Self-Representation and Korean Honorific Shifts

Kyung-Ae Oh*

Duksung Women's University

Kyung-Ae Oh. 2014. Self-Representation and Korean Honorific Shifts. *Language and Information 18.1*, 53–74.   This study discovers the dynamic nature of an interactional hierarchy as well as an institutional hierarchy in the use of Korean honorifics. Data was collected from the conversations of two Korean female interlocutors. The interlocutors met for the first time in the U.S. and often changed their use of honorifics. The paper examines the method in which the two interlocutors negotiate hierarchies during interaction and how the negotiation is reflected in their use of honorific shifts. The paper also investigates honorific shifts in terms of self-representation to suggest that there is another hierarchy at work other than the institutional hierarchy. An examination of the data shows that the shifts occurred not randomly but strategically. The findings suggest that 1) interlocutors may negotiate interactional hierarchy during their conversation, often in the same sentence, 2) interactional hierarchy often cross the boundary of the institutional hierarchy to obtain interactional goals, in this case, intimacy, and 3) the utterance contents may play a significant role in the interlocutors' honorific shifts. (**Duksung Women's University**)

Key words: Korean honorifics, interactional hierarchy, institutional hierarchy, polite form, non-polite form, self-representation, utterance content

1. Introduction

In early studies, honorifics represent power and solidarity in an asymmetrical society (Brown & Gilman 1960, Brown & Levinson 1987). Later studies, based on earlier notions of honorifics as a representation of hierarchical society, provided grounds for the ambiguity and polysemy of the honorifics (Tannen, 1994). To account for ambiguity and polysemy, Japanese and Korean honorifics studies have focused on honorific shifts based on context (Maynard 1991, 1993, 1996, Cook 1996, 1999, Eun & Strauss 2004, Strauss & Eun 2005). Studies on honorific shifts have provided multiple frameworks for interlocutors' use of honorific shifts based on contexts supplementing each other. For instance, power in the use of language can be

* Duksung Women's University, Dept. of General Education, 33, 144-gil, Samyang-ro, Dobong-gu, Seoul, 132-714, Korea, Phone: +82-2-901-8506, E-mail: `kyungaeo@gmail.com`

accompanied by solidarity not mutually exclusive to each other (Tannen, 1994). In addition to previous frameworks, such as evidential approaches, investigating internal structure of human mind, or situational meanings, the paper proposes to consider self-representation in utterance content to account for honorific shifts.

Honorifics, reflecting interlocutors' negotiation of their hierarchy, index "positioning" oneself since they represent the relative status between two interlocutors. Positioning for Davies and Harré (1990) is the process by which speakers place themselves in conversation as participants in jointly produced story lines. Interactive positioning assumes one individual positioning the other. Taking up Davies and Harré's definition, Blackledge and Pavlenko claim that "positions are not stable entities, and people are continuously involved in the processes of producing and positioning selves and others, and in creation of new subject positions" (Blackedge & Pavlenko, 2001, p.249).

This paper will examine the method in which two Korean female speakers negotiate hierarchies during interaction and how negotiation is reflected on the constant changes of honorifics. This will specifically investigate honorific shifts in terms of self-representation that suggests another hierarchy at work in addition to the institutional hierarchy. As a result, this study offers an additional account to analyze honorific shifts: self-representation in utterance content.

2. Previous Studies of Honorifics

Honorifics have been studied as a method to display power and solidarity from the earliest studies (Brown & Gilman 1960, Brown & Levinson 1987, Lee & Chae 1999). In an early study of honorifics by Brown and Gilman (1960), the relationship between honorifics and power/solidarity is discussed for the honorific pronoun, T and V (*tu* and *vos* in Latin, *tu* and *vous* in French, *tu* and *vos* in Italian, and *du* and *ihr* in German). According to the authors, T indexes condescension or intimacy, while V signals reverence or formality. Developing the study, Brown and Levinson (1987) interpret honorifics as a grammatical code to convey an asymmetrical social ranking. However, the role of context is not considered as an indicator for the indexical process.

In contrast to the noncontextual approach, Tannen (1994) and Agha (1993) propose interactional approaches to honorifics. She argues that a unidimensional model of power and solidarity does not account for the co-occurrence of hierarchy and closeness because hierarchy creates distancing not closeness in such a model. She proposes a multidimensional model which accounts for the co-existence of closeness and hierarchy. Similarly, Agha (1993), while agreeing with Brown and Levinson's definition of honorifics as a grammatical code for asymmetrical social ranking, questions how the notion of grammatical code provides any analytic power to describe interactional variability. He, therefore, proposes that social status and deference entitlement should be distinguished[1].

The interactional approach by Agha (1993) and Tannen (1993) is also found

_____

[1] Instead of using Agha's terms, social status and deference entitlement, institutional hierarchy and interactional hierarchy are used in this paper

54

in recent studies of Japanese honorifics based on empirical research that shows the actual honorific usage is different from ideological usage. Okamoto (1997) illustrates that actual language practice has a wide variation and suggests that a speaker considers linguistic ideologies as well as multiple social aspects of the context. She further states that the complexity of social context and the diversity of linguistic ideologies create different practices which should not be treated as 'deviant.'

Empirical research also proves the shifts in honorific use based on discourse context and situational meaning. Maynard (1993), for example, states that the Japanese plain form, *-da*, is used when 1) a speaker expresses sudden emotion; 2) a speaker takes a narrative-internal point of view; 3) a speaker displays echo-response and questions; 4) interlocutors jointly create an utterance; 5) interlocutors are in an intimate relationship. Based on these findings, Maynard (1991:577) states that "the more the speaker is aware of *'thou[nanji]'* as a separate and potentially opposing entity, the more elaborate the markers for discourse modality become, one of which is the *desu/masu* [polite] endings."

Cook (1999) agrees with Maynard's discussion that a Japanese speaker chooses a polite or a plain form depending on the speaker's feeling of distance from the addressee; however, she suggests considering the forms' indexical meanings, since honorifics have multiple situational meanings in communicative practice in specific social contexts. According to Cook (1999:94), "the *masu* form indexes the speaker's self, which is acting 'in role' or the speaker-focused self-presentation. Meanwhile, the plain form, *da*, indexes the speaker's not acting in role or an absence of the speaker's self presentation." For instance, when a mother offers food to her child, the polite form indexes acting as a mother who has a social responsibility to provide food for her child. Cook (1999), developing on Maynard's (1996) proposal, suggests that (1) a plain form indexes an absence of self-presentation and addressee-deference and (2) the polite suffix indexes speaker-focused self-presentation and addressee-deference. Therefore, a speaker more likely uses a plain form when s/he does not act in role and do not show deference toward the address. Conversely, a speaker uses polite suffixes when s/he acts in role and show the deference toward the addressee.

