *hanta*, intimate *hay*, familiar *haney*, blunt *hao*, polite *hay yo*, formal (deferential) *hapnita*. The plain style is a language form which adults use to children. It is also used typically by any speaker to any child, to one's own younger sibling or grandchild regardless of age, or to one's daughter-in-law, or between intimate adult friends whose friendship started in childhood. The intimate level is used by a child of preschool age to his or her family members, including parents, or between close friends whose friendship began in childhood. The familiar level is slightly more formal than the

intimate level, typically used by a male adult to an adolescent such as a high school or college student or to one's son-in-law, or between two close adult friends whose friendship began in adolescence. The remaining three levels are used only to adult hearers. The blunt level, which is gradually disappearing from daily usage due probably to its blunt connotation, is sometimes used by bosses to their subordinates. The polite style is the most commonly used by contemporary South Koreans. This speech level is the informal counterpart of the formal (deferential) level. While the formal (deferential) level is usually used by males, the polite level is used widely by both males and females in daily conversation. Both the polite and deferential levels are used to a socially equal or superior person, but in general, the polite level is favored between close friends (Sohn 1994:9-10).

8. There are several second personal pronouns in Korean; *ne* 'you (plain)', *caney* 'you (familiar)', *tangsin* 'you (blunt)', *tayk* 'you (to an adult stranger)', *ne huy (tul)* 'you guys (plain)', etc. (Sohn 1994:221). Normally, these second person pronouns are understood from the context without being directly mentioned by the speaker in the sentence. The pronoun *ne* is generally used between intimate equals or from superiors to subordinates. Addressing someone with his or her first name requires some degree of intimacy between the speaker and the hearer. Other than this, when adults address children, they can use the children's first names. Addressing an adult whom the speaker just met with his or her first name is considered very rude in Korean.

9. Koo's finding (1993) shows that the *-(u)sey yo* ending, typical of standard varieties of contemporary Korean, hardly exists in Koreans' speech in Korean communities in China. This demonstrates how the same language has developed and changed differently in separate regions over time.

10. Im (1993) also provided a similar interpretation of men's more frequent use of formal speech style. He explained that men use a formal speech style more often than women because a formal speech style is used more commonly in public domains of the society and men are more sensitive to the hierarchical structure of the society which is generally related to the public domains. Im also pointed out that the Korean language differs from most other languages in that women use less deferential speech style than men.

11. Hwang (1990) introduced 'whimperatives' as a way of utilizing indirect speech style as an indicator of politeness. The whimperatives are defined as "requests and offers in the guise of questions" (p.49).

12. Appropriate deference levels are marked by choosing from among numerous sets of lexical terms. Some lexical sets consist of three or more variants but most of them have only two variants; deferential/honorific, and plain. A few examples are as follows:

	Honorific	Plain	
Nouns	*cinci*	*pap*	'meal'
	yensey	*nai*	'age'

95

Verbs	capswusita	mekta	'to eat'
	kyeysita	issta	'to be present'

13. Concepts like 'absolute' and 'relative' women's language were introduced earlier in Im's article (1993). He argued that previous research on Korean language and gender tended to perceive characteristics of absolute women's language as an entire domain of Korean women's language, thereby limiting the area to a higher degree.

14. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act was established in 1987 to guarantee equality between men and women in employment and was revised in 1989 to include provisions for equal pay for equal work regardless of the worker's sex. This Act makes discrimination against women in recruitment, employment, placement, promotion, and retirement punishable, and also provides for child care leave in the spirit of protection of motherhood (Korean Women's Development Institute 1994:25).

15. Each superior's position in the *Yengwung Sinhwa* can be charted as follows:
(1) Thayil construction company
president: Mr. Choy
                              Mrs. Choy (after Mr. Choy's hospitalization, Choy's wife replaces him as president)
                              Choy Hyeyyeng (after Mrs. Choy's imprisonment, her daughter replaces her as president)
executive director: Mr. Cang
manager: Choy Hyeyyeng
(2) Olyun construction company
senior president: O Sengcwu
junior president: Kim Inwu
(3) Hotel (including a night club)
former president: Mr. Kang
president: O Cinswu (O buys this hotel from Mr. Kang)
manager: Kim Thaywu

16. Each superior's position in *Yeykam* can be charted as follows:
(1) Sinseng cosmetic company
i. main office
president: Kim Tonghwun
executive director: O Ilto
director in the public information department: Kim Sengho (earlier he was a marketing director and later
                                             gets transferred to the public information department as a
                                             director)

96

marketing director:	Choy Kyengmin (brought to Sinseng by the president earlier he worked as owner of a construction company)
manager:	Cang Seyyeng
senior team leader	Ko Sungmi
junior team leader	Ms. Kwu
team member	Kim Yulim (later becomes a team leader)
ii. factory	
team leader:	Yi Mikyeng
team member	Kim Yulim (later transferred to the main office)
iii. research center	
office head:	Yi Pyenghwun
researcher:	Yi Cwunsep
(2) Hanto cosmetic company	
director:	Mr. Co
manager:	Mr. Pak

17. The requestive mood suffix -*si* appears in the formal imperative *hasipsio* as well, which is broken down to subject honorific -*(u)si*-, addressee honorific suffix -*p*-, requestive mood suffix -*si*- and imperative suffix -*o* (Sohn 1994).

18. The adverb *com* has two meanings; 'a little bit' (e.g. *hankwuk mal com hay yo* 'I speak a little Korean') and 'just' or 'please' (e.g. *yenphil com cwusipsio* 'Give me a pencil please') (King and Yeon 1996). The meaning of this adverb changes according to the context in which the utterance occurs. It is only in the second sense that the adverb *com* functions as a mitigator, adding more politeness to the utterance.

19. Ellis (1994) explains that in an indirect speech act, the illocutionary force of the act is not derivable from the surface structure, as when an interrogative form serves as a request.

20. The cajolative -*(u)lyem(una)* and ceremonial -*[(u)si]-(op)-sose* are other special forms of Korean imperative. These forms were not found in the data of the present study, yet are sometimes used in contemporary Korean. Here are examples of these imperatives;

      (1) ceypal kongpwu com ha *lyem*   'Please study, will you?'

      (2) pi lul naylye cwu *sose*   'Please let us have rain'

The plain level imperative form -*(u)lyem(una)* in the example (1) is termed a 'cajolative' by Martin (1992) and is rather archaic and rarely used in contemporary Korean; nonetheless, it can sometimes be found in grandparents' speech to their grandchildren. The ceremonial imperative ending -*[(u)si]-(op)-sose* in example (2) is also seldom

found in contemporary Korean but functioned as a highly deferential ending until the early twentieth century (Sohn 1994). This linguistic form is presently used only in religious contexts, especially in prayer to God.

21. The polite form *haciyo* is usually reduced to a *hacyo*.

22. Sohn further explained that the *-ci* may be equated historically with the nominalizer suffix *-ci* that occurs before a negative verbal (p.18).

23. Martin (1992) further explained: "the subjunctive aspect underlies, when combined with the assertive mood, the ending which expresses suggestions, proposition or immediate sequence ("as soon as"), and has the plain style form *-ca*. When combined with the attentive mood, the subjunctive is realized as the imperative ending that is used to express commands, plain-style *-ula*" (p.245).

24. Under Sohn's explanation (1994), the honorific blunt imperative (*hasio*) can be referred to as a requestive blunt imperative because he claims that the honorific suffix *-si* in *hasio* might have lost its function and functions instead as a requestive mood suffix, thereby simply making the utterance sound more contemporary.

25. Forming solidarity with the addressee is the first step in becoming intimate with the person. In this regard, it is understandable that Korean people use the term 'older sister' to address a female clerk in a clothing shop or to a waitress in a restaurant in order to build an in-group solidarity with the addressee.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth-Vaughn, Nancy. (1992). Topic Transition in Physician-Patient Interviews: Power, Gender, and Discourse Change. *Language in Society*. 21. pp.409-426.

Bak Sung-Yun. (1983). Women's Speech in Korean and English. *Korean Studies*. 7. pp.61-76.

Bergvall, Victoria, L. (1996). Constructing and Enacting Gender through Discourse: Negotiating Multiple Roles as Female Engineering Students. In Bergvall, Victoria, L., Bing, Janet, M.and Freed, Alice, F. (Eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. pp.173-201. London; New York; Longman.

Bing, Janet, M. and Bergvall, Victoria, L. (1996). The Question of Questions: Beyond Binary Thinking. In Bergvall, Victoria, L., Bing, Janet, M.and Freed, Alice, F. (Eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. pp.1-30. London; New York; Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S & Olshtain, E. (1984). Request and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*. 5(3). pp.196-213.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown Penelope. (1980). How and Why Are Women More Polite: Some Evidences from a Mayan Community. In MaConnell-Ginet S, Borker R and Furman N (Eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. pp.111-136. Praeger Publishers.

Cameron, Deborah. (1997). Theoretical Debates in Feminist Linguistics: Questions of Sex and Gender. In Wodak Ruth (Ed.), *Gender and Discourse*. pp.21-36. Sage Publications Ltd. London: Thousand Oaks: New Delhi.

--------(1996). The Language-Gender Interface: Challenging Co-optation. In Bergvall V.L. Bing J.M and Freed A.F. (Eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. pp.31-53. London; New York; Longman.

--------(1995). Rethinking Language and Gender Studies: Some Issues for the 1990s. In Mill Sara (Eds.), *Language & Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. pp.31-44. Longman Publishing, New York.

Cameron, Deborah, McAlinden Fiona and O'Leary Kathy. (1988). Lakoff in Context: the Social and Linguistic Functions of Tag Questions. In Coates, Jennifer and Cameron, Deborah (Eds), *Women in Their Speech Community: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. pp.74-93. Essex: Longman.

Cang, Thaycin. (1969). Hyentay Yesenge Yenkwu (A Study of Modern Korean Women's Speech). *Aseya Yeseng Yenkwu*. 8. pp.53-75.

Case, Susan S. (1988). Cultural Differences, Not Deficiencies: An Analysis of Managerial Women's Language. In Laurie Larwood and Suzanne Rose (Eds.), *Women's Careers: Pathways and Pitfalls*. New York: Praeger.

Cheshire, J. (1978). Present Tense Verbs in Reading English. In Trudgill (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*. London, Edward Arnold.

Crawford, Mary. (1995). *Talking Differences on Gender and Language*. Sage Publications. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Eckert, Penelope, & McConnell-Ginet, Sally. (1992). Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-based Practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, pp.461-490.

Edelsky, Carole. (1993). Who's Got the Floor?. In Tannen Deborah (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. pp.189-227. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, Rod. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Fishman, Pamela. (1983). Interaction: The Work Women do. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender and Society*. pp.89-102. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

--------(1980). Conversational insecurity. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, and P.M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives*. pp.127-132. New York: Pergamon.

Freed Alice F. (1996). Language and Gender Research in an Experimental Setting. In Bergvall, Victoria, L., Bing, Janet, M.and Freed, Alice, F. (Eds.) *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. pp.54-76. London; New York; Longman.

Freed Alice F and Greenwood Alice. (1996). Women, Men and Type of Talk: What Makes the Difference. *Language in Society*. 25. pp.621-644.

Freeman, Rebecca, and McElhinny, Bonnie. (1996). Language and Gender. In McCay, Sandra L. & Hornberger, Nancy H. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. pp.219-279. Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. (1980). Directive-Response Speech Sequences in Girls' and Boys' Task Activities. In McConnell-Ginet, S, Borker, R and Furman, N (Eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. pp.157-173. Praeger Special Studies. Praeger Scientific.

Graddol, David and Swann, Joan. (1989). *Gender Voices*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell.

Greenwood, Alice. (1996). Floor Management and Power Strategies in Adolescent Conversation. In Bergvall, Victoria, L., Bing, Janet, M.and Freed, Alice, F. (Eds.) *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*, pp.77-97. London; New York; Longman.

Hill, Beverley et.al. (1986). Universals of Linguistic Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*.10(4), pp.347-371.

Holmes, Janet. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London and New York. Longman.

--------(1986). Functions of 'you know' in women's and men's speech. *Language in Society*. 15(1), pp.1-22.

Horikawa, Randy Y., Mickey, Jeffrey and Miura, Steven. (1991). Effects of Request Legitimacy on the Compliance-Gaining Tactics of Male and Female Managers. *Communication Monographs*. 58(4), pp.421-436.

Hwang, Jek-Lyun. (1990). 'Deference' versus 'Politeness' in Korean Speech. *Interactional Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 82, pp.41-55.

Ide, Sachiko., Hori, M., Kawasaki, A., Ikuta S and Haga, H. (1986). Sex Difference and Politeness in Japanese. *Interactional Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 58, pp.25-36.

Im, Hong-Pin (1993). Kwuke uy Yesenge (Women's Language of Korean). In Kim Pyeng-Ik (Ed.) *Kwukesa Calyowa Kwukehakuy Yenkwu* (The Materials of Korean Language History and Research of Korean). pp.819-829. Mwunhakkwa Cisengsa. Korean Research Association of Seoul National University.

James, Deborah and Drakich, Janice. (1993). Understanding Gender Differences in Amount Talk: A Critical Review of Research. In Deborah Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. pp.281-301. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jorden, Eleanor H. (1990). Overview. In Ide, Sachiko and McGloin, Naomi H. (Eds.), *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*. pp.1-4. Kurosio Publishers.