Previous studies of Korean honorifics also follow those done on other honorifics. Many agree that social hierarchy and intimacy are considered prime factors in choosing honorifics (Lee 1999, Lee & Chae 1999, Sohn 1999, Strauss & Eun 2005). For example, Strauss and Eun (2005) state that the use of honorifics depends on age, gender, profession, and status. Lee and Chae (1999) elaborate the criteria of selecting Korean honorifics as: (1) relative and absolute age, (2) rank in school, work, and the military, (3) marital status, (4) genealogical lineage, (5) social status, (6) gender, (7) degree of intimacy, and (8) level of formality of the setting. Lee (1999) claims that age is the most important factor in selecting honorifics; however, he also states that rank could overrule relative age in some groups. Lee (1999) also maintains that such criteria are norms, not including everyday language practice as another criteria. He claims that interlocutors' common belief in appropriate honorific usage works as force in a speech community. Lee's argument is similar to Silverstein's notion of linguistic ideology, which states that "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived

language structure and use" (Silverstein, 1979, p.193).

Lee and Chae (1999)'s criteria adequately present a common belief of Korean honorifics; however, Lee's study (1999), based on empirical data, suggests that the honorific usage of everyday language practice varies and does not conform to the normative usage. Example (1) shows the phenomenon.

(1)   A son in junior high school says to his father:

appa, way ilekhey nuc-ess-e?
daddy why like this late-PAST-NPOL

'Daddy, why are you late like this?' (Lee, 1999, p. 92)

In example (1), the son uses the intimate level suffix, -e, although his father is higher in the hierarchy in terms of age and status in family. Lee explains that the son's unexpected use of a non-polite level is common because of the intimacy among family members, although it seems to contravene the norm.

Another finding by Lee (1999) is interlocutors' honorific shifts. He proposes that variability is created when interlocutors deliberately manipulate speech levels. Example (2) shows this manipulation.

(2)   A son says to his father when he needs allowance

appa, ceki pwuthak-i   hana iss-nuntey-yo
daddy, there favor-NOM one   EXIT-CIRCUM-POL

'Daddy, I have a favor to ask you.' (Lee, 1999, p. 92)

When the son needs an allowance, he produces a polite level, *-yo*, presumably because he thinks his father will give him an allowance because his polite level use will please his father. Lee (1999) terms this "the strategic use of honorifics" and defines it as "the conspicuous and conscious use of honorifics which speakers manipulate to achieve a certain purpose when the honorifics use is different with that of norm in one language community." (1999, p. 93)

Lee (1999), nevertheless, states that unequal social status and intimacy do not change even in the strategic use of honorifics because normative honorific maintains a balanced relationship regardless of the strategic use of honorifics. Despite his insightful argument regarding the strategic use of speech levels, it does not capture the interlocutors' manipulation of speech levels in ordinary interaction.

Strauss and Eun (2005) are also aware of honorific usage contravening the normative usage. Thus, although they state that "social stratification is an inherent factor when it comes to selecting an honorific form over non-honorific ones" (2005, p. 618), they point out that actual discourse is far more complex and does not simply reflect social stratification. That is, interlocutors alternate the use of honorifics, such as the deferential and the polite form, even in the same stretch of talk addressing the same interlocutor (Eun & Strauss, 2003, Strauss & Eun, 2005). They suggest that interlocutors do not simply follow static or relative institutional status but shift speech levels based on the distance between interlocutors

in moment-to-moment interaction. As a result, they find that the deferential form creates bounded distance between a speaker and an addressee, while the polite form establishes or reinforces common ground. Strauss and Eun's study is informative and deals with the most commonly used Korean honorific system; however, it is still limited to higher speech levels and does not address lower degree speech levels such as blunt, familiar, intimate, and plain.

Proposing a content-based approach to analyze Korean honorifics, the researcher uses Self-Representation (SR) to refer to a speaker's positioning toward the addressee. According to Bangerter (2000, p. 438), SR involves "self-disclosures about oneself as a person insofar as they are manifestly produced for self-presentational purpose or for related purposes of discursive face management". Two salient SR types are used to illustrate utterance content in the data: High Self-Representation (High SR) and Low Self-Representation (Low SR). High SR means that a speaker positions themselves higher than the addressee when talking about attributes, behavior, actions, or events related to the self. In contrast, Low SR means a speaker positions themselves low in the interactional context when talking about issues related to the self. Honorifics are a linguistic device to indicate status and solidarity between a speaker and an addressee; therefore, it follows that High/Low SR plays an important role to select speech level.

This study has two goals. First, it provides additional support for the phenomenon of honorific shift in Korean by analyzing the two most commonly used honorific levels, the polite and the non-polite levels A polite level refers to the polite level (see Table 1) and a non-polite level refers to the intimate and familiar levels.[2]. Second, this study examines the relationship between honorific shift and SR.

3. Data Collection and Method of Analysis

The data was collected in Santa Barbara, California in the fall of 2005. Two Korean females met for the first time after an introduction by a mutual friend. Sung was a language student in the city and was twenty eight years old. She had just returned from a trip from Spain and had agreed to meet Kang, who was thirty three. Kang was a grad student who had just arrived in the city a few weeks prior. They both agreed to audio-tape their conversation for research purposes. They both signed a consent form before audio-taping the conversation. Yet, when they started audio-taping, they came to have a problem with the recorder. Thus, the first part of the transcription shows their interaction to fix the problem.

The duration of the recording was two hours and thirty minutes, but only forty minutes of the conversation was transcribed. To minimize reactivity, the participants were asked by the researcher to have a natural conversation not considering the recorder in order to obtain authentic data. However, when the participants changed the venue of the conversation to a nearby coffee shop after forty minutes, the environment became too noisy to understand the details of the conversation. Thus, only data before the second venue was transcribed for the paper.

---

[2] A polite level refers to the polite level (see Table 1) and a non-polite level refers to the intimate and familiar levels.

The file name was SB212‗2005‗Oh. The data was first transcribed in Korean. The words were 6,821 in fifty-one pages. Then all predicates by each participant were marked. Data was analyzed based on conversation analysis because the method is often used for casual conversations between or among interlocutors. The researcher decided to use the conversation analysis method since the data was from the casual conversation between two interlocutors. The initial analysis indicated that the honorific shift was the most salient one. Consequently, honorifics were marked with acronyms for efficient analysis following three steps. First, all predicates by each participant were marked. For instance, S1 indicated the first predicate by Sung, while K2 meant the second predicate by Kang. The honorifics of each participants were then marked. Only polite level and a non-polite levels were used for this paper even though polite, familiar, intimate speech levels were also marked. For instance, S6/SP5 indicates the 6th predicate and the 5th polite level used by Sung. In addition, a polite address and intimate address were also marked. The second analysis showed that shifts were between polite and non-polite levels. Thus, familiar and intimate speech levels were categorized into a non-polite level. In addition, the researcher decided to focus on the honorific uses of speech levels since the address forms were rarely used by participants.

After the analysis, the researcher selected sections in Korean that could be used as examples in the paper and transcribed the sections using Yale transcription. Approximately 4 minutes of transcription was transcribed. The accuracy of the initial transcription was confirmed by the two colleagues for validity as well as subsequently confirmed by another Korean colleague.

4. Korean Honorifics and Speech Levels

Korean is a typical honorific language, and the patterns of honorifics are systematic (Sohn, 1999). Korean is, yet, rather complicated at first glance having honorific pronouns, honorific address terms, titles, vocative suffixes, lexical items, verbal infixes and suffixes to present the honorific system (Strauss & Eun. 2005).

While Strauss and Eun (2005) examine the Korean honorific system based on linguistic structure, Lee and Chae (1999) divides the honorific system into three categories based on whom an interlocutor shows deference: the agent, the referent, and the addressee. Invented example (3) illustrates two of the categories, the agent and referent honorific systems.

(3)　　a.　agent honorifics

　　　　　hyeng-nim-un　　　　　　ki-ka　　　　khu-si-ta.
　　　　　elder brother-HON-TOP height-NOM tall-HON-DEC

　　　　　'The elder brother is tall.'

　　　　b.　referent honorifics

　　　　　hyeng-un　　　　　halmeni-m-lul　　　　　　mosi-ko　　　　　gan-ta.
　　　　　elder brother-TO grandmother-HON-ACC bring:HON-and go-DEC

　　　　　'The elder brother brings his grandmother.'

The agent honorific system is exhibited by a title, -nim, and a verbal infix, -si- in example (3a). In example (3b), the referent, halmeni-(ni)m 'grandmother', is given honorific status by the honorific title, nim, and a lexical item, mosiko 'bring'. The referent honorific system in example (3b) defers the referent. The referent halmenim 'grandmother' is deferred; however, the agent, hyeng 'elder brother' in example (3b) is not. The referent honorific system is limited because it involves few lexical verbs, unlike the agent honorific system, which involves both by lexical items and a verbal infix, -si-. The verbal infix, -si-, is used with any word root, so it makes the agent honorific system more actively used.

The third category by Lee and Chae (1999) is the addressee honorific system, which is the most frequently used. While the previous two honorific systems defer the agent and referent in the utterance, the addressee honorific system defers to the addressee, who is present during the interaction. Unlike the agent and referent honorific system, which has two levels, the addressee honorific system has six different levels. Lee and *bi-* (1999) propose that the relative complexity of the addressee honorific system might be caused by a speaker's need to defer the addressee better because the addressee is present during interaction. Sohn (1999) and Strauss & Eun (2005) refer the addressee honorific system as "speech levels", which are displayed by verbal suffixes. Table 1 shows the six levels of verbal suffixes used in the declarative mood ranged from the lowest degree of politeness at the top to the highest degree of politeness at the bottom. The intimate form, -E indicates the alternation between -a, which occurs after a and o in preceding syllable, and -e elsewhere.

Low degree of politeness

Declarative	Examples
Plain (*-ta*)	pi-ka on-ta rain-TOP come-HON 'it rains.'
Intimate (*-E*)	pi-ka w-a rain-TOP come-HON 'it rains.'
Familiar (*-ney*)	pi-ka o-ney rain-TOP come-HON 'it rains.'
Blunt (*-(s)o/-(s)wu*)	pi-ka ocian-swu rain-TOP come-HON 'it rains.'
Polite (*-(E)yo*)	pi-ka wa-yo rain-TOP come-HON
Deferential (*-(su)pnita*)	pi-ka o-pnita rain-TOP come-HON 'it rains.'

High degree of politeness

[Table 1] The Korean Honorific Speech Levels (Sohn, 1999, p. 413)

Examples in Table 1 have the same meaning, 'it rains', but the level of deference differs from plain to deferential suffixes. According to Sohn (1999), the blunt level, -(s)o is disappearing from daily use, and the familiar level, -ney, is also becoming obsolete; consequently, most younger speakers use plain, intimate, polite, and deferential levels.

The data in this paper confirms Sohn's findings, showing no blunt and familiar levels. Since there is no deferential level either in the data, two levels will be used for this paper: a non-polite level (-E,-ta) and the polite level (-yo). This paper investigates the actual use of speech levels in everyday conversation and the next section examines how the speech levels are put to use in interaction.

5. Self Representation and Speech Levels

This section analyzes the role of Self-Representation (SR) in alternating honorifics. The questions raised are: (1) do interlocutors shift speech levels even within the same speaking turn as others have proposed?; (2) do SR and speech level choice have a systematic relationship? High/Low SR is closely related to the use of speech levels despite the appearance of random shifting between the polite and non-polite level; (3) do interlocutors also alternate between Low SR and High SR? I will also provide the reasons of interlocutors' honorific shifts and alternation between Low SR and High SR to investigate the shifts and alternation. Interlocutors do not always conform to the norm of using speech levels but either challenge or maintain an institutional hierarchy based on moment-to-moment interactional goals.

Regarding the first question, data show that interlocutors shift between a non-polite and a polite level. In the conversation between Kang and Sung, the non-polite level, -E, is expected to be the default form for Kang based on the Korean norm that the older speaker is higher on the social hierarchy. In contrast, the polite level, -yo, is expected to be the default form for Sung because she is younger than Kang. In the data, however, the younger speaker, Sung, frequently shifts from the polite to the non-polite level, contradicting the expectation that she should consistently use the polite level. The older speaker, Kang also shifts from non-polite to polite levels even though she is older than the addressee, Sung. Table 2 presents the frequency of polite and non-polite level used by both speakers.