King, Ross and Yeon, Jae-Hoon, with Samuel E. Martin. (1996). *Korean: A Foundation Course*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle & Co.

Koo, John H. (1993). Sex Discrimination and Verb Endings in Korean: The Case amongst Korean Speakers in Peoples' Republic of China. *Korean Language Education*. 4, pp.111-127.

--------(1991). On Sex Discrimination in Korean Address System. *Korean Language Education*. 3, pp.129-141.

Korean Women's Development Institute. (1994). *Korean Women Now*.

Lakoff, Robin, T. (1990). *Talking Power: Politics of Language*. Basic Books. A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.

--------(1975). *Language and Women's Place*. Harper Row Publishers, Inc. New York.

Lee, Ok-Yeun. (1987). Hankwuk Pwupwuhoching uy Sahoyenehakcek Kochal (Sociolinguistic Studies of Mutual Address Terms of Spouses). *Aseya Yeseng Yenkwu*. 26, pp.193-212.

Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York. Longman.

Maltz, Daniel N. and Borker, Ruth A. (1982). A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication. In Gumperz, John J (Ed.), *Language and Social Identity*. pp.195-216. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Markle, Susan. (1994). *Politeness in Politics: Women's and Men's Talk during Question Period*. University of Toronto. M.A. Thesis.

Martin, E. Samuel. (1992). *A Reference Grammar of Korean: A Complete Guide to the Grammar and History of the Korean Language*. Charles E. Tuttle Company. Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan.

McElhinny, Bonnie. (1995). Challenging Hegemonic Masculinities: Female and Male Police Officers Handling Domestic Violence. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (Eds), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. pp.217-244. New York and London: Routledge.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. (1996). Dealing with Gender Identity as a Sociolinguistic Variable. In Bergvall, Victoria, L., Bing, Janet, M.and Freed, Alice, F. (Eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. pp.202- 227. London; New York; Longman.

Min, Hyen-Sik. (1996). Kwuke uy Yesenge Yenkwu (A Study of Women's Language in the Korean Language). *Aseya Yeseng Yenkwu*. 34, pp.7-62.

O'Barr, William, & Atkins, Bowman. (1980). "Women's Language" or "Powerless Language"? In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker, & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. pp.93-110. New York: Praeger.

Palley Marian L. (1994). Feminism in a Confucian Society: The Women's Movement in Korea. In Gelb J. and Palley M.L. (Eds.), *Women of Japan and Korea*. pp.274-296. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Reynolds, Katsue. (1990). Female Speakers of Japanese in Transition. In Ide, Sachiko and Hanaoka-McGloin, Naomi. (Eds.), *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*. pp.127-144. Kurosio Publishers.

Roh Mihye. (1994). Women Workers in a Changing Korean Society. In Gelb J. and Palley M.L. (Eds.), *Women of Japan and Korea*. pp.240-256. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Schein, Virginia E., Mreller, R. and Jacobson, C. (1989). The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics Among College Students. *Sex Roles*. 20(1/2) pp.103-10.

Smith, Janet S. (1992). Women in Charge; Politeness and Directives in the Speech of Japanese Women. *Language in Society*. 21(1), pp.59-82.

Sohn, Bong-Scuk. (1994). Agenda for Social Reforms: Women's Political Participation in South Korea. In Gelb J. and Palley M.L. (Eds.), *Women of Japan and Korea*. pp.257-273. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Sohn, Ho-Min. (1994). *Korean*. London and New York. Routledge.

Sterling, Bruce S. and Owen, John W. (1982). Perception of Demanding Versus Reasoning Male and Female Police Officers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 8, pp.336-40.

Tannen, Deborah. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and Power*. New York: Avon.

---------(1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine.

Trudgill, P. (1974) *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge University Press.

West, Candace. (1990). Not Just 'Doctors' Orders': Directive-Response Sequence in Patients' Visits to Women and Men Physicians. *Discourse and Society*. 1(1), pp.85-112.

West, Candace, & Zimmerman, Don (1983). Small Insults: A Study of Interruptions in Cross-sex Conversations between Unacquainted Persons. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender and Society*. pp.102-117. Rowley MA: Newbury House.

Woods, Nicola. (1988). Talking Shop: Sex and Status as Determinants of Floor apportionment in a Work Setting. In Jennifer Coates and Deborah Cameron. (Eds.), *Women in their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. pp.122-140. Essex: Longman.

Yi Jiseon (1995). Changes in Korean Honorific System and Suggestions for Teaching Honorifics. *Korean Language in America*. 1. pp.153-165.

APPENDICES

I. Directives by Female Superiors

	Cang Seyyeng	Kim Yulim	Ms. Kwu	Ko Sungmi	Yi Mikyeng	O Cinswu	Mrs. Choy	Choy Hyeyyeng	Total
Imperatives									
plain					1				1
intimate	63	3(di)	4	25	55				150
polite	5	1(di)				7, 4 (ho)	1,2 (ho)	2,1(ma,ho)	16,7(ho)
formal					1				1
Propositives									
plain	2			1	1				4
formal		1			1				2
Benefactives									
intimate	2			2	3				7
familiar	1								1
polite	1(ho)	3(ho)				2	2(ho)	1(ma,ho), 2(ho)	2, 9 (ho)
Desideratives									
plain					4				4
intimate	2								2
Whimperatives									
intimate	2				1				3
polite						3	1	1	5
Adverbials									
com	3	3		2	2	3	2	1	16
Others (1)									
plain					2				2
intimate	3	3(di)		1	1				8
polite						2			2
formal		3				1(ho)	3		7
Others (2)									
-tolok	3	1(di)			4				8
-ci					1			1(po)	1,1(po)
-yaci	1			1					2
-ko (-kwu)	1			2(2)	3	(1)(po)	1(po)		6, 1(po) (2), (1)(po)
-ya tway	1			1	1				3
-myen tway					1				1
an tway	1								1
-lako kulay				1					1
-ya hay	1								1

II. Directives by Male Superiors

	Choy Kyengmin	Kim Tonghwun	O Ilto	Kim Sengho	Mr. Co	Mr. Kang	Kim Thaywu	Kim Inwu	O Sengcwu	Total
Imperatives										
plain									1	1
intimate	3(ow),1	2	14	1	7	5			10	43
familiar		6	2							8
blunt		2(ho)							1(ho)	3(ho)
polite	2,1(ow,ho) 12,16(ho)	1(ho)	7, 1(ho)	2(ho)	1, 1(ho)		1,10(ho)	3, 1(ho)	2	28, 33(ho)
Propositives										
plain									3	3
formal	1(ow), 9	2	5		2			1	1	21
Benefactives (Imperatives)										
intimate			1							1
familiar		3	3	1						7
blunt			1(ho)							1(ho)
polite	2 (ow,ho) 5, 18 (ho)						2(ho)			5, 22(ho)
formal	7									7
(Propositives)										
familiar		1	1							2
Desideratives (Imperatives)										
polite			1							1
formal	1		1							2
(Declaratives)										
familiar		1								1
Whimperatives										
polite	1(ow), 3							1	1	6
formal	2									2
Adverbials										
com	1(ow),12		2		2			1		18
Others(1)										
plain									1	1
intimate	1	2	4		1					8
polite	5						1			6
formal	1(ow), 7	1	2, 1(ho)							12

	Choy Kyengmin	Kim Tonghwun	O Ilto	Kim Sengho	Mr. Co	Mr. Kang	Kim Thaywu	Kim Inwu	O Sengcwu	Total
Others (2)										
-tolok									1	1
-ci	3 (po)	1	1(po), 1(po,ho)			1			1	3, 4 (po), 1 (po, ho)
-ko	1, 2(po)	1			1	1	1(po)	1(po)		4, 4 (po)
an tway									1	1
-myen tway	1(po)		1							1, 1 (po)
-la(ko) kulay			1							1
-lan maliya			1		1	1				3

KEYS

* ho: honorific with -(u)si
* po: polite with -yo ending
* ma: manager
* di: director
* ow: owner
* others (1): other patterns with the illocutionary force of a request
* others (2): other patterns with the illocutionary force of an imperative
* bracketed numbers: incidence of form in data.

III. Transcripts from *Yeykam*

1. Female Superiors
1.1. Request Speech Acts by Cang Seyyeng (manager)

1. *in the rehearsal of the company event show*
Cang Seyyeng: selchi miswul kwa nawasseyo?
Kim Yulim: aniyo. capci eyse kesil khethun interior ilkun key sayngkak i naseyo.
Cang Seyyeng: e, nukkim i nappuci anhuntey. kulehkey hapsita. hwicang ulo pakkweyo.
Yi Mikyeng: ney?
Cang Seyyeng: coha, kulem. kyeysok cal hay pwayo, nukkimto sillyek inikka.

2. *in the clinic*
Cang Seyyeng: (to the female clinic worker) cleanser, kakcil ceykecey tasi son pwa.
                      nemwu kanghay.

3. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: Kyengho ssi, khenthulol aicey lul ....lo pwakkwe cwuseyyo.
Male Subordinate: ney.
Cang Seyyeng: nwunka pwupwun ul yeypang uloyo.
Male Subordinate: ney.
Cang Seyyeng: (phone) e, insapwu, na Cang Seyyeng iya. wuli kongcang phanmaywen
                      cwungey Kim Yulim ilako issulkeya. e. insakilok hanpen hana khapi
                      hayse nay cali ey nwa cwe. swuko.

4. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to all of the team members) kwu wel isipsam il yakunca nawa. epse?
                      (one female worker comes out) neyka ku nal paris eyse on ceyphwum
                      cengpo fax lul poko to haci anhko hyuci thong ey pelinun palam ey wuli
                      rival sa tul un paris eyse chwulsi toyn perfect lipstick kwa ttokkathun
                      ceyphwum ul mantule nayssnuntey wuli man kkamatukhi moluko issesse.
                      mwullon oykwuk ceyphwum ul peykkicanun ken anya. nan kulehkey
                      caconsim ppacin cis un anh hay. haciman iken kipon cekin cengpo
                      ssawum eyse cin keya. ilay kaciko mwusun marketing iya. ttala hay pwa.
                      sonnim i sinpal i phyenha sipnikka?
Female Subordinate: sonnim i sinpal i phyenha sipnikka?
Cang Seyyeng: ku mal un ceytaylo hanun kwun. kulem sinpal ina phala. nen haykoya.

5. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to all of the team members)---motwu censacek ulo imhay cwukey. (to
                      Pak) promotion mix nun?
Pak Soyeng: ney, kongcwung party pi wa sinmwun, tases kay cenkwang phan ey
                      taytaycek ulo hongpo hako isssupnita man thukhi ipen eyn sinmwun
                      kwangko ey yekcem ul twuko isseyo.
Cang Seyyeng: coha. campaign source nun hwakceng twayssna?

Ms. Kwu:	ney. nostalgia uy cakuk ul phyohyen hayssum. cuk hyangswu elin swunswu ham inteyyo.
Cang Seyyeng:	nosucca nun ppaypeliko swunswuham man kangco hatolok hay. Ceng tayli.
Ceng:	ney
Cang Seyyeng:	hoyuy cwunpi hayyo.

6. *in the office*

Ms. Kwu:	kwangko tayhayngsa ey yenlak hay polkkayo?----
Cang Seyyeng:	cen kwacengul cosa hay pwaya hay ---- pwu teamcang, eccaysstun cen kwaceng ul chwucek hay pwa.

7. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng:	---ettehkey twayssnunci cenhwa hay pwa. (to Pak Soyeng) ---- isahoy sokpo naonun taylo poko hay cwe.

8. *outside of the office*

Cang Seyyeng:	(to Pak Soyeng) kuman hay, kukey cengpoya, hemtamici. ipman cal wumcikici malko momto com yelsimhi wumcikye pwa.

9. *in the office*

Pak Soyeng:	ponsa insa pallyeng cang ipnita.
Cang Seyyeng:	polyu sikhye.

10. *in the airport*

Kim Yulim:	e, silcang nim. annyng haseyyo.
Cang Seyyeng:	cenhwa yenlak patasse. cal halswu isskeyssci?
Kim Yulim:	ney. yelsimhi hakeyss supnita.-----
Cang Seyyeng:	insa tulyeyo. saylo osin marketing isanim iseyyo.
Kim Yulim:	ney?
Choy Kyengmin:	Choy Kyengmin ipnita. cal hay popsita.

11. *in a hotel room*

Cang Seyyeng:	nail seminar ey chamkaca lo nawa cwul tayphyoca tul i nikka mokcha taylo pwunlyu hatolok.
Kim Yulim:	ney. (Kim talks about her dream as a career woman) --- ce
Cang Seyyeng:	um
Kim Yulim:	model ieyo. nayka toyko siphun career woman model ieyo, Cang silcang nim i. Cangsilcang nim chelem toyko sipheyo.
Cang Seyyeng:	malun komawun tey thukcenginul modello samci ma. nato hwuhoy han cek isse.

12. *in a hotel, stairs*

Cang Seyyeng:	(to Kim Yulim) kaca, takwahoy ka cwunpi toyessunikka.

13. *in a hotel*

108

Cang Seyyeng: (to junior manager Yi) ettek haciyo? mence isa nim eykey yenlak <u>hayyo</u>.
                     nan ponsaey yenlak halthey nikka.

14. *in the gallery*
Kim talks about her idea to get Hwayong department to have a section for Sinseng cosmetics.
Cang Seyyeng: OK. chwucin <u>hay pwa</u>. cenphok cek ulo ciwen hal they nikka. isa nim
                     eykey to nay ka poko hakeysse.
Kim Yulim: ce hoca hal swu issulkkayo?
Cang Seyyeng: haysscanha, cikum.
Kim Yulim: kulehciman kkok sengkong hantanun pocang to epsnuntey.
Cang Seyyeng: selsa sengkong mos hanta hayto ku tul ul hyepsang table lo pwulle tulin
                     tanun key te cwungyo hay. casin ul kacko <u>hay pwa</u>. nayil achim kkaci
                     cengsik ceyanse <u>olye pwa</u>.

15. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to a female subordinate) ike, ppuwacong capci com hanpen chamko
                     <u>hay pwa</u>. tapi naoltheynikka.
Female Subordinate: ney, alkeysssupnita.
Cang Seyyeng: Ko teamcang, ---- kwangko cwungtan <u>halako hay</u>. ponsa cisika
                     ttelecyesse.
Ko Sungmi: ney, alkeysssupnita.

16. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to Kim Yulim)---- mence, isa nim hanthey insa <u>haca</u>. e, Ko teamcang to
                     cengsik insa <u>hayyaci</u>.
Ko Sungmi: ney.

17. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: coha. kulehciman hoysa pwunwiki ka a cohunikka kantan <u>hakey hay</u>.
Pak Soyeng: ney.

18. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: a, kuliko nayilun cenyek yaksok <u>haci ma</u>. hwanyengsiki issul kenikka.
Kim Yulim: ney? hwanyengsik iyo?

19. *in the clinic*
Ko Sungmi, Pak Soyeng, Ceng Sunghwan and Kim Yulim are wearing a mask to test the quality.
Cang Seyyeng: -----Ko teamcang, Ko teamcang pwuthe mal <u>hay pwa</u>. (Ko tells opinions
                     about the mask)
Cang Seyyeng: um, coha, Pak Soyeng, (Pak talks)
Cang Seyyeng: -----Ceng Sunghwan, (Ceng talks)
Cang Seyyeng: coha, Kim Yulim, (Kim talks)
Cang Seyyeng: ----seyan hwu meeting sil lo <u>moye</u>.
Everybody: ney

20. *in the meeting room*

Cang Seyyeng: ca swuko tul haysse.----- haciman, mancok haci malko kakca chwuka uykyen nayil kkaci hana ssik kacye otolok. isang.
Team Members: swuko hasyesssupnita.

21. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to other team members) ese kapwa.
Team Members: ney.

22. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to Ceng tayli) cenhwa kele.
Ceng: ney.
Cang Seyyeng: chwulkwu pongsway hay.

23. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (leaves the room) Kim Yulim, sapho ssul cwunpi hay.

24. *in front of an elevator*
Cang Seyyeng: te yelsimhi pwunpal hay pwa.
Kim Yulim: ney.

25. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: nwukwu helak macko kacye kacnyakwu.
Ko Sungmi: silcang nim. cey cal mos ipnita. ceyka helak hayssupnita.
Cang Seyyeng: Ko teamcang, nal ttala wayo.

26. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: (to all team members) cwawukan wuli sinceyphwum kakyekphyo mwunseka ku ccokulo hullekasstakan motwu sapho ssuko nakase say cikcang chachul kako hay. Kim Yulim, com chacha pwassna?
Kim Yulim: coysong hapnita. ta chacha pwassciman...
Cang Seyyeng: Kim Yulim, icey pwuthe epmwu eyse son ttey.----- nen il ul ppayski nun kil pwuthe paywe. Kim Yulim eykey amwu il to cwuci mala. poksa na kongmwuswupal to an tway. nay cisi ka issul ttay kkaci nen coffee na kkulhi nun keya.

27. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: Ko teamcang, design teamcang sewullo ppalli olako hay.
Ko Sungmi: design team cang un cikum changwen seminar kassnun teyyo.
Cang Seyyeng: seminar ka mwunceyka anya. ilceng chwisohako tangcang ollaolako hay.
Ko Sungmi: yey.
Cang Seyyeng: isa nim hanthey cenhwa nehko. kuphatakwu. Pak Soyeng, nen hoysa komwun pyenhosa hanthey yenlak hay pwa..
Pak Soyeng: ney, silcang nim. e, ce kuntey mwelakwu...
Cang Seyyeng: iltan ponsalo tule osilako hay.
Pak Soyeng: ney
Ko Sungmi: (phone) ney, cikum palo yo. Kim Yulim, kimwusil ey cha nayka.
Kim Yulim: ney.

110

28. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: (to all team members) kakca nakase mathun pwupwun ul <u>chacha pwa</u>.
mwenka caphil keya. ani <u>capaya tway</u>. ipen il elmana cwungtayhan ilinci
cal alkeya. motwu nolyekhay <u>cwuki palay</u>. isang.

29. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: ku yeph pang un?
Kim Yulim: yeph pangun ceyka...
Cang Seyyeng: ta <u>tollye</u>.

30. *in the office*

Kim Yulim: tasinun coffee lul kkulhici anhkeysssupnita.
Cang Seyyeng: kulem kongcang ulo <u>naylye ka</u>.

31. *in the hallway*

Cang Seyyeng: ---te pwunpal <u>hay pwa</u>.
Kim Yulim: ney
Cang Seyyeng: ----kuliko, nay samwulham yelsoy ya. kase <u>yele pwa</u>.

32. *in the office*

After looking at the report submitted by Kim Yulim

Cang Seyyeng: ----nayka OK lul hayya toynunkeya. ala? tasi <u>haywa</u>, ohwu seysi kkaci.
Kim Yulim: ney, alasssupnita.
Cang Seyyeng: chwuyenlyo hantheyto hanpwu ssik <u>tollye</u>.

33. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: ta tollyessna?
Kim Yulim: ney
Cang Seyyeng: tasi <u>haywa</u>. ihayka an toyna? Pak Soyeng,
Pak Soyeng: ney, silcang nim.
Cang Seyyeng: Kim Yulim pokoso ey mweka pwucok hanci mal <u>hay pwa</u>. (Pak talks)
Cang Seyyeng: kulehci. tasi <u>hay wa</u>. nayil achim kkaci.

34. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: Kim Yulim, sinceyphwum palphyohoy ey com kal kke nikka <u>cwunpi hay</u>.
isa nim cisi ya.
Kim Yulim: ney, alkeysssupnita.

35. *in the presentation of new products*

Cang Seyyeng: (to Kim Yulim) sinceyphwum yongkiuy paychwul, brand cenlyak, brand
mantul ttay motwu towumi toylkkeya. motwu cal <u>tule twe</u>.---

36. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: mwusun soliya? cam tel kkaysse? tasi hanpen print <u>hay</u>.
Kim Yulim: ney.
Cang Seyyeng: kuliko, Ko teamcang, TV kwangko sikantay data com <u>ceke nwa</u>.

| Cang Seyyeng: | kuliko, Ko teamcang, TV kwangko sikantay data com <u>ceke nwa</u>. |
| Ko Sungmi: | ney, alkeyssssupnita. |

37. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: (walking into the office) mwun <u>tata</u>. (to all team members) ---hoyuylul hansikan nuchchwul they nikka ku cen ey nay samwulham ey diskette <u>nehe nwa</u>.

38. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: ----kakca selap kkenayse chayksangwiey <u>ollye nwa</u>. mwullon diskette box phoham. ---iltan mwun <u>tata</u>. (Pak closes the door) Kim Yulim, cikcep <u>chacha pwa</u>. ney diskette i nikka.(Kim is searching for a diskette) ta chacha ponkeya.

Kim Yulim:	ney.
Cang Seyyeng:	epse? kaciko issnun ke ta kkenay non keya.
Pak Soyeng:	ce, silcang nim kke ppaykonun ta pon ke kathun teyyo.
Cang Seyyeng:	----Ceng tayli <u>chacha pwa</u>.

39. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: amwulayto kihoyk 1team eyse yunung han salam han myng ul chachwul <u>hay</u> <u>cweya keysse</u>. (Cang and Ko discuss who would be the best for the position of a team leader)

Cang Seyyeng:	Pak Soyeng un ettelkka?
Ko Sungmi:	Pak Soyeng iyo? -----
Cang Seyyeng:	kongsa lul kwupwun mos hal aynun anya. sikye <u>potolok hay</u>.

40. *in the office*

Cang Seyyeng: (walks into the meeting room) ----cal towase choytayhan uy sengkwa lul <u>kkule nay tolok</u>. (one female worker complains) ---allaynghan caconsim un ssuleyki thong ey <u>pelye</u>.---isen ey tayhan chaykim un nayka cil they nikka. motwu Kim Yulim ul cal support hayse caki mathun il ina cal <u>hatolok hay</u>. (leaves the room)

41. *outside the office*

| Cang Seyyeng: | *(Pak speaks ill of Kim Yulim)* alasse. kuman <u>tule ka pwa</u>. |
| Pak Soyeng: | ney |

1.2. Request Speech Acts by Kim Yulim
1.2.1. As a Director

42. *in the director's office*

Kim Yulim: (monologue) e, na Kim isa ya. mwe? cohasse. tangcang kyeyyak <u>hayyo</u>. e, Cang silcang. ipen campaign tamyak nemwu cohasseyo. pwunpal <u>hatolok</u>, nukkimto sillyekinikka. e, Hwang pise, onul ocen cochanul chwiso <u>hayyakeysse</u>. onul nayka nemwu phikon hayse maliya. thank you. Yi Cwunsep ssi, na Kim isa ya. tangsin nalang kyelhon <u>hayya</u>

112

keysse, cikum tangcang. iken isauy <u>myenglyeng iya</u>. hampwulo <u>kwulci</u>
<u>ma</u>. sangphwumkihoyk sillo, ilumun moluciman saphyossese nay
pangulo <u>kacye wa</u>. chi--, wuskicito anha. ai, cokkumhankey unkunhakey
panmaliya. lip stick com mancyesstako.

1.2.2. As a Team Leader

43. *in the meeting room*

Kim Yulim: ----cal pwuthak hapnita. choysenul tahayse hoysauy kitayey pwuung
<u>hatolok hapsita</u>.

Pak Soyeng: chi, colyensa chwulsin inkapoci. nunglyekul kkule nayl casini issta...

Kim Yulim: wusen, Yi Yeywan ssi, soliphphayk ey tayhan sicang cosa nayil ocenk
kkaci <u>pwuthak hapnita</u>.

Yi Yeywan: ani, sicang cosa ka mwusun hwacang phwum myech kay phala noh tus i
kulehkey swiwun ken cwul ana pwucyo? il ul com sikhilyemyen alko
sikhisicyo.

KimYulim: enu iley elmamanhan sikan ul halay hanunya nun team cang i phantan hal
mwuncey ipnita.

Pak Soyeng: he, mile pwuchi nun ke hananun cal paywessney.

Kim Yulim: kuliko, Pak Hyeyswuk ssin, kongcang yenkwuso ey uyloy hay nohun
soliphphayk wenlyo ancento check kyeysok com poko com <u>hay</u>
<u>cwuseyyo</u>.

Pak Hyeyswuk: poko yo? (in a sarcastic tone) a, ney, poko yo.

Kim Cihyey: wuli hayto nemwu hanun key anipnikka. echaphi kwuseng toyn team
ipnita.

Pak Soyeng: ya, Kim Cihyey, ne, cha...

Kim Yulim: Iltan ocenun i cengto lo machiko ohwu ey tasi <u>moi keysssupnita</u>. ku sai
ey epmwu pwutam oksun kakca caliey fax lo ponay keysssupnita.

44. *in the meeting room*

Pak Soyeng: ipwa team cang. cikum iluy simkakseng ul moluna pwuntey ilcengi nuce
cyese palmay siki mos macchwuntamyen wuli Sinseng kyewul cangsa
kkuthna nun keya. Kim Yulim hana chaykim cinun kello kkuthnanun ke
anilanun ke alatwe.cikum ku ttawi congi ccokali cosa hanun key
mwuncey ka aniya.

Kim Yulim: ----kulayse yelepwuntul hanthey hyepcolul kwuhanun kecanhayo. selyu
posiko uykyen <u>nay cwuseyyo</u>. onul yeki kkaci <u>hakeysssupnita</u>.

45. *in the meeting room*

Kim Yulim: komaweyo. naymwu check kkuthnamyen sopica yuco test to hayya
toyko tto um, ceyphwum selmyengse mwunan cakseng hako tto kyocay,
ceyphwum kwanlise to mantul eyya twayyo. kuliko, ...calyoto
mantuleya toynikka ce Yi Hyeywen ssi ka ceyphwum selmyeng
mwunan com cakseng <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.

Kim Cihyey: namecinun wuli hanthey mathkisiko naymwu check ey sinkyeng
ssuseyyo.

Kim Yulim: kulayyo.