	NON-POLITE	POLITE	TOTAL
KANG(OLDER)	173 (84%)	**30(16%)**	205 (100%)
SUNG(YOUNGER)	**139 (51%)**	134 (49%)	273 (100%)
TOTAL	313 (66%)	165 (34%)	478 (100%)

[Table 2] Frequency of Speech Level Use in the Data

Table 2 shows that the older speaker, Kang, uses a more non-polite level. Her 84% use of a non-polite level indicates that she maintains the institutional hierarchy since she is in a higher hierarchy than the younger speaker, Sung. Kang, however, does not conform to the institutional hierarchy all the time. Out of 205 utterances with speech levels, the older speaker Kang displays 30 occasions of polite

level use, covering 16% of her total utterances with speech level use. This result contradicts a common assumption that predicts the older speaker will not use a polite level. Kang is not the only one who challenges the institutional hierarchy. The younger speaker, Sung, displays 139 occasions of non-polite level use out of 273 utterances with speech levels, which is 51% of her total utterances with speech level use. Since Kang is six years older than Sung, this result contradicts the Korean belief that three or four years are the maximum age gap that allows a younger speaker to use a non-polite level (Lee & Chae 1999). Thus, the data indicates that interlocutors shift between a non-polite level and a polite level even with the same addressee. Why do these shifts occur? The interlocutors shift speech levels to achieve an interactional goal. The institutional hierarchy of interlocutors in the data is relatively static due to the age difference. However, the interactional hierarchy between them is dynamic. Okamoto (1997) suggests that the hierarchical relation creates a social distance. This social distance makes it difficult to create intimacy between interlocutors at different positions in a hierarchy whether it is institutional or interactional. The interlocutors in the data, who met for the first time, try to get acquainted in the interaction analyzed here. Their constant restructuring an interactional hierarchy might be due to their attempt to narrow the interpersonal distance due to unfamiliarity. The second question arising from this analysis is that if SR and speech level choice have a close connection. SR in utterance content provides insight into why a speech level shifts. A speaker's rank in the institutional hierarchy may not always predict her choice of High/Low SR display. For example, the older speaker in this study does not consistently display High SR and the younger speaker does not always display Low SR. The data shows that interlocutors may display both types of SR despite age differences. In addition, both types of SR co-occur with either a non-polite or a polite level. Table 3 illustrates the use of SR types and speech levels. The examples are excerpted from the data. (The form -ya is an allomorph of the non-polite form, -a.)

Style Mixing	Example
Low SR + Polite level	1. *ce-to kikeychi yey*-**yo**. 'I am also a person who can't handle machines.'
Low SR + Non-Polite level	2. *na-nun myesskay-wol tongan Leve lchil-man ha-nunke*-**ya**. 'For several months, I've only been at Level 7.'
High SR + Polite level	3. *ceil nophun pan-ul patun keyey*-**yo** 'I was assigned to the highest class.'
High SR + Non-Polite level	4. *elwulicip-en kunama cwungsang cengto toinun Leveliye*-**yo**. 'My house is still the middle or high level.'

[Table 3] Examples of SR and Speech Levels

Examples 1 and 2 in Table 3 show Low SR co-occurring with a non-polite and a polite level respectively. Prior to example 1, the researcher's tape recorder malfunctioned. The younger speaker says that she does not know the recorder well and that she is not good with machines. In saying so, she displays Low SR, and this co-occurs with a polite level, -yo. In example 2, the younger speaker reports

that she is retaking the level 7 ESL class although she has been taking the same class for several months. Low SR in example 2 co-occurs with an on-polite level,-ya (an allomorph of-a).

Examples 3 and 4 in Table 3 illustrate the use of High SR co-occurring with a non-polite and a polite level. In example 3, the younger speaker displays High SR by saying that she was assigned to the highest level in the ESL program. The High SR in example 3 co-occurs with a polite level. Prior to example 4, the younger speaker says that other students' housing, which the school arranged for them, is inadequate. Then she says her housing is better than that of other students. Her High SR co-occurs with a non-polite level.

Although both High and Low SR co-occur with either a non-polite or a polite level, each tends to occur with a particular speech level. Table 4 displays the rate of High/Low SR with speech levels in the data. The first column represents the relationship between Low/High SR with the non-polite level, and the second column represents the relationship between Low/High SR with the polite level. The bold face in each column represents the highest frequency of SR with the speech level. The "other" category is discussed in the discussion section.

			NON-POLITE			POLITE		
	LSR	HSR	OTHER	TOTAL	LSR	HSR	OTHER	TOTAL
SUNG	**47**	8	84	139	5	**73**	56	134
(Younger)	**(34%)**	(6%)	(60%)	(100%)	(4%)	**(54%)**	(42%)	(100%)
KANG	**59**	2	113	174	1	**14**	15	30
(Older)	**(34%)**	(1%)	(65%)	(100%)	(3%)	**(47%)**	(50%)	(100%)
TOTAL	**106**	10	197	313	6	**87**	71	164
(Average)	**(34%)**	(3%)	(63%)	(100%)	(4%)	**(53%)**	(43%)	(100%)

[Table 4] Relationship between SR and Speech Level

Table 4 shows that in the speech of the younger speaker, Sung, 34% of the time a non-polite level use co-occurs with Low SR, and the same percentage of non-polite level use co-occurs with Low SR in the speech of the older speaker, Kang. Conversely, High SR co-occurs with a non-polite level in only 6% of Sung's utterances and in 1% of Kang's utterances. While Low SR tends to co-occur with a non-polite level, High SR tends to co-occur with a polite level. In Sung's utterances, 54% of polite level use co-occurs with High SR, and 47% of polite level use co-occurs with High SR in Kang's utterances.

Table 4 indicates that the younger speaker uses a more polite level while the older speaker uses a more non-polite level, which confirms a speaker's relative age as an important factor to decide the institutional hierarchy of the speaker. The tendency of co-occurrence of the non-polite level with a Low SR, and the polite level with a High SR, yet, demonstrates the relationship between SR and speech level confirming that a speaker's relative age is not the absolute factor to determine the choice of honorifics. The relationship exhibits that interlocutors do not simply follow the institutional hierarchy but manipulate the use of speech levels on purpose.

Table 4 also does not show a significant difference between the two interlocu-

tors in the relationship of SR with speech levels. I assume that both of them try to make the interactional hierarchy more symmetrical to balance the asymmetric institutional hierarchy. This is possible because the interactional hierarchy has not been established since they have only met for the first time. This special circumstance is also shown in that High SR is found more than Low SR in both speakers' utterances. While they seem to want to impress each other by displaying more High SR than Low SR, they are being polite by a displaying SR with an appropriate speech level.