1.3. Request Speech Acts by Ms. Kwu (team leader)

46. *in the office*
Ms. Kwu: (to a male subordinate) ku mok ancen halyemyen natural twin cake
                    pwuthe ceytaylo ppopa nwa.

47. *in the office*
Ms. Kwu: (to all team members) cwunpi tul *hay*.
Pak Soyeng: cwunpi lanyo?
Ms. Kwu: poko calyo maliya.---ipwa, Pak Soyeng ssi. ciksok sangkwan i
                    nwukwuya?-----kulem nay cisi ey tangyenhi wumcikye. kuliko pwu
                    teamcang ilan mal kuman hay. eyenhi teamcang cikmwu tayli ya. ale?

1.4. Request Speech Acts by Ko Sungmi (team leader)

48. *in the office*
Ko Sungmi: (to a male subordinate) iltan sikhinun taylo hay. ---(to Pak Soyeng) ---
                    pwuthak han ke cwunpi twayssna?
Pak Soyeng: yey.-----
Kim Yulim: annyeng haseyyo.
Ko Sungmi: wassna, yayki tulesse. ili wa.---- chachum yayki hako Pak Soyeng ssi,
                    sinip sawen ina machankaci nikka cal kaluchye cwe.

49. *in the office*
Kim Yulim: ---- kamsa kinyemphwum to com cenhay cwukoyo.
Ko Sungmi: kulay, kulem. hoysa pongkocha thako kacta wa. ayay, nucumyen
                    makpalo hwanyengcang ulo oko.

50. *in the office*
Pak Soyeng: ce, team cang nim. ....ey kwanhan kinkup hoyuy hasintako hasyess
                    canhayo.
Ko Sungmi: kulay, silcang nim naylye onun taylo clinic center lo kaca. Ceng tayli
                    nun
Ceng: ney.
Ko Sungmi: --- pikyo pwusekphyo kacye okwu.
Ceng: ney, alkeyssssupnita.

51. *in the meeting room*
Ko Sungmi: Pak Soyeng ssi. ....pwuchyese .....ey ponay.
Pak Soyeng: ney.
Ko Sungmi: (to team members) kuliko selyu onul hoyuyeyse naon yaykinun hanato
                    ppathulici malko moa. .....ta nay nwa.--- (everybody leaves the room
                    except Kim and Pak)

114

| Ko Sungmi: | (coming back to the room again) Kim Yulim ssi.---- kase, seythak hay. ettehkey sayong hanun cwul alci? |
| Kim Yulim: | ney, ecey sayong hay pwasseyo. |

52. *in the meeting room*

Ko Sungmi:	chakunhi pwa pwa.----kuliko ohwu eyn kamsa team ey ka pwaya halkeya.
Kim Yulim:	kamsa team iyo?
Ko Sungmi:	----kulenikka, chacha nay.

53. *in Kim Yulim's mind (in the bathroom)*

| Ko Sungmi: | Kim Yulim, chacha ya tway.------ pam ul sayselato chacha nay. |

54. *in the office*

Ko Sungmi:	An Unca ssi, ike hoyuy marketing pwu ey *com* kacta cwe.
Kim Yulim:	a, ceyka kassta okeyss supnita.
Ko Sungmi:	silcang nim cisi ka naylye cil ttay kkaci poksa na kongmwu swupal to an toynta nun yayki cangnan ulo han mal anya.

55. *in the office*

| Ko Sungmi: | cip eyse man pwa. na kkaci konlan hakey mantulci malko. |
| Kim Yulim: | ney, kamsa hapnita. |

56. *in the office*

| Ko Sungmi: | tule ka pwa. kuntey iken mweya? os sasse? |
| Kim Yulim: | cey ke anieyyo. |

57. *in the office*

| Ko Sungmi: | diskette eyto backup pata nwassci. wusen kukel lo tasi print hako nacwungey tasi chacha pwa, ese. |
| Kim Yulim: | ney. |

58. *outside the office*

Ko Sungmi:	solcikhi mal hay.
Pak Soyeng:	totaychey cikum mwusun malssumul hasinun ke eyyo?
Ko Sungmi:	taytap man hay.

59. *in the office*

| Ko Sungmi: | sangphwum kihoyksil kihoy 1 teamcang ulosse silcang nimuy tayhan tayhayngkwen ul hayngsa hakeyssta. ---diskette box cenpwu kemyel hakeysse. --- han kwuntey ey kkenay nohulako hay. kuliko, Kim Yulim neyka cikcep tasi chacha. |

60. *in the copy room*

| Ko Sungmi: | (walking into the copy room) (to Kim) ---palphyo cwunpi hayyaci. sikan epse, ese. |
| Kim Yulim: | ney, team cang nim. |

61. *in the office*

Ko Sungmi: Pak Soyeng, hoysa ka philyo hanun caliey tulekamyen toynunkeya. silhumyen <u>kwantwu nun kekwu</u>. mali manha. (leaves the room)

62. *in the office*

Ko Sungmi: ----cali com kwuhay <u>talla ko kulay</u>.

Female Subordinate: ney, alkeyssSupnita.

63. *in the women's washroom*

Ko Sungmi: a, Kim Yulim, yeki issesskwuna. --- ppali <u>ka pwa</u>.

Kim Yulim: ai, kulayyo. ce, komapsupnita.

1.5. Request Speech Acts by Yi Mikyeng (team leader)

64. *in the rehearsal of a company event show*

Yi Mikyeng: ceki kase sample ina kacye wase <u>tollye</u>.

Kim Yulim: ney. (Kim makes some suggestions for the rehearsal but it only ends up annoying Yi) ney, elyenhi teamcang nim kkeyse cal alase hasyess keyssciyo.

Yi Mikyeng: sinkyeng kkuko sikhinun il ina ceytaylo <u>hay</u>.

65. *in the rehearsal of a company event show (after Cang leaves the scene)*

Yi Mikyeng: (to Kim Yulim) iltan hwicang ta alase sataka tala nohko thoykun <u>hatolok</u>. mwullon honcase <u>hayya keyssci</u>. wulin kulen ccok ey mwunoyhan inikka.

66. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng: (to team members) kaykwulito olchayngi ceki issessta. kukes ul kiek <u>hasipsio</u>--- ca, kulem onulto woykunpwu ssuko himchakey <u>sicak hapsita</u>.

67. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng: (to team members) tasi kase <u>sakwa hay</u>. nehuy tul chakkak <u>haci ma</u>. kosang ttelci ma. nehuy tuli kulehkey cal nasse.---kosang ttelko siphumyen saphyo ssuko cip ey <u>tule anca</u>.---Seng Yengca, Kim Yulim.----kulem, caconsim peliko kase <u>sakwa hay</u>. etten swumo lul tanghayto <u>chama</u>. kuken pikwul han key anya. kuken business ya. nay mal <u>cal tule</u>.----inkancek taywu? kuken nehuy cip ey kase nehuy pwumo nim hanthey na <u>pata</u>. Kim Yulim.

Kim Yulim: ney

Yi Mikyeng: ala tulesse?----kulay, twuko pokeysse. sakwa hako <u>ttwulhe wa</u>. nehuy tul kathcanhun caconsim ttaymwuney ppayskil swun epse. <u>swukye</u>, mwucoken <u>swukye</u>. tasi hanpen malhanta. <u>swukye</u>. haysan.

68. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng: (to team members) ipen eynun kiphilkho epkyey paychwul 5 wi thalchwul un mwullon Hyentay hwacangphwum kkaci nwulleya toyntanun kel icci malko <u>pwupal hatolok</u>. thukhi sacen cwunpitul chelcehi <u>hatolok hay</u>. O Yenglan, Song Mikyeng. nehuy nun campaign

116

	kikan tongan patul swu issnun motun yeysang cilmwun ppoptolok hay.---Kim Yulim, Yu Kyengwuk, Ceng Uncwu. nehuy nun cikum nalul ttalase ponsa ey kanta.
Female Subordinate:	ponsa eyyo?
Yi Mikyeng:	campaign calyo hako mokum swulyng hayya toy. ca, haysan.

69. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	(to team members) iltan ponsa eyse yenlak ol ttay kkaci all stop hay.

70. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	Kim Yulim.
Kim Yulim:	ney, teamcang nim.
Yi Mikyeng:	kwi an mekesse. cikum ponsa kassta wa. selmwun kyeyhoyk siley tullyese taumtal saylo caphin campaign calyo pata wa. cwul keya.
Kim Yulim:	ney.

71. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	(to team members) phanchoki maychwul lo iecil cohun uykyen i issu myen nay nwa pwa.---sayngsan wenka wa macinlyul to molumyense kulen chel epsnun soli haci ma. talun uykyen.---mwe com chamsin han uykyen tul epse? Kim Yulim.---kwuchey cek ulo malhantamyen. ----twaysse. sikan tul epsunikka kakca nayil kkaci tasi hapen tul sayngkak hay pwa.----Kim Yulim.
Kim Yulim:	ney.
Yi Mikyeng:	ohwuey oykwuk ponsaey kase campaign kyoyuk calyo hako ipen campaign inswaymwul calyo ppali patwa wa.------

72. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	(to team members) ----kakpyelhi momkacim kwa enhayng cosim hatolok. kuliko Uncwu hako Yenglan i nun sonim osimyen alase takwa nay kako.----kulayssna? kulem, Kyengok i hako hay. ----ya, ceki changko cengli com hayyakeyssta. ya, Kim Yulim ney ka hay.--sikhinun taylo hay.

73. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	(to Kim Yulim) ne nayil pwuthe oykun haci malko samil tongan phanchok sil motun ceyphwum cengli hako changko cengli ta hay nwa.

74. *in the office*

Yi Mikyeng:	(to team members) ca, moye.---ipen event nun tanswunhan ceyphwum palphyohoy ka anila ol hwupanki wa naynyen sangpankiuy maychwul kwa cikkyel toynun cwungyo han il i lanun kes ul icci malala.---kak sosok pyello pikyo toyl swu issuni tewuk pwunpal hay cwuki palanta. ca, chwultong cwunpi.--- Kim Yulim,---- namase tasi hay.

75. *in the campaign*

Yi Mikyeng: (to a female subordinate) nunglyek kkes kwusullye pwa, kase.

76. *in the campaign*
Yi Mikyeng: Kim Yulim.
Kim Yulim: ney.
Yi Mikyeng: cengmal swuko haysse.
Kim Yulim: ney
Yi Mikyeng: (to famale subordinates) ppali olmkye.

77. *in the campaign*
Yi Mikyeng: (to team members) onul un kuman chelswu haca. swuko tul haysse. onul
                       cip ey kase phwuk switolok.----a, kuliko nayil ocen thwuphyohoyka
                       issunikka 30 pwun ilccik chwulkun hatolok hay.

78. *in the office*
Yi Mikyeng: taum cwu pwuthe tangpwunkan naykun hatolok hay.
Kim Yulim: naykun iyo?------
Yi Mikyeng: ---kekise nato cwucey palphyolul hakey toyse calyo cwunpi lul hayya
                       toynikka tangpwunkan naykun hamyense nal toptolok hay. calyosil kase
                       oykwuk capci phoham yeki cekhin calyolul chacha wa pwa. phanchok
                       ey tayhan cwucey nun mweka cohun cito chacha poko.
Kim Yulim: ney alkeysssupnita.----
Yi Mikyeng: (to O Yenglan) O Yenglan, neto poye cwe, neyka te nastanun kel. ne
                       yocum sillyek i ceco hay.

79. *in the office*
Yi Mikyeng: (to team members)-----tewuk te pwunpal hayse 1tung ul hay cwuki
                       palanta.----motwu O Yenglan chelem choysenul ta hay pwa.---motwu
                       pakswu hanpen chye cwe. (everybody claps) hamyen ta
                       tway.---eccaysstun swuko hayssta.----twiskelay hata palkak toymyen
                       ettehkey toynunci alci? kakca swukci hako manuy hanalato kulen ili
                       epski lul palanta. nanwe cwe.----(Ceng Uncwu faints) ppalli yanghosillo
                       teylye ka.

80. *in the office*
Yi Mikyeng: (to team members) ----pwulmisulewun ilto issessciman motwu tasi
                       pwunpal hay ttwie cwuki palanta. O Yenglan, Song Uncwu. mwusun
                       swutan ul sseselato phalaya hanta. haciman celtay phalci malaya toyl kesi
                       isse.----hantal kampong kwa simalse lo i ili maytup ciecin kel tahayngul
                       altolok hay. Kim pwucang nimi pocung ul sesinun thukpyel paylye ka
                       issusyesse. ta tul haysan. ah, Kim Yulim. calyo cwunpi onul pam kkaci ta
                       toyci?
Kim Yulim: yey, cwupi hako issupnita.

81. *in the office*

118

Yi Mikyeng:	swuko hayssnuntey ikel lonun pwucok hay. yuthong kwuco ccok ulo powanse tasi <u>sse wa</u>.
Kim Yulim:	ney.
Yi Mikyeng:	----ceki, eccaysstun <u>swuko com hako</u>.
Kim Yulim:	ney.

82. *at the hospital*

Kim Yulim:	ei, team cang nim, ettek hasitaka.
Yi Mikyeng:	twaysse. wusci ma. ------
Yi Mikyeng:	----Kim Yulim, ney ka <u>taysin ka</u>.
Kim Yulim:	etilyo?-----
Yi Mikyeng:	------kunyang kase ilehkey calyo poko kunyang ilkki man <u>hamyen tway</u>. ppali <u>setwulle</u>. ese. calyo cwunpinun ta twayssci?

83. *in the office*

| Female Subordinate: | ettek hayyo. kot seminar yellil theyntey. |
| Yi Mikyeng: | ettek hakin ppali <u>cenhwa hay</u>. |

84. *in the office*

| Yi Mikyeng: | (to a female subordinate) ppalli cenhwa <u>hay pwa</u>. -----hotel business pwu lo fax nehul swu issnunci <u>ala pwa</u>. -----penho <u>cwe pwa</u>.------- |

85. *in the office*

| Yi Mikyeng: | cal hay pwa. kase cengmal cal hay pwa. tan ku kosi i kos pota hayngpok hal kos ilakonun <u>kitay haci mala</u>. |
| Kim Yulim: | ney, kamsahapnita. |

2. Male Superiors
2.1. Request Speech Acts by Choy Kyengmin
2.1.1. As an Owner of a Construction Company

1. *in the car*

| Male Subordinate: | ce akassi maltaylo sacang nim ayin ilang tusyeya toyltheyn teyyo. |
| Choy Kyengmin: | caneyka kacyekase kulehkey <u>hay</u>. <u>setwulle</u>. |

2. *coming down the stairs*

| Choy Kyengmin: | ....ceycwuto towerto lul kacko <u>olla kaseyyo</u>. |
| Male Subordinate: | ney, alkeysssupnita. |

3. *in the office*

| Choy Kyengmin: | (to the five other male subordinate workers) sangsik kwa thulul kkayko kkwumul <u>capulan malipnita</u>. |

4. *in the office*

Female Subordinate:	cenhwa ipnita. Sinseng hwacangphwum pisesil ilapnita. Sinseng hwacangphwum sacang nimkkeyse kkok hanpen poypcako hasinun teyyo. enceytun cohuni yaksok cangso cenghay tallako...
Choy Kyengmin:	mannal iyu epstako <u>cenhay yo</u>.
Female Subordinate:	alkeysssupnita.

5. in the construction site

Choy Kyengmin:	(to a constructions worker) him tusikeyssci man tasi <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>. .....ka i kenmwul uy key point ipnita. kumankhum cwungyohanikka tasi <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Construction Worker:	kuke nun pwul kanung hapnita.
Choy Kyengmin:	pwulkanung ul kanung ulo mantule tuliciyo. (Choy breaks the window glass) iceyn tasi <u>hal swu isskeyssciyo</u>?

6. at home

Choy Kyengmin:	(phone) ku mwunceyn silsi selkyey tankyey eyse ....ulo <u>cipe</u>. thukpyel han cwumwuni chwuka toyci anhnun han kunyang <u>kapsita</u>. ng, ng, kulay, mamwuli com <u>pwuthak hayyo</u>.

2.1.2. As a Director

7. in the office

Choy Kyengmin:	----Cang silcang uy towum i philyo <u>hapnita</u>.
Cang Seyyeng:	ney.
Choy Kyengmin:	sinip ila sayngkak hako manhun coen <u>pwuthak hapnita</u>.----aphulo Cang silcang i kayinkyosup ul com <u>hay cweya hal kes kathun teyyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng:	ney.
Choy Kyengmin:	kuliko onul nayka choywusen cek ulo cheli hayya toylkey mwenci briefing com <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng:	ney, alkeysssupnita. ce, isa nim. eceyn ceyka silswulul.
Choy Kyengmin:	sinkyeng ssuci <u>maseyyo</u>. cencekulo nay calmos inikka.---

8. in the office

Female Secretary:	(phone) sangphwum kihoyk sil Cang Seyyeng silcang i briefing hakeyssstapnita.
Choy Kyengmin:	olla <u>olako hayyo</u>.

9. in the office

Choy Kyengmin:	swuko haysseyo.---- a, Cang silcang, cokum issumyen OBR Asia ciyek tamtang chong manager in doctor O wa kongcang kyenhaki issnuntey towumi philyo <u>hal kes kathsupnita</u> kwaynchanh keysseyo?
Cang Seyyeng:	cwunpi hakeysssupnita.
Choy Kyengmin:	a, kuliko ipen campaign event kwuchey cekulo caphyess supnikka?
Cang Seyyeng:	acik kolye cwung ipnita.

120

Choy Kyengmin: tayani epstamyen ikel hanpen pwa cwuseyyo. acik rough han choanse cengtociman Cang silcang i com te powan hanta myen cohun idea ka toyl kes to kathuntey.

10. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (to Cang Seyyeng) cohsupnita. chwucin hay cwu seyyo.

11. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: cohsupnita. (to Cang Seyyeng) iltan yenkwuso ccokto iyuka issul they nikka ku ccok uykyen to tule poko choysenchay ul chachtolok haseyyo.----

12. *in the hallway*
Choy Kyengmin: (while walking) Cang silcang,---- kaypalpi ka tultelato wuli manuy kes ul mantule nayya hayyo.--- kulayyo? ku SP 24 calyo cikum pol swu isssupnikka?
Cang Seyyeng: cwunpi hakeysssupnita.-------
Choy Kyengmin: alkyeysupnita. cwunpi hay cwuseyyo.
Cang Seyyeng: ney, kulem.
Choy Kyengmin: (entering the office) a, Cang silcang, camkkanmanyo.---- thulpyelhan kwansimul kacici anhassesstamyen ipeney hanpen cosa hay cwuseyyo. enu hotel enu paykhwacem i itten ceyphwumul pichihay nohnunci cosa hay posiko wuli sinseng uy ceyphwum i tule kal manhan tey lul ala poseyyo.----
Cang Seyyeng: ney, alkeysssupnita.
Choy Kyengmin: ------cen eyto malssum tulyessciman kulen cikwen ul pwuhalo twuko siphci anhuseyyo? ponsa pallyeng hanpen chwucin hay poseyyo.

13. *in the reception*
Choy Kyengmin: (to junior manager Yi and Cang) ----ca, kulem wulito sulsul wumcikye pol kkayo. Cang silcang, ceyanse com popsita.
Cang Seyyeng: ney. Kim Yulim,----- nay pangey ollakamyen thakcaey ....ceyanseka issulkeya. kacye otolok hay. lobby eyse kitalilkkey.
Kim Yulim: yey, alkeysssupnita.

14. *on the road*
Choy stops his car in front of Kim Yulim
Choy Kyengmin: (to Kim Yulim) thayo

15. *in the car*
Choy Kyengmin: Kim Yulim ssi. swuko haysseyo.
Kim Yulim: ney?
Choy Kyengmin: selyu ttaymwun ey nollakeyssci man kekceng hal philyo epseyo.----

16. *on the road*
Choy Kyengmin: (to Kim Yulim) ca, kapsita. camkkan tullil ttayka issunikka.

17. *in a hotel room*

Choy Kyengmin: (to Cang Seyyeng) hankwuke lo ssenayto cakiney tuli cikcep Phulangsue
 lo penyek hal they nikka hankwuke lo ssenayto kwaynchanh tako <u>cenhay</u>
 <u>cweyo</u>.

18. *in a hotel room*

Choy Kyengmin: kwucheycek in calyo cwunpi <u>halswu isseyo</u>?
Kim Yulim: acik cwunpi nun an twayssci man cwunpi hay pokeysssupnita.

19. *in a hotel*
Cang Seyyeng tells Choy that she should leave the reception.

Choy Kyengmin: Cang silcang un il pok to manhkwunyo. kulehkey <u>hatolok haseyyo</u>.

20. *in the office*

Choy Kyengmin: (phone) kongcang yenkwuso Yi Cwunsep yenkwuwen yenkyel <u>hay</u>
 <u>cweyo</u>.

21. *in the office*

Choy Kyengmin: (phone) kongcang phanchok sil yenkyel <u>hay cweyo</u>.
Kim Yulim: ney. Kim Yulim ipnita.
Choy Kyengmin: ----etil com kathi kassu <u>myen hayseyo</u>. kenchwuk hyephoy moimi
 issnuntey Yulim ssi ka ceycwuto seminar eyse poye cwun caychilo nal
 com towa <u>cwess umyen hanun tey</u>....

22. *inside the building*

Choy Kyengmin: (to Yi Cwunsep) kulem, nal *com* towa <u>cwusipsio</u>.----taumey tasi pwulu
 keysssupnita.

23. *outside*
Choy's car stops in front of Kim Yulim

Choy Kyengmin: (to Kim Yulim) <u>thayo</u>. (Kim gets into the car) onul un eti kkaci na chotay
 patun mom i lanun kel <u>icci maseyyo</u>.----um...pwul man kke <u>cwumyen</u>
 <u>twayyo</u>.

24. *in front of taxi, on the street*

Choy Kyengmin: (Yulim is in the taxi) a, kulikoYulim ssi to na chelem pwul ul kkeya hal
 il i issul ttay <u>yenlak hayyo</u>. towa cwultheynikka.

25. *in the office*

Choy Kyengmin: Hwayong paykwhacem ipcemkwen ey tayhayse nun nacwung ey com te
 sangsey hakey poko <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: ney.

26. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng introduces Ko Sungmi and Kim Yulim to Choy.

Choy Kyengmin: (to Ko and Kim) -----cal pwuthak hayyo. aylosahang i issumyen enceytun
                   tulle cwusiko. ca, kulem. (Cang, Ko and Kim bow) Kim Yulim ssi nun
                   camkkanman. (to Kim Yulim)---wuli hoysaka acik poho kyaythong i
                   an sese kulenuntey aphulo nay sokwan il ul nato molukey mith eyse cheli
                   hanun ke yongnap an hapnita.
Kim Yulim: ney?
Choy Kyengmin: tekwuna na molukey han ilul kacko wuccwul haysen an toykoyo.
Kim Yulim: isa nim. ce nun...
Choy Kyengmin: ----ca, kulem naylyeka poseyyo.

27. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (phone) (to Cang Seyyeng) cwunpi haseyyo. kathi kalteyka isseyo. ney.

28. *outside of MBC*
Cang Seyyeng: isa nim. mwe eyyo?
Choy Kyengmin: cohasseyo. kapsita.

29. *in the car*
Cang Seyyeng: sasil inkayo?
Choy Kyengmin: kitalye popsita.------

30. *in the research center*
Choy and Cang are walking into the research center
Choy Kyengmin: Yi Cwunsep ssi, tokseng test com pwuthak hapsita.
Yi Cwunsep: tokseng test yo? etten sample ipnikka?
Choy Kyengmin: ----sasil hwakin i philyo hapnita. kukesto onul pam an ulo....
                   ----onul pam an ulo kanung hakeysssupnikka?
Yi Cwunsep: tokseng test nun myech sikan cengto myen toyciman misayngmwul
                   silhem kkaci nun myechil kellil kepnita.
Choy Kyengmin: kulem, tokseng test kyelkwa pwuthe pwuthak haciyo. iken sikan ul
                   tathwunun cwungyo han ilipnita. ilcha kyelkwamanilato fax lo pwuthak
                   hapnita. nacwungey nayka fax pata olkos penholul allye tuli keyss
                   supnita. kulem, pwuthak hapnita.
Yi Cwunsep: yey.
Cang Seyyeng: a, cinan pen mascara saykkkal yayki haycwun ken chamko
                   hakeysssupnita. swuko haseyyo.
Yi Cwunsep: yey.
Choy Kyengmin: wulin haykyenl hayya hal il i issu nikka yeykan tasi hanpen mannapsita.

31. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: nayil achim cokan ey kutaylo i kisa ka sillin ta myen kos isa kanpwuhoy
                   ka yelliko kos chwukwung ul tanghasikey toyltheyntey....
Choy Kyengmin: twaysssupnita. naka poseyyo.

32. *in the hallway*
Cang Seyyeng: Kim Yulim uy hwanyenghoy ka kunche ...ey isseseyo.

123

Choy Kyengmin: a, kulayyo.tasi hanpen chwukha hantako kkok *com* cenhay cwuseyyo.

33. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: elyepkeyssciman capa popsita.
Cang Seyyeng: kkok chacha naytolok hakeysssupnita.

34. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (to Cang and Ko) iltanun yenlaki olttaykkaci kitalye poko chahwuey
pangpep ul kangkwu hay popsita. kyeysok swuko hay cwuseyyo.

35. *in the hallway*
Choy Kyengmin: ipen, sinceyphwum chwulsi event taytaycek ulo cwunpi hay cwuseyyo.
Cang Seyyeng: alkeysssupnita.

36. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng and Kim Yulim are in Choy's office
Choy Kyengmin: cohayo. ithul kan uy sikan yeyu lul tulicyo. cal hay pwayo, Kim Yulim
ssi.
Kim Yulim: ney.

37. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: icey Kim Yulim ssi ka wuli sangphwum kihoyk sil ey kitwung i tway
kanun kes kathunteyyo. ca, kulem. il tul poseyyo.
Cang and Kim: ney.

38. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (to Cang Seyyeng) kulehkwunyo. kulayto soliphphaykey tayhayse
pangpep ul chacha popsita.