How do we account for the correlation between Low SR with a non-polite level and High SR with a polite level? I suggest that interlocutors combine these devices to negotiate the interactional hierarchy. The interactional hierarchy among interlocutors is dynamic even in a single stretch of talk, unlike a static institutional hierarchy such as age. Interlocutors systematically employ strategies to manipulate the use of High/Low SR and speech levels to both challenge and maintain the institutional hierarchy in order to achieve intimacy. For example, by displaying High SR, the older speaker might run the risk of reinforcing her social distance from the younger speaker. Therefore, the older speaker uses a polite level to mitigate the distance. However, the younger speaker might seem to be challenging the institutional hierarchy by displaying High SR, so she tries to maintain the hierarchy by using a polite level with High SR. Compared to High SR, Low SR can reduce social distance if it is displayed by the older speaker. However, if it is used by the younger speaker, it may magnify the distance. Consequently, the interactional hierarchy is continually restructured as interlocutors keep challenging or maintaining the institutional hierarchy. Thus, the style of mixing of Low/High SR and honorific suffixes might be the result of the interlocutors' constant attempt to maintain the interactional balance. Example 4 provides an illustration of the relationship between Low/High SR and honorific use. In the following example, Kang, the older speaker, and Sung, the younger, have been talking about their new life in America and their trouble adjusting. When the researcher, Kang, has a hard time setting up a microphone, Sung begins talking about her own problems with a laptop computer and two cell phones that she purchased in America.

Prior to the example, Sung has found out that Kang paid too much for her cell phone. Sung informs her that if she had a one- or two-year contract, she could have paid only 30 to 50 dollars and received a better phone than what she has now. Sung then gives an example of her own experience.

In the example, Sung first displays High SR by saying that she has made a wise choice in getting a one-year contract when buying her cell phone. She then displays Low SR by saying that she later lost the cell phone. In Sung's utterance, High SR co-occurs with a polite level, -yo, and Low SR co-occurs with a non-polite level, -a/e. (The polite and non-polite levels are in bold, and the abbreviations in the gloss are in the appendix.)[3]

(4)　　File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line: #83-98

　　　　　1　SUNG; ^Ce-twu　　　　　kulaykaci-kwu,
　　　　　　　　　I:HUMBLE-too:TOP so-and:CONN

---

[3] The @ symbol represents laughing.

            'I do too, so'

2   Ce-n   ^il-nyen-to   an-iss-ul

        I:HUMBLE-TOP one-year-too not-exist-ACC

        ke-ntey:

        thing-but:CONN

        'I won't be here for a full year'

3   ^Kulaytwu sonhay-ka ani-ese,

        nevertheless loss-NOM not-so:CONN

        'nevertheless (it) isn't a loss'

4   Il-nyen   kyeyyak ha-n   ke-^ketun-**yo**?

        one-year contract do-ADJ thing-CORREL-POL

        '(to have) a one-year contract'

5   (0.4)

6   @Kuntey@ @phone@ @^icepel-ess-**canha**.@@

        but   Phone   lose-PST-:NPOL

        'but I lost the cell phone'

7   @ ^Kulayse@@(H),

        so

        'so'

8   @Kulayse ^phone-ul   sa-llye-kwu,

        so   phone-ACC buy-PURP-and:CONN

        'so I wanted to buy a phone'

9   Ceil ^ssan ke   nayno-la-[kwu:],

        most cheap thing give–IM-and:CONN

        '(I asked them) to give me the cheapest one.'

10 KANG; [ung].

         uh-huh

        'uh-huh'

11 SUNG; ^Color ile-n   ke   pilyo-ep-ta-kwu:.

         color   like-ADJ thing need-not-DEC-and:CONN

        '(I told them that I) did not need a color phone.'

12   [Ceil] ssan   key   ^paykosip-pwul i-ess-**canha**.

        most cheap thing 150-dollar   DEC-PST-:NPOL

        'the cheapest one was $150.'

13 KANG; [ung].

         uh-huh

        'uh-huh'

14 (0.3)

15   [2Kulenikka   nay ^kes-to kulen   ke-yess-**e:**].

        for that reason my too:TOP like that thing-PST-:NPOL

        'mine was just like that.'

16 SUNG; [2Kuttay kulenikka ^chem] Phone-un   twaykey
         then   therefore first   Phone-TOP very

co-ass-e.
good-PST-:NPOL

'(my) first phone was better.'

In lines 1 through 4, Sung says she got a one-year contract for her cell phone even though she will be staying in the US less than a year because it would still be more beneficial for her. By saying so, she displays High SR to Kang, who paid too much for her cell phone. While she displays High SR, the polite level,–yo, in line 4 displays respect for Kang. That is, Sung mitigates her High SR in lines 1 through 4 by using the polite level. This is important in that she maintains the institutional hierarchy by using the polite level while she transgresses the hierarchical boundary by displaying High SR as a younger person.

On the other hand, she also maintains the institutional hierarchy by displaying Low SR even as she challenges the hierarchy by using a non-polite level. Consequently, a balanced interactional hierarchy is created. Immediately after, she implies that she is a better bargain hunter than Kang by getting a good deal on the purchase of a cell phone in lines 1 through 4; in line 6 she mocks herself for losing her phone and laughs at the same time. Here she displays Low SR to Kang by revealing her fault. While she displays Low SR, Sung decreases the social distance between herself and Kang by using a non-polite level, -a. If Sung had used a polite level, it would have emphasized her humility toward Kang in addition to Low SR. The Low SR co-occurring with the non-polite level in line 6 achieves intimacy because the non-polite level use prevents intensification of the distance between Sung and Kang.

In line 11, Sung again displays low SR by saying that she had to pay $150 to get a second phone, and this Low SR co-occurs with a non-polite level. As a result, she represents herself the same as, if not lower than, Kang, who also paid a high price for her cell phone. Low SR and the non-polite level use in Sung's remark in line 11 has the effect of creating closeness with Kang. Sung's successful achievement in creating intimacy in shown in Kang's utterance in line 15. Kang expresses her empathy by saying her own phone was the same as Sung's. By mixing Low SR and the non-polite level, Sung keeps a balance between transgressing and maintaining social hierarchy in most of her remarks. If Sung had used High SR with a non-polite level to achieve more intimacy, she would have risked being rude. Conversely, if she had used Low SR with a polite level, the hierarchy between Sung and Kang would have been reinforced. Then, the distance between these interlocutors, meeting for the first time, would have increased.

Sung is not the only one who displays Low SR in this interaction despite being of lower status. Kang displays Low SR in 29% of her total utterances with speech levels, and 98% of her use of Low SR co-occurs with non-polite levels. At first glance, it does not seem unusual that she uses a non-polite level because she is older than Sung, but mixing Low SR with a non-polite level suggests that Kang also pursues intimacy. Example (5) is one of the instances in which Kang achieves intimacy by displaying Low SR. After Sung complains about her new cell phone,

saying it does not have many music options, Kang replies that her own phone does not even have a musical ring tone.

(5)   File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line: #93-99

   1 Sung; Cheum Phone-un(0.1) Samsung-kke-y-ess-nuntey,
         first   Phone-TOP   Samgsung-thing-is-PST-CIRCUM

         'my first phone was a Samsung,'

   2   Color-y-ess-kwu   Camera-nun ebse-to ku-ke
        Color-is-PST-and:CONN Camera-TOP not-too the-thing

        Folder-hyung-i-ko   [toykey coa-ss-ke]tun-**yo**?,
        Folder-type-is-and:CONN very   good-PAST-CIRCUM-POL

        '(it) was a folding type and was very good.'