39. *in the office*
Kim Yulim: (in the presence of Cang) ----tasi hapen ce eykey mathkye cwusipsio.
Choy Kyengmin: cohsupnita. chwucin hay poseyyo.
Kim Yulim: kamsa hapnita.

40. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: OK, alasseyo. choan *com* ppali cwunpi hay cwuseyyo. (Kim leaves the
room and Cang walks in)
Chang Seyyeng: ipen hwancelki ey ssul ceyphwum yongcise ey sign patule wassnun teyyo.
Choy Kyengmin: a, ku mwuncey nun Cang silcang i alase cheli hay cwuseyyo.

41. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: Cang silcang i Kim Yulim ssi lul towase soiphphaykul mantul tolok hay
cwuseyyo.
Cang Seyyeng: ceyka supporting ul halakoyo, ceyka cwuto hanun key anila..-----

Choy Kyengmin: -----nemwu minkamhakey pata <u>tulici maseyyo</u>.----ipen eynun sanghwangi taluko nato swukko kkuth ey naylin kyelceng i nikka ttala <u>cwusi ki lul palapnita</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: alkeysssupnita.

42. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: pantusi chacha <u>naytolok haseyyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: ney.

43. *in the office of the products planning department*
Choy Kyengmin: (walking into the office) (to Kim Yulim) chachass umyn twaysseyo. ppalli print hako briefing cwunpi <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.

44. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: Cang silcang, soliphphayk kyeypalul wihan project team ul mantul ess umyen hanuntey ettehsupnikka?
Cang Seyyeng: project team ulyo?
Choy Kyengmin: ---tankikan project team ul mantule wunyeng <u>hayssumyen hapnita</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: alkeysssupnita
Choy Kyengmin: Cang silcang i cenpan ul cito hay cwusiko soliphphayk project teamun sangphwum kihoyk sil 1,2,3 kak team eyse han myng ssik chachwul hako design sil, hongpo sil, marketing sil eyse han myeng ssik ciwen pata kwuseng <u>hay cwusipsio</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: cohsupnita, teamcang un nwukwu lo halkkayo?
Choy Kyengmin: mwe, tangyenhi soliphphak idea lul ceykong han Kim Yulim ssi eykey mathki nunkey <u>cohkeyssciyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: alkeysssupnita.
Choy Kyengmin: a, kuliko pwu teamcang kyekun yeksi kihoyk 1sileyse hanmyng senpal <u>hayya haltheykwuyo</u>.

45. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: chwulha sikilul nohchil swunun epssupnita. kyeysok pwunpal <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: ney.

46. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: kamsa pwucang nim. Yi Cwunsepssika way hantolo kassnunci hanto lo kassulttay kelaycoken un mwues i ess nunci ku iyu lul cosa <u>hay cwusipsio</u>. unmilhi <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>. ppalulswulok cohsupnita. poko to ce eykey cikcep <u>hay cwusipsio</u>.
Inspection Department Manager: alkeysssupnita.

47. *in the meeting room (after Kim Yulim's presentation)*
Choy Kyengmin: alkeysssupnita. onul iman <u>hacyo</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: ney.

125

Choy Kyengmin: Kim Yulim ssin, *com* nama <u>cwuseyyo</u>.
Kim Yulim: ney. (silence) isa nim
Choy Kyengmin: ce,
Kim Yulim: ney.
Choy Kyengmin: anipnita. <u>naka poseyyo</u>.

48. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (phone) sacang nim schedule hwakin hay cwuko cikum poypko siphtako <u>cenhay</u> <u>cwuseyyo</u>.

49. *in front of Yi Cwunsep's house*
Choy Kyengmin: Sinseng ulo <u>tola wa cwusipsio</u>.
Yi Cwunsep: tola kaya hal iyuka epssupnita.

50. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (phone) Hanto hwacangphwum Co isa *com* yenkyel <u>hay cweyo</u>.

51. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: iken hoysa lul wihan ili kito hayyo. yelsimhi hayse <u>towa cweyo</u>. kuliko, cwusik ----cipwunun ipen ili anitelato phoki hal myengpwunul chachko issessunikka <u>yemlye malayo</u>.---- ca, ese il <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Kim Yulim: ney, alkeysssupnita.

52. *in the office*
Choy Kyengmin: (talking to a research center head on the phone) ney, yenkwu socang nim uy palkun moksoli olay man ey tutnun kwunyo. kulayyo. kyeysok swuko <u>hay cwusipsio</u>. (hangs up the phone and talks to Cang in person)
Choy Kyengmin: ----sicang hyokwaey macnun cekceng kakyek ul cenghay ceyphwum kakyek ul setulle kyelceng <u>hay cwusipsio</u>.
Cang Seyyeng: alkeysssupnita.

53. *voice in Kim Yulim's mind*
Choy Kyengmin: selap ul <u>yele poseyyo</u>. loma hayng pihayngki phyo ka issul kepnita. cikum chwulpal hamyen mannal swu issul kepnita.

54. *in the office*
Cang Seyyeng: isa nim. kinyemsikcang ey cangep hyephoy sacang nim nawa kyeysipnita.
Choy Kyengmin: ney, kaciyo. a, Cang silcang. onul sikan *com* nay cwusil <u>swu isssupnikka</u>?
Cang Seyyeng: mwusun...
Choy Kyengmin: sikan iyo.
Cang Seyyeng: ney, cohsupnita.

126

2.2. Request Speech Acts by Kim Tonghwun (president)

55. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

Son Pyenghuy:	thwuca toyn kaypalpi ka akkawase cenmang epsnun ceyphwum kaypal ey ton ul ssota pwusnun kes un akswunhwan ul cholay hal ppwun ipnita.
Development Department Director:	cenmang epsnun ceyphwum i lanun kunke ka mwues ipnikka?
Kim Tonghwun:	kuman kuman, hoysa uy cakum sacengi i cikyeng i toyn kesey tayhaysen chaykim ul nukkipnita. haciman SP24 kaypal cwungtan mwuncey ey tayhaysenun ce eykey <u>mathkiseyyo</u>.

56. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

Kim Tonghwun:	ku Phulangsu hapcak caykyeyyak ken un talun saeppwu uy uykyen ul chwungpwunhi swuyong han taum ey AR cosmetic sa hoy uy O cenmwu ka tasi kepwu <u>hay cwukyey</u>.
O Ilto:	ney alkeysssupnita. kuliko kak saeppwu kitha anken i issu si myen malssum tul <u>hasiciyo</u>. e, cakum pwucang mal <u>hay pokey</u>. (Finance deparment manager says he has an important thing to announce)
Kim Tonghwun:	(to finance department manager) palphyo <u>hakey</u>.

57. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

Kim Tonghwun:	ku mwuncey nun siphan isa hako saep isa ka cal sanguy hay coceng <u>hatolok haci</u>.
Two Directors:	ney, alkeysssupnita.
Kim Tonghwun:	----isa nun uyyok man aphseywuci malko O cenmwu hanthey ppalli il ul <u>paywu tolok haci</u>. kuliko marketing isa nun onul pwuthe hayoy saep ul <u>matha cwusey</u>.

58. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

Kim Tonghwun:	(Choy and Son are arguing) kuman kuman,---- taum ankenulo <u>neme kapsita</u>.

59. *in the meeting room*
Directors argue about pine needle mask and about Yi Cwunsep.

Son Pyenghuy:	a, kukey mwusun soli ipnikka?
Kim Tonghwun:	ca, ca, echaphi il un imi sicak han il inikka Choy isa ka cal mamwuli hatolok com te cikye <u>popsita</u>.

60. *in the office*

Kim Tonghwun:	----ipen soliphphayk kaypal sengkong ul pathang ulo soliph chwuchwulmwul ul iyong han saylowun ceyphwum ul kaypal <u>hayss u myen hapnita</u>.
O Ilto:	cen acik siki sangco lako sayngkak hapnita.----

| Kim Tonghwun: | O cenmwu, iceyn kuman cacwung hasio. O cenmwun, totaycey enceyna cengsin ul chalil keyo. (beeping sound) tulye ponay. |
| Kim Tonghwun: | ----cen kaypal isa si p nita. ese osio. |

61. *at the restaurant*

| Kim Tonghwun: | (Cang Seyyeng and Choy Kyengmin talked about Kim Yulim's big contribution to the campaign) kulay? komawun akassi lo kwu man. aphulo ssul campaign to cal mamwuli hay cwukey. |

62. *at the restaurant*

| Kim Tonghwun: | (to Kim Yulim) Kyengmin kwun ul aphulo to kyeysok towa cwukey. |
| Kim Yulim: | ney. |

63. *in the office*

| Kim Tonghwun: | kulay, oketun palo manna. kulayse nayka hanpen mannacanh tako cenhay. talun solin ilchey haci malkwu. |
| Male Subordinate: | al keyss supnita. |

64. *in the office*

Kim Tonghwun:	sachay wumcikim ul cal cikhye pokey.
Male Subordinate:	ce, kulentey, cehuy Sinsenguy seypen ccay taycwucwu in ....uy Pak hoycang kwa yenlak i an toynun key amwulayto O cenmwu ccok ulo kiwun kes kathsupnita.
Kim Tonghwun:	acik soktan un ille. kyeysok yenlak chwihay pokey.
Male Subordinate:	ney.

65. *in front of the meeting room*

| Kim Tonghwun: | (to Choy Kyengmin) (while walking) -----monaci anhkey hakil palaney. |

66. *in the hallway*

Kim Tonghwun:	(while walking) haciman, caney to hayngtongkeci cosim hako isa tul ip ey olunaylici anhkey chelcehi kunmwu ey imhakey.
Choy Kyengmin:	ney.
Kim Tonghwun:	(to a male subordinate) kuliko,
Male Subordinate:	ney.
Kim Tonghwun:	ku Yi Cwunsep yenkwuwen un iltan cey kongcang cektanghan kos ulo ponay posio.

67. *in the office*

| Kim Tonghwun: | (after listening to Choy Kyengmin's conflict regarding Kim Yulim) ku yeca ka senthak hatolok nay pelye twukey.----- (Kim tells his story) ----motun kes ul ku yeca ka senthak hatolok nwa twukey. kulehtako casin ul ilhulken epse. ----kunyang tamtay hakey nakakey. |

68. *in the office*

Kim Tonghwun:	-----choyko kyengyengca lamyen enu swunkan ey kyeltan ul nayya haney. kukey olhtun kulutun malilsey. taysin nan caney ka han mal ey tayhaysen pantusi chaykim ul cyeya toyntako sayngkak haney. yelsimhi <u>hay pwa</u>.
Choy Kyengmin:	komapsupnita.

2.3. Request Speech Acts by O Ilto (executive director)

69. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

O Ilto: (to all directors) Yi Cwunsep ssi Phlangsu chwulcang swuko hayssko piyong mwuncey nun nayka cikcep chenghayse cosa hal they nikka onul un ikes ulo <u>machipsita</u>.

70. *in the meeting room (in the company meeting)*

O Ilto: (to Choy Kyengmin)-----selsa, ku uysa kyelceng i cal mos toyessta hatelato kyelkwa lul pwucengcek ulo yeychuk hayse mili phoki haysen <u>an toypnita</u>. Choy isa nun ipen il eyse namwu nun pwass nunci moluci man swuph un mos pwass eyo.----- Choy isa nun aphulo pantusi nay kyelcay lul patko wumcikyo cwukil <u>palayyo</u>. (to other directors) ca, onul un yeki kkaci <u>hapsita</u>.

71. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

O Ilto: (to all directors) icey taum, taum ken ulo neme <u>kapsita</u>.

72. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

O Ilto: (to all directors) poan ey kwanhan ken twu pen tasi enkup haci anhul they nikka hwaksilhi <u>hay cwuki palapnita</u>.

73. *in the meeting room (during the company meeting)*

O Ilto: (to all directors) motwu tul kanung han han motun route lul tongwen hay il ul cal cheli hakey <u>hay cwusio</u>. isang ipnita.

74. *in the office*

O Ilto:	tangsin hongpo isa ya. tangsin han tal tongan ssunun kwankum ulo taychey mwe hanun keya. ces salim hana, enlon hana mos capa.
Son Pyenghuy:	coysong hapnita.
O Ilto:	(to Son) kyengyeng nan ul iyu lo sacang toycin ul yokwu hanta. ike ssess swu. kunyang sse nayl ke la myen kako <u>hala kulay</u>.
Kim Tonghwun:	twaysse, epsnun il ssun kes to anintey sikkulepkey <u>halke epse</u>.

75. *in the office*

O Ilto:	ketup mal ssum tuliciman cen sasim un amwu kes to epssupnita. ocik hana, hoysa lul sallyeya hakeyss supnita. kuleki wihaysen Pak isa nim uy towum i celtaycek ulo <u>philyo hapnita</u>.
Director Pak:	tasi malssum tulli keyss ciman cen enu ccok eyto seko siphci anhsupnita.