   3 KANG; [u,   u,   u.]
          yes, yes, yes.

         'yes, yes, yes'

   4 SUNG; kuntey   cikum hwaum-to umaksori-to   isangha-ko
         but:CONN now   chord-too musicsound-too strange-CONN

         sentayk-hal kes-to   pyelo   ep-ko   mak
         choose-FUT thing-too especially not-and:CONN terribly

         ccacungn-**a**.
         peevish-NPOL.

         'but (the current phone) doesn't have many music choices,
          so   I'm mad.'

   5 KANG; Na-nun umak-i   ^eps-**e**:.
         I-TOP music-NOM not:EXIST-NPOL

         'mine doesn't have music'

   6   [Na-n ^Bellsoli-pakkey eps-**e**@].
        I-TOP Bell:sound-only   not:EXIST-NPOL

        'I only have a bell sound.'

   7 SUNG; [^Ettek-**hay**.@@@]
         how-do:NPOL

        'what can you do?'

In lines 5 and 6, Kang states that her cell phone does not have musical ring tones, but only a bell tone. She displays herself as lower than Sung by saying that her own phone is not as good as Sung's, which does have a musical ring tone. Her Low SR co-occurs with a non-polite level, -e, in lines 5 and 6. Her remarks in those lines, along with the use of the non-polite level, narrows the institutional hierarchical distance between speakers and create intimacy as evidenced by Sung's remark in line 7, ettek-hay. The direct translation of the phrase is 'what can you do?'; however, it is a common expression of empathy among Korean people and it indicates that Sung takes a sympathetic stance in line 7. That is, Kang's deliberate display of Low SR co-occurring with a non-polite level successfully achieves intimacy.

On the other hand, Kang's use of High SR co-occurring with a polite level also shows her goal of achieving intimacy. Kang only uses High SR in 8% of her total utterances with a honorific suffix; however, 98% of her High SR use co-occurs with a polite level. While High SR can create distance between speakers, Kang is also being humble by using a polite level. If she followed the traditional notion that the older speaker uses a non-polite level, her use of High SR with the non-polite level would reinforce her higher status. Therefore, Kang appropriately uses a polite level when she displays High SR in order to maintain a balance between status and intimacy. Example (6) illustrates her use of High SR with a polite level and how it helps to diminish distance between speakers. After around 40 minutes of conversation at a restaurant, Kang and Sung decide to go to a coffee shop. Kang says that she will pay the check.

(6)   File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line #534-540
    1 KANG; na hwacangsil ka-ss-ta-o-ko.
              I   bathroom go-PAST-TRANS:come-and:CONN
          'after I come back from bathroom.'
    2 SUNG; ceki   anccok-ey   isse-**yo**.
              there inside-OBL EXIST-POL

          '(it) is there inside.'
    3 KANG; nay-ka kyeysan-ul   yeki kke-l   hal-kkey-**yo**.
              I-NOM payment-ACC here thing-ACC do-INT-POL
          'I will pay for this one.'
    4 SUNG; <H> eme.
              oh   my
          'oh my'
    5 KANG; lako malhay-ss-nuntey,
               say talk-PAST-CIRCUM
          '(I) said (I would pay) however,'
    6   ca cikap-i   eti-lo   ka-ss-**ulkka**?
             well, wallet-NOM where-OBL go-PAST-INTERR/NPOL?
          'well, where is my wallet?'
    7 SUNG; <@@@>

In line 3, Kang proposes that she will pay for dinner. By saying so, Kang reveals her higher status because it is a Korean custom that people of higher status pay for meals for those of lower status. However, she uses a polite level to mitigate her higher assertion of status. The mitigation is well evidenced by Sung's response. In line 4, she does not oppose Kang's generosity but expresses her surprise by inhaling and saying eme 'oh my', a typical exclamation among Korean women. It is notable that she does not express her gratitude by saying kampsahapnita 'thank you'. If she had immediately expressed her gratitude after Kang's offer to pay for her, it might indicate that she had expected that Kang would pay. That is, she would have treated Kang as a person higher in the hierarchy at the moment of Kang's

offer. By expressing surprise instead of straightforward gratitude, Sung accepts Kang's offer without being rude or too humble. Likewise, in lines 5 and 6, Kang says she cannot find her wallet, and displays Low SR co-occurring with a non-polite level. This remark, which could be embarrassing for Kang, mitigates her display of social status, who pays for whom, and makes it a somewhat comical situation. Kang's use of Low SR with a non-polite level dissolves the awkward moment of reinforcing the institutional hierarchy. Sung's laughter in line 7 confirms that the distance created by Kang's paying the check has been overcome.

Third question for this paper is alternation between Low SR and High SR. Interlocutors not only mix Low/High SR with non-polite/polite level, but also alternate back and forth between Low SR and High SR. I propose that interlocutors alternate between Low SR and High SR to maintain an institutional hierarchy while achieving intimacy. For example, Sung's remarks in line 1 through 4 in example (4) could be seen as blaming Kang, who did not get a one-year contract for her phone. Instead of running the risk of being rude by blaming the older speaker, Sung presents herself with Low SR right after line 4 by saying that she lost her first cell phone, and therefore had to pay a lot for the second one, which turned out to be worse than the first. Alternation between Low SR and High SR keeps the conversation going without being either rude or too humble.

In sum, the data confirms honorific shifts as shown in previous research. The data also reveal that the alternation between a polite and a non-polite level in Korean interaction does not happen randomly. Rather, the relationship between SR and speech levels is systematic. When the speakers display Low SR, it tends to co-occur with a non-polite level, and when their utterances display High SR, they tend to co-occur with a polite level. The speakers also alternate between Low SR and High SR. The systematic balance between SR and speech levels, and the alternation between Low SR and High SR can be explained if we assume that interlocutors shift within the interactional hierarchy to create intimacy.

6. Discussion

Social life is reflected in ordinary conversation as the basic form of organization for interaction (Schegloff, 1995). Institutional hierarchy in Korean society, represented by age difference in data, is salient in interactional conversation. This is evidenced by the use of the Korean addressee honorific system consisting of six speech levels. The institutional hierarchy is not, however, the only factor in a speaker's choice of an appropriate speech level in everyday conversation.

Along with the institutional hierarchy, an interactional hierarchy is important for choosing the appropriate speech level. Interactional hierarchy is created when interlocutors negotiate their hierarchy (e.g., positioning themselves as higher or lower in status in relation to the addressee) to achieve intimacy. The display of interactional hierarchy in a speaker's choice of a speech level differs at times from his/her static institutional hierarchy. The interactional hierarchy is dynamic, and this is evidenced shifts in speech levels. This opposes normative usage, in which a younger person should always use a polite level to an older person whereas the older person can use a non-polite level to a younger person. According to data,

a younger person uses a non-polite level along with a polite level while an older person uses a polite level along with a non-polite level.

The phenomena can be explained by speakers' attempt to fulfill interactional goals. Since the institutional hierarchy creates distance between interlocutors, they can cross the boundary between them by manipulating the use of speech levels. For example, the younger speaker in the data often used a non-polite level to reduce the status distance between herself and the older speaker. Example (7) displays such a case.

(7)   File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line #83-88

   1 SUNG; ^Ce-twu   kulaykaci-kwu,
              I:HUMBLE-too:TOP so-and:CONN

              'I do too, so'

   2   Ce-n   ^il-nyen-to an-iss-ul   ke-ntey:
            I:HUMBLE-TOP one-year-too not-exist-ACC thing-but:CONN

            'I won't be here for a full year'

   3   ^Kulaytwu sonhay-ka ani-ese,
            nevertheless loss-NOM not-so:CONN

            'nevertheless (it) isn't a loss'

   4   Il-nyen   kyeyyak ha-n   ke-^ketun-**yo**?.
            one-year contract do-ADJ thing-CORREL-POL

            '(to have) a one-year contract'

   5 (0.4)

   6   @Kuntey@ @phone@ @^icepel-ess-**canha**.@@
            but   Phone   lose-PST-:NPOL

            'but I lost the cell phone'

While the younger speaker Sung used polite level from lines 1 through 4, she shifts to a non-polite level in line 6. Her use of a non-polite level along with sharing her experience of losing the phone creates less social distance.

Conversely, the older speaker often uses a polite level to mitigate her higher status. Example (8) exhibits such as case.

(8)   File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line #536

   1 KANG; nay-ka kyeysan-ul   yeki kke-l   hal-kkey-**yo**.
              I-NOM payment-ACC here thing-ACC do-INT-POL

              'I will pay for this one.'

In example (8), the older speaker, Kang, mitigates her higher status, which revealed by paying for the check, using a polite level. As shown in the examples, interlocutors display a shift in their use of honorifics, demonstrating that interactional hierarchy does not always conform to institutional hierarchy.

These shifts in the interactional hierarchy do not happen randomly. It is suggested that High/Low SR in utterance content and a speaker's choice of speech levels have a systematic relationship. Schegloff (1995) claims that utterance content

is important in shaping grammatical structure. He suggests that aspects of grammatical structure should be understood as adaptations to the environment and at least partially shaped by interactional considerations. Considering that speech levels index a speaker's position in relation to an addressee, it is not surprising that High/Low SR in utterance content is integrated into a speaker's choice of a speech level. Furthermore, the speech level used with High/Low SR maintains a balance between the interactional and institutional hierarchy. For example, when a younger speaker overrides the institutional hierarchy by using a non-polite level, Low SR co-occurs with a non-polite level, demonstrating that the institutional hierarchy is still maintained to a certain degree. Conversely, if an older speaker uses the non-polite level, her high status will be reinforced. Therefore, her use of non-polite level co-occurs with Low SR to mitigate the hierarchy.

High/Low SR is important because it explains shifts in the Korean honorific system within a single interaction. Previous studies on Japanese honorifics have made a breakthrough in studying honorifics interactionally. For example, Maynard's (1991, 1993) interactional approach to Japanese honorifics explains when speakers shift honorifics from a polite to a plain level. As discussed earlier, she proposes that Japanese speakers shift from a polite level, -desu/masu, to a plain level, -da, in cases: (1) when the speaker exclaims, or suddenly recalls something; (2) when the speaker vividly expresses events scene-internally as if the speaker is present right there and then; (3) when the speaker expresses internal thought self-reflexively, including almost self-addressed utterances and monologues; (4) when the speaker jointly creates utterances whose ownership is shared; (5) when the speaker presents information semantically subordinate in nature or background information; (6) when the speaker is in an intimate relationship with the addressee where the speaker does not consider the addressee as opposed to self, expresses social familiarity and closeness. The cases narrated above are also found in the data. Example (9) demonstrates Maynard's criteria applied for the current data.

(9)   File: SB212‗2005‗Oh/Line #314-315

    1 SUNG; kulay na-nun cikum ilel tatty ppalli   nawaya-ci
             ok   I-TOP now   this time quickly come   out-COMM

        'ok, if I don't quit (my job) quickly now,'

    2   cikum an-nao-myen   pyengsayng yeki mukkye
        now   NEG-come out-COND all my life   here bounded

        iss-kess-**kwun-a**
        EXIST-DCT:RE-UNASSIM-NPOL

        'I'll stay here for the rest of my life.'

In example (9), the younger speaker, Sung, explains how she felt when she was working in Korea. She expresses her internal thought as if she was present right there and then, which Maynard classified as a case of shifting to a plain level. Another case of her classification, self-addressed utterances and monologues, is also found in the data. Example (10) exhibits a speaker's self-addressed utterance, which is almost monologue.

(10)   File: SB212_2005_Oh/Line #459-465

    1 SUNG; maycwu   umak Jazz-to   ha-kwu,
              every week music Jazz-ADD do-CONN

        '(they) have a Jazz festival every week'

    2   mwek-to   ha-kwu,   mak ilaykaci-kwu,
        something-ADD do-CONN very like this-CONN

        '(they) have something like that.'

    3   mannal Picnic-ey   salam-tul manhi ka-ketun-yo.
        everyday Picnic-LOC person-PL many go-CORREL-POL

        '(that's why) people go to the picnic (to the beach) a lot.'

    4   kacok-tul-i   mak,
        family-PL-TOP very

        'family too.'

    5 KANG; nay Style-**iya**,
           my Style-COP:NPOL

        'it's my style'

    6   nay Style.
        my Style

        'my style.'

    7 SUNG; um kukey nemwunemwu co-ass-**e**.
          hm it   very very   like-PAST-NPOL

        'hm, it was very very good.'

In example (10), Sung explains how it was to go to the Jazz festival on the beach. While she used a polite level in line 3, she shifts to the non-polite level when her utterance is almost self-addressed remembering how she felt at the time. Example (9) and (10) represent commonly occurring cases based on Maynard criteria. Table 5 indicates that Maynard's criteria account for a large percentage of the data. However, they do not always explain the shifts in the current data. Table 5 describes the difference.