O Ilto:	Pak isa nim kathun aymay han thayto ka hoysa lul i cikyeng kkace molko okey han kepnita.-----tasi hanpen malssum tuliciyo.---ipen imsi chonghoy eyse caycheng ul patusiko siphusita myen phapeley seko siphci anhu si ta nun sayngkak un pelisyeya hal kepnita.---- (Director Pak gets angry and leaves the room)
Finance Deparment Manager:	kaypal isa nun an toyl kes kathsupnita. salam i nemwu kocisik hayse...
O Ilto:	sangsa nun kulen salam hanthey mitum i kaci.
Finance Department Manager:	ceyka kyeysok seltuk hay po keyss supnita.
O Ilto:	seltuk tankyey cinasse. twaysse.

76. *in the company cafeteria*

O Ilto:	(to Kim Yulim) manhi mekko wuli yelsimhi ttwipsita. e, onul nato yekise mekko siphuntey... wuli cikwen tul hako yayki to hako....
Cang Seyyeng:	yey...

77. *in the meeting room*

Finance Department Manager:	kuntey ettehkey hasil sayngkak isinci...
O Ilto:	kitalye pwa.

78. *in the meeting room*

O Ilto:	(while walking) (to Director Kim and Son) kulayto Choy Kyengmin ku chinkwu honca haykyel mos hamyen kathi nasetolok hay.

79. *in the campaign*

O Ilto:	(to Choy Kyengmin) kulem, kyeysok cal hay cwukey.

80. *in the car*

O Ilto:	thayo, nay ka teylyeta cwul they nikka.
Kim Yulim:	ei, anipnita.
O Ilto:	ese thayo.----- ese thayo, ney? ppalli.
Kim Yulim:	komapsupnita.
O Ilto:	(to a driver) e, tulekaci malko cha ikwuey com seywe cwe. swuko haysse. Kim kisa, i pwun tayk kkaci mosye tulye.----aphulo kitay manhi hakyeysse. Kim Yulim ssi, cal hayyo.
Kim Yulim:	kamsahapnita. anyenghi kaseyyo.

81. *in the office*

O Ilto:	(to Director Kim and Son) eccaysstul tulinun somwuney uyhamyen Choy isa ka SP 24 kaypal keney tayhayse cengpo swucip cwung ilatentey kuttay cek pwuthe yayki hay popsita.
Kim Sengho:	SP 24 yo?
Son Pyenghuy:	ku michin nom anya. a, ta kkuthnan hwu ey mwulko nule cyese ecce keyss tanun kepnikka?
O Ilto:	(to Son) Ceycwu cisaey Yun sangmwu eykey cenhwa com hay pwa.

130

82. *in the office*

O Ilto: (with Son, Kim and Finance Department Manager) ---- ci talk capa
               meknun il mantulese coha haci malko Choy Kyengmin kayin ul
               kwungci lo mola neh nun il ul sayngkak hay polan maliya.
Son Pyenghuy: alkeysssupnita.
O Ilto: cinan pen sinmwun eyse chelem twithongswu chinun cakphwum ul
               hana mantule potenka.
Son Pyenghuy: alkeysssupnita.

83. *in the hallway*

O Ilto: (to Kim Yulim) (smiling) ---- nay pang ulo wayo.

84 *in the office*

O Ilto: (to Kim Yulim) i ccok ulo ancayo. (phone) nokcha twu can
               pwuthak hayyo. (O and Kim have a conversation)
O Ilto: wuli congcong mannapsita.
Kim Yulim: ney, cenmwu nim.

85. *in the office*

Finance Department Manager: cenmwu nim. pangsongkwuk sinin talent senpal
                               hyepchan sa lo cehuy Sinseng hwacang phwum i kyelceng
                               twayss tap nita.
Kim Sengho: mweyo?
Son Pyenghuy: ettek haciyo?
O Ilto: isahoy pwuthe chwiso sikhye.

86. *in the office*

O Ilto: kulayto naypwu sanep spy nun kkok chachtolok hay.
Finance Deparment Manager: alkeysssupnita.-----
O Ilto: (to Son) ------salam hana chacha pwa. ipi mwukewun
                               salamulo maliya.----Yi Cwunsep ul sanep spy lo
                               monun keya.

87. *in the office*

Finance Department Manager: ---insa tulikey.
Man: Cang Chwunghwan ipnita.
O Ilto: ancciyo.-----
O Ilto: cal cheli hay cwukey. wanpyek han olkami ka
                               philyo hay.-----wusen ku selyu ka Yi Cwunsep eykey
                               kenne kakey man hay cwukey.-------
Cang: (to a finance department manager) kulayto kecel hanta
                               myenyo?
O Ilto: kuttayn Kim Yulim ilan ilum man toymyen tway. cal kiek
                               hay twukey. Kim Yulim iney.

88. *in the office*

131

O Ilto:	(with Son, Kim and Finance Department Manager) te twuko pomyen antoykeysse. ku ilul chwucin hay.
Son Pyenghuy:	ani, kulayto, kuken com te sikan ul twuko....
O Ilto:	----cakum pwucang,
Finance Department Manager:	yey, cenmwunim.
O Ilto:	kongcang ccok ey ip mwukewun salam hana mwulsayk hay nwa.

89. *in the office*

Finance Department Manager:	ney, ip i mwukepko cektang han salam ul hana kwu hay nwass supnita.
O Ilto:	silswu nun epseya hal keya.
Finance Department Manager:	chacil epsi cwunpi ha keyss supnita.-----
O Ilto:	ipen Kim Minwu selliphoy sinceyphwum palphyohoy ttay ikel nehtolok hay.
Finance Department Manager:	alkeysssupnita.

90. *in the office*

O Ilto:	----soliphphayk ey pangpwucey lul nehtolok hay. (Son, Kim and finance deparment manager stay silent) way taytap tul i epse.
Finance Department Manager:	cwunpi ha keyss supnita.

2.4. Request Speech Acts by Kim Sengho (director)

91. *in the office*

Kim Sengho:	cochi haseyyo.
Cang Seyyeng:	alkeysssupnita.

92. *in the office*

Kim Sengho:	etise pwuthe cal mos twayss nunci chelcehi cosa hay pwa.
Cang Seyyeng:	ney.

93. *in the office*

Kim Sengho:	hwullyung han pokose ya. swuko hayssney.
Head of the Research Center:	komapsupnita.
Kim Sengho:	kyeysok pwunpal hay cwukey. caney ey tayhan cenmwu nim uy kitay ka khuney.
Yi Cwunsep:	ney.

94. *in a private place*

Kim Sengho:	(to a finance deparment manager) a, nayil chespal un cakum pwucang i chongtaylul maytolok haseyyo.

2.5. Request Speech Acts by Mr. Co (director)

95. *in the hallway*

Mr. Co: (while walking) ce ccok ceyphwum chwulsiko kakyek concept pantusi <u>ala nay</u>.

Manager Pak: ney.-----

96. *in the office*

Mr. Co: ----kuliko malya. na pamsay ilhayya hanikka cengmwun eyta panghay haci <u>mallako kulay</u>.

Female Secretary: ney, alkeysssupnita.

97. *in the office*

Mr. Co: (phone) a, Pak kwacang. na Co isa eyyo. caney nay il com <u>towa cweya toy keyss nuntey</u>. um tangyen haci, cikum tangcang. um kulay.

98. *in the office*

Mr. Co: ----eccaysstun soliphphayk kihoykan ul ppayss kkyess umyen wulin kukes pota te han kes ul ppaysse <u>olan maliya</u>. ala tulessna?

Manager Pak: alkeysssupnita

99. *in the car*

Mr. Co: (to manager Pak) ce chinkwulul wumcikil swu issnun mwenkaka issulkeya. <u>chacha pwa</u>.------

100. *in the hallway*

Mr. Co: (to manager Pak) (while walking) ----nayil achim tangcang Sesan ulo ttenal <u>cwunpi hay</u>. cohasse.

101. *in the office*

Mr. Co: (to manager Pak) Yi Cwunsep eykey i tape ul <u>ponay</u>.----

102. *in the presentation of new products*

Mr. Co: ----Yi Cwunsep ssi, ili *com* <u>wa poseyyo</u>. (Yi is walking toward Co)

103. *in the research center*

Mr. Co: ----sinkyeng <u>ssuci malayo</u>. ipcung toyn calyo ka eps canh supnikka?

Yi Cwunsep: haciman imi sencinkwuk eyse nun (Co interrupts)

Mr. Co: ----kuttay sayngkak <u>hay popsita</u>. ---oykwuk copy ceyphwum to cohko Yi Cwunsep ssi ka te cohun kel mantul eto <u>cohko</u>. cakphwum <u>hana mantupsita</u>.---- SP 24 kitay ha keyss supnita. kulem.

IV. Transcripts from *Yengwung Sinhwa*

1. Female Superiors
1.1. Request Speech Acts by O Cinswu (president)

1. *in the night club*
O Cinswu: han kaci man yayki halkkeyyo. talun ken cenpwu cikum kkaci
                 yelepwun tul i hay osyess ten kutaylo <u>hasimyen toypnita</u>. haciman,
                 aphulon celtay phoklyek un yongnap haci anh keyss eyo.
Hotel Waiter: anni, ayu, sacang nim. wuli ka pholyek ssuko siphese ssu nun key ani lan
                 mal ipnita. kakkum swul chwihan nyesek tul i na ku cil nappun nyesek
                 tul i yekise selchye tay myen yo. iltan wuli yengep ey panghay ka toyko
                 tto talun senlyang han sonnim tul kkaci to phihay lul ipkey toynikka.

2. *in the office*
O Cinswu: na Kim Thaywu ssi lul com te cwungyo han il ey ssuko sipuntey ettayyo.
                 nal *com* towa <u>cwul swu iss keyss eyo</u>?
Kim Thaywu: ilen kyengwu nun yenghwa eyse to mos pon kes kathun teyyo.
O Cinswu: nay ceyan ul pata tulyese sonhay pokena hwuhoy toyl il epsul they nikka
                 han pen cal sayngkak <u>hay pwayo</u>.

3. *in O's office*
O Cinswu: cohayo. cikum i sikan pwuthe ku ccok il ey tayhan motun kwenhan kwa
                 chaykim un cencekulo Kim Thaywu ssi eykey <u>mathki keyss eyo</u>.
                 philyo han key iss ta myen mwe tunci ciwen hal ke kwuyo.
Kim Thaywu: komapsupnita.
O Cinswu: hongpo sil ccok eyn imi yayki hay nwass unikka chwulkun to ku ccok ulo
                 hanun key phyenhata myen <u>kuleh key hakwuyo</u>.

4. *in the office*
O Cinswu: (to Thaywu) sikan kweynchah umyen itta cenyek ina <u>kathi halkkayo</u>?

5. *in front of a car, Outside of restaurant*
O Cinswu: onul pam nay chinkwu ka toye cwuci <u>anhullayyo</u>?.
Kim Thaywu: ney?
O Cinswu: <u>thayo</u>, onul kathi kipwun cohun nal kunyang tule kakin sepsep hal kes
                 kathun tey...
Kim Thaywu: a, ku ce...
O Cinswu: kecel <u>haci malayo</u>. nan kecel tang hanun ke silhu nikka. (to manager Pak)
                 ng, <u>twayss eyo</u>. onul pam un chinkwu lang tan twul i issko sipheyo.

6. *inside the car*
O Cinswu: mwusun yaksok incin moluciman onul un na hanthey sikan ul *com* <u>nay</u>
                 <u>cweyo</u>. <u>kweynchanhciyo</u>?.

7. *while dancing in the night club*

134

O Cinswu:	(to Thaywu) ku yeca salang hayyo? phoki _hayyo_, ku yeca.

8. *in O's office*

O Cinswu:	chwulcang cwunpi _ha seyyo_.
Kim Thaywu:	ney?
O Cinswu:	mwullon il i cal chwucin toymyen Thaywu ssi nun keki ey sacang ul lo nama isseya _tway yo_. cohayo. sikan i philyo hata myen chwungpwunhi sikan ul tuliciyo. haciman myengsim _hayyo_. kihoy nun yelepen oci anhayo.

9. *in O's office*

Manager Pak:	pwulu syess supnikka?
O Cinswu:	Pak pwucang nim kuman _twuseyyo_.
Manager Pak:	kuman twulakwuyo?
O Cinswu:	nunglyek i eps umyen kuman twunun key tangyen haci anhsupnikka? hyengphyen epsi ttelecin maychwul ayk ey tayhayse nwukwunka chaykim ul cyeya haci anhsupnikka?
Manager Pak:	cen kutongan i hoysa lul wihayse choysen ul ta hayss supnita.
O Cinswu:	kuman twulamyen kuman _twuseyyo_. cen cikum Pak pwucang nekstwuli tutko issul mankhum hanka han salam anipnita.
Manager Pak:	hoycang nim.

10. *in a hotel room*

O Cinswu:	mwullon nay ka cikcep kanpwuhoyuy lul cwucay hay alli keyss ciman iltan Kim pise ka nay uysa lul cental _hay cweyo_.
Secretary Kim:	ce, kulem cwungkwuk ccok saeppwu lul chelswu sikhil kkayo?
O Cinswu:	aniyo. cwungkwuk ccok saep un kyeysok chwucin hal ke eyyo.

11. *in front of an elevator at the hotel*

O Cinswu:	hotel kokayk tul i ssulteyepsnun oypwuin tul kwa cepchok toyci anhkey sinkyeng ul _com ssuseyyo_.
Male Subordinate:	ney, alkeyss supnita.

1.2. Request Speech Acts by Mrs. Choy (president)

12. *in the office*

Mrs. Choy:	ku salam cikum eti isseyo?
Executive Director Cang:	ohwu ey kanpwu hoyuy lul machisiko Chengphyeng pyelcang ulo kasin kes kathsupnita.
Mrs. Choy:	nayil tangcang kanpwuhoyuy lul socip _hay cwuseyyo_.
Executive Director Cang:	kanpwuhoyuy lul yo. icey pwuthe nun ceyka cikcep hoysa kyengyeng ey nasel kepnita.

13. *in the executive meeting*

Mrs. Choy:	ikes poseyyo. Kim isa. kulehkey nayakhan sayngkak ul hako issunikka onul nal hoysa ka i cikyeng i toyn ke anipnikka. talun hoysa ka ecci toyn

ken kuken cwungyo chi anhsupnita. Kim isa kathi kulehkey nayak han sayngkak ul hasi lyketun tangcang saphyo lul ssuseyyo. wuli Thayil un Kim isa kathi kulehkey nayak han salam philyo chi ka anhsupnita.

14. *in Mrs. Choy's office*

Executive Director Cang:	kulemyenun kwuco coceng uy yunkwak un etten pokan ul kaciko kyeysipnikka?
Mrs. Choy:	ku tongan hoysa kyumo ka nemwu pangman hay cyesseyo. cikum pwuthe hankyeysang kwakam hakey cengli lul hako 50% man kamwen haseyyo.
Executive Director Cang:	kulem kensel ccok un cengli lul hasil sayngkak isipnikka?

15. *in Mrs. Choy's office*

Mrs. Choy:	mwusun il i isseto kensel ccok un sallyeya hapnita.
Executive Director Cang:	haciman yocum kensel kyengki to cenpancek ulo pwucin hantey, ku cey sayngkak ipnita manun kensel ul phoki hanun ccok i....
Mrs. Choy:	kensel un Thayil silep uy mothay ka toynun hoysa eyyo. cey halapeci kkeyse nun notong hyencang mak notongca lo sicak hayse onul nal tay silep ul ilu khyess eyo. kensel ul celtay phoki mos hapnita.

16. *in the hallway*

Mrs. Choy:	Cang sangmwu nim ipen kongsa kkok Thayil i ttanayya hapnita.
Executive Director Cang:	thullim epsul kepnita.

17. *in the office*

Mrs. Choy:	Olyun kensel i etten hoysanci *com* ala pwa cwuseyyo. kuliko Kim Inwu wa Olyun un etten kwankyeynci casey hakey *com* ala pwa cwusikoyo.
Man:	cwulo etten myen ul----

18. *in the office*

Mrs. Choy:	wulin tasi pol il epskeyssciyo.
Man:	mwullon ipnita.

1.3. Request Speech Acts by Choy Hyeyyeng
1.3.1. As a Manager

19. *in the office*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	Cang sangmwu nim. saep i lan key wenlay ton ul pelca ko hanun ke aninkayo?
Executive Director Cang:	uh, kukeya kulehcimanun talun hoysa tul to cehuy wa machankaci lo...
Choy Hyeyyeng:	talun hoysa ya ettehtunci aphulo ilensik ulo hoysa saep ul halyeketun chalali hoysa mwun ul tatnun key nasciyo.

136

20. *in the office*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	Cang sangmwu nim, kanpwuhoyuy lul socip <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Executive Director Cang:	ani, mwe thukpyel han anken ilato issusipnikka?
Choy Hyeyyeng:	cikum isikan pwuthe ceyka emeni taysin hoycang cik ul math keyss supnita.

1.3.2. As a President

21. *in the office*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	(phone) cha tayki <u>sikyeyo</u>. pilla kensel hyencang ey nakal kke eyyo.

22. *in the office*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	Cang sangmwu nim, ce *com* manhi <u>towa cwuseyyo</u>. ce wuli hoysa kkok sallye nohko mal ke eyyo. swuko hasyess eyo.

23. *in the construction site*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	kuliko, yeki, inpwu tul,---- cal <u>hay cwuseyyo</u>.
Executive Director Cang:	yey, alkeysssupnita. choysen ul ta hayse cehuy ka cal hatolok ha keyss supnita.
Choy Hyeyyeng:	(to workers) swuko haseyyo.

24. *in the office*

Choy Hyeyyeng:	ng. alkeysseyo. tulye <u>ponayyo</u>.
Executive Director Cang:	mwe, talun cisi sahang epsusiciyo.
Choy Hyeyyeng:	cenyek ttay hoyoy kensel part tamtangca tul hako manchan cwunpi chacil <u>eps keyss ciyo</u>.
Executive Director Cang:	ney, hoycang nim.
Choy Hyeyyeng:	kulayyo.

2. Male Superiors
2.1. Request Speech Acts by Mr. Kang (president)

1. *in the office*

Mr. Kang:	mosiko <u>nakaci</u>. To pwucang, yenlak toynun teylo sonnim i wa kyeysi tako <u>yayki hay</u>.
Male Subordinate:	yey, sacang nim, nakasiciyo.

2. *in the office*

Mr. Kang:	(to manager To) ku Kim Thaywu lan nom maliya. caneyn ku nom ina yekise <u>ppaynay</u>. talko naolan yayki ka anila yeki naoci moshakey <u>halan maliya</u>.

3. *in the car*

Mr. Kang:	(phone) alasse. naomyen tasi poko <u>hako</u>. kulay.

2.2. Request Speech Acts by Kim Thaywu (manager)

4. *in Kim's office*

Kim Thaywu:	a, kuliko akka ku cola te tallaten sonnim ttaymwun ey saynkgak han ken tey nayil pwuthe nun umlyotay lul hana te <u>mantule cwuseyyo</u>. kulayse, siksa tocwung ey umlyo lul masinun sonnim tul eykeyn han can kakyek ey amwu umlyoswu lul senthayk hayse maumtaylo masil swu isstolok system ul <u>pakkwe cwuseyyo</u>.
Manager Pak:	kuken com konlan hal kes kathun teyyo.
Kim Thaywu:	iltan, nay yayki taylo silhem hay posiko nacwung ilato Pak pwucang nim malssum i olhumyen kuttayn nayka cheli hacyo. twaysssupnikka?
Manager Pak:	alkeysssupnita.
Kim Thaywu:	a,cha, kuliko, ku cemsim ttay hanchang sonnim tul i millye tul ttayn self service lul haci malko alupaithu sayng ul te sseselato cwumwun tul ul <u>patuseyyo</u>.
Manager Pak:	malssum kkuthna syess umyen.
Kim Thaywu:	ney, <u>naka poseyyo</u>.

5. *in Kim's office*

Kim Thaywu:	melcceng han koki lul ilehkey pelipnikka? pangpep ul <u>chacha poseyyo</u>. onul pwuthe tangcang sito lul <u>hay poseyyo</u>. cwupangcang hanthey thukpyel cisi lul hayse talun il ta ceychye nohkolato talk kasumsal lo mantun saylowun yoli lul kaypal halako <u>haseyyo</u>.
Kim Thaywu:	aphulo salad bar to umlyoswu service cheycey ccok ulo <u>pakkwe poseyyo</u>.
Manager Pak:	kulehciman yachaylyu nun wenak tanka ka pissa nwase.
Kim Thaywu:	com kwakam hay cil <u>philyo ka isseyo</u>. ttaylonun nami kamhi haci mos hanun palsang, kukesi maychwul ul ollinun tolphakwuka toyl swu ka issunikkayo.

6. *in their branch restaurant.*

Kim Thaywu:	(to manager Pak) han pen <u>tusye poseyyo</u>. (to restaurant staff) han pen <u>meke tul pwayo</u>. na lamyen mek keyss nunka kukel saynkgak <u>hay poseyyo</u>. kulemyen, i yoli uy ilum un chicken teriyaki steak lo haciyo. menu phan pwuthe saylo caylyak <u>hasikoyo</u>. tangcang sonnim tul i mollase cwumwun ul mos hal they nikka sisik corner pwuthe mantulese hongpo pwuthe <u>haseyyo</u>.

2.3. Request Speech Acts by Kim Inwu (president)

7. *in the office*

Male Subordinate:	iccok ulo oseyyo.
Yengwu:	hyeng
Kim Inwu:	yeki neyka weyn il iya?
Yengwu:	yo aphey cinakata camkkan tullye pwasse.
Kim Inwu:	naka <u>pwayo.</u>
Male Subordinate:	yey.

138

8. *in the office*

Kim Inwu: kutongan millin selyu *com* <u>kacta cwullayyo</u>?

Ceng Soyeng: ney, kulelkkeyyo.

9. *in the construction site*

Kim Inwu: tongcelki ey pwuthci anhkey <u>cosim hakoyo</u>.

Male Worker: yey.

Kim Inwu: yey, kuliko cacay tul celtay pwullyang <u>ssuci maseyyo</u>.

Male Worker: yey. cenpwu cengphwum man kola ssuko isssupnita.

Kim Inwu: a, kuliko meknun ke eyse <u>akkici mapsita</u>.

10. *in the office*

Ceng Soyeng: sacang nim. thoykun an haseyyo.

Kim Inwu: acik thoykun an haysseyo? nan sangkwan malko mence thoykun <u>hayyo</u>.

2.4. Request Speech Acts by O Sengcwu (president)

11. *outside (fight)*

O Sengcwu: kuman hamyen <u>twayssta</u>. kuman tul <u>hayla</u>. poki pota kang nom ikwun. kulay iwang sicak han ke nikka han pen yelsimhi hay posio.

Kim Inwu: nukwupnikka?

O Sengcwu: na Olyun kensel O Sengcwu lako hapnita. encey sikan namyen nahako swul ina han can hapsita. <u>kaca</u>.

12. *inside the building*

O Sengcwu: (while walking) ettayyo? ipen Thayseng opisteyl kongsa ipchal ey Kim sacang i wuli hako son ul capko hayss umyen hanuntey cansin isskeyss ciyo?

Kim Inwu: talun panghay man epstamyen kongsa nun wuli ka mathkey toyl kepnita.

O Sengcwu: a, ha ha ha, kulen ken yemlye <u>haci malayo</u>. kwichanhun nalphali ttey nun wuli ka imi hak ul chye nwass unikka.

13. *in Kim's office*

O Sengcwu: cokum ilato isang han hayngtong ul hamyen kot palo na eykey <u>yenlak hay</u>.

Ceng Soyeng: ney, al keyss supnita.

14. *in Kim's office*

O Sengcwu: cacay mwuncey lamyen aphulo wuli ka alase hal they nikka Kim sacang un kongceng ccok eyman <u>sinkyeng sseyo</u>.

Kim Inwu: cengphwum ul ssuci anhko iltan pwulyangphwum ul ssesstakan nacwungey emcheng nan sako ka sayngkil swuto issta nun kel molusipnikka?

O Sengcwu: cal mos ala tul ess tamyen tasi han pen yayki hay cwuci. nen wuli ka koyong han welkupcayngi ey pwulkwa hay. aphulon tasi ilen mwuncey lo nal sengkasikey <u>mantulci ma</u>.

139

15. *in Kim's office*

O Sengcwu: mwel chakkak hanun moyang intey Kim Inwu ssi. tangsin un wuli ka
koyong han welkupcayngi sacang il ppwun iya. hoysa ton i elma tule
kako naka ken kuken tangsin i sangkwan <u>hal pa aniya</u>.

Kim Inwu: ceketo sacang i myen ku cengto nun al cakyek i isstako sayngkak i toynun
teyyo.

O Sengcwu: ku yaykin tasi <u>kkenayci masio</u>.

O Sengcwu: (to Ceng Soyeng) camkkan na <u>com poci</u>. (outside of the office) aphulo
Kim sacang hayngtong ul yusimhi cikye poko hanato ppacim epsi
na hanthey <u>poko hay</u>.

16. *in front of the night club*

O Sengcwu: (to one of the male subordinates) nen yekise <u>kitalye</u>.

17. *outside*

O Sengcwu: celtaylo silswu haysen <u>antway</u>. cachis cal mos hatakan nehuy tul un
motwu kkuthcang ita.

Male Subordinate: kulem Kim sacang un ettehkey halkkayo? Kim sacang ohwu ey ipchal i
iss nun teyyo.

O Sengcwu: o, kulay iltan ipchal kkuthnako <u>poca</u>. kuliko ku Soyeng i lan kyeycipay
amwulayto swusang hay. ku kyeycipay lul chelcehi <u>kamsi hatolok</u>.

18. *in Kim's office*

O Sengcwu: ei...Kim sacang. wuli cemsim ina kathi mekko ipchalcheng ey <u>kapsita</u>.

Kim Inwu: kuleciyo

19. *in Kim's office*

O Sengcwu: Kim sacang, wuli palam ina com <u>ssoyle kaca</u>.

Kim Inwu: ike way ilenun kepnikka?

O Sengcwu: amwulayto nen antoykeysse. <u>kkulko wa</u>.

20. *in front of Choy Hyeyyeng's house*

Choy Hyeyyeng: nwukwu seyyo? tangsin tul.

O Sengcwu: mwel twu pen ina mwule popnikka? mok aphukey. phyenhi <u>mosye</u>.