	NON-POLITE				
	Maynard	SR	Ambiguous cases	Other	Total
SUNG (Younger)	54 (39%)	36 (26%)	19 (14%)	30 (11%)	139 (100%)
KANG (Older)	65 (38%)	58 (33%)	0 (0%)	50 (29%)	173 (100%)
TOTAL (AVERAGE)	119 (38%)	94 (30%)	19 (6%)	80 (26%)	312 (100%)

[Table 5] Non-Polite Level Use Explained by Maynard's Criteria and by High/Low SR

    The first column indicates the cases in which Maynard's criteria can be applied, and the second column indicates the cases in which SR can be applied. The third

column represents ambiguous cases in which both Maynard's criteria and High/Low SR can be applied but not distinguished. In these cases, it is unclear which model provides a better explanation. The category 'Other' in the fourth column represents a shift to the non-polite level which cannot be explained by either Maynard's criteria or SR. These cases are mostly past event-descriptions or other cases that have no clear explanation. In several cases, the use of a non-polite level is to avoid multiple incidences of the polite level because the consequential use of the polite level could reinforce institutional hierarchy.

Interlocutors try to maintain the balance between challenging and maintaining the hierarchy by not using the polite level repeatedly. The results suggests SR might need to be considered as another framework for honorific shifts in addition to Maynard's explanation. Almost all the younger speaker's data is accounted for when Maynard, SR, and ambiguous cases are counted. Table 5 shows that SR alone explains 26% of the younger speaker's non-polite level use, and when it is combined with ambiguous cases, it explains 40% of the speaker's shifting to the non-polite level. When it is summed with Maynard's criteria, 89% of the speaker's shifting can be explained. In the older speaker's use of non-polite level, SR alone explains 33% of shifts, and 71% of her shifting to the non-polite level can be explained when it is summed with Maynard's criteria. Overall, 74% of both speakers' shifts to the non-polite level can be explained when both Maynard's criteria and SR are applied. A large percentage of the data of the older speaker is accounted for; however, it is, still less accounted for when it is compared with those of the younger speaker. I assume that it is due to an institutional hierarchy; she is eligible to use a non-polite level since she is the older one.

Table 5 explains considerable amount of shifting to a non-polite level in the data in particular when it is combined with Maynard's criteria. It would have been useful to compare the results with findings for a polite level, but Maynard does not provide specific criteria as she did them for a plain level. SR, however, provides a large sum of explanation for honorific shifts from a non-polite to a polite level. Table 4 indicates that 58% of younger speaker' use of the polite level and 50% of older speaker's can be accounted for only by SR.

7. Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate three things. First, interlocutors negotiate interactional hierarchy, even in the same stretch of talk, as demonstrated in their strategic use of honorific shifts. Second, the interactional hierarchy often transgresses an institutional hierarchy to achieve interactional goals such as creating intimacy. Third, interlocutors' SR in utterance content displays its close relationship with honorific shifts and suggests a new approach in addition to previous studies on honorific studies. While previous studies account for a large part of honorific shifts by analyzing them with contextual meanings such as evidential approaches, a speaker's awareness of the addressee, or situational meanings, this study proposes an analysis of utterance content. The SR is positioning oneself in a relative status with the addressee during conversation. The speech levels in the Korean honorific addressee system co-occur with SR to mitigate or reinforce the institutional hier-

archy. The strategic honorific uses indicate that a speaker is the one who chooses honorifics based on content and does not simply use them based on static institutional hierarchy.

8. Limitations of the Study

It is important to note that the generalizability of the current research is low because it only analyzes one conversation. It also should be noted that the shifts occurred more often and were more salient because the two speakers had met for the first time. A relationship between them was not established at the time of recording. Thus, the findings from the study can have been more generalized if data is collected from different occasions by different interlocutors. Further studies might need to be conducted if the findings are applied to the general properties of the Korean language. The study suggests that future research might need to consider utterance content in honorific shifting and the negotiation of a hierarchy between interlocutors. Another goal for future research is to consider other types of utterance content in addition to SR.

References

Agha, Asif. 1993. Grammatical and Indexical Convention in Honorific Discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 3(2), 131-163.

Blackledge, Adrian and Aneta Pavlenko. 2001. Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Context. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 243-257.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1960. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 253-76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cook, Haruko M. 1996. Japanese Language Socialization: Indexing the Modes of Self. *Discourse Processes*, 22(2), 171-197.

Cook, Haruko M. 1999. Situational Meanings of Japanese Social Deixis: The Mixed Use of the Masu and Plain Forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), 87-110.

Davies, Bronwyn and Rom Harré. 1990. Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 20, 43-63.

Eun, Jong-Oh and Susan Strauss. 2004. The Primacy of Information Status in the Alternation between Deferential and Polite Forms in Korean Public Discourse. *Language Science*, 26(3), 251-272.

Lee, Ik-Sup and Wan Chae. 1999. *Lecture on Korean Grammar Theory*. Seoul: Whayun-Sa.

Lee, Jong-Bok. 1999. The Strategic Use of Korean Honorifics. *Language Research*, 35(1), 91-121.

Maynard, Senko K. 1991. Pragmatic of Discourse Modality: A Case of Da and Desu/Masu Forms in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 15, 551-582.

Maynard, Senko K. 1993. *Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, Emotion, and Voice in the Japanese Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Maynard, Senko K. 1996. Multivoicedness in Speech and Thought Representation: The Case of Self-quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 207-226.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1997. Social Context, Linguistic Ideology, and Indexical Expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 795-817.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1995. Discourse as an Interactional Achievement III: The Omnirelevance of Action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28(3), 185-211.

Silverstein, Michael. 1999. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In Paul Clyne, Willam F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The Elements: A Parasession in Linguistic Units and Levels*. 193-247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, Susan and Jong Oh Eun. 2005. Indexicality and Honorific Suffix Choice in Korean. *Linguistics*, 43(3), 611-651.

Tannen, Deborah. 1994. The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies. *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix: Abbreviations

ACC	accusative particle
ADD	additive
ADJ	adjective marker
CIRCUM	circumstantial
COMM	committal
COND	conditional
CONN	connective
COP	copular
CORREL	correlative
DCT:RD	deductive reasoning
DEC	declarative sentence-type suffix
EXIST	existential
FUT	future tense
HUMBLE	humble lexical item
HON	honorifics
IM	imperative sentence-type suffix
INTERR	interrogative
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative case marker
NPOL	non-polite suffixes, a plain, intimate, and familiar levels.
OBL	oblique
PAST	past tense
POL	polite speech lever, suffix, or particle
PST	past tense suffix
PURP	purpositive
TOP	topic case marker
TRANS	transferentive
UNASSIM	unassimilated