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This study documents the discovery processes of two Korean language students during their participation in a series of student-led Korean language workshop series founded on principles of cognitive linguistic (CL) approaches to Korean grammar instruction. Using the students’ verbal contributions to workshop discussions and activities as indicators of their learning processes, I examine how the students negotiate meaning and identify patterns within authentic discourse data to form understandings of Korean particular elements of Korean grammar: locative particles (저의 and 저에게서; -ey and -eyse), topic/subject markers (-은/-는 and -이/가; -un/nun and -i/ka), evidentials (-군, -네, and -더라; -kwun, -ney and -tela), and completives (V+ -아/어 버리다 and V+ -고 말다; V+ a/e pelita and V+ ko malta). Importantly, the students discover that grammar is a highly meaningful and creative system and that understanding Korean grammar requires recognizing it as a system unique from concepts found in other languages, especially English. The data also support the value of creating graphic representations of the conceptual elements of grammatical forms to guide student learning. Ultimately, the narrative, dialogue, and analysis presented here echo the need for language students everywhere to be recognized as capable and deserving participants in meaningful use of their target languages and call specifically for further research and curriculum development involving cognitive linguistics-based approaches to the thorough instruction of L2 grammar in general and Korean grammar in particular.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Some of the best advice I received in my early days of studying Korean came from one of my young English tutees, a middle-school boy from South Korea who had just moved to the United States. He was one of a group of Korean students whom I was teaching at the time, and the combination of our friendship and my ever-deepening respect for their determination to learn English had led me to begin studying Korean. Likely speaking from his own experience, the student said, “Grace, when you learn Korean, you have to forget English”.

I remembered his words without really understanding them until several years later. Indeed, I eventually realized, English and Korean are very different languages, each one its own, unique system. The more I heard about other languages, the more this appeared to prove true across the board. Just as my student had so wisely advised, the more I considered my foundation for learning Korean as a blank slate, the more sense I was able to make of the language. While being a language user in general and a second-time language learner (mediocre French from middle and high school classes) certainly helped me to approach learning Korean effectively, so did recognizing that it would not align smoothly with what I knew about language and conceptualization so far - just as French and English do not have one-to-one correspondence.

When I began to teach Korean in a series of Korean language workshops at my university, I knew that providing the students with tools to recognize and apply Korean-based patterns of cognition could significantly aid their studies of the language. Cognitive Linguistics (CL) was the ideal framework for this, as it advocates understanding of one’s surroundings on a very basic,
sensory level, in ways that are reflected directly in the target language. Once we understand how expert speakers of a language experience their worlds, it becomes much easier to apply those ideas back to our own language usage and negotiate creative and meaningful expressions to represent our own experiences.

The following study examines a series of an intermediate-level workshop I taught over one semester. Almost all of the workshop content for the semester was based in CL, and among those, four sessions were chosen for review.

The first session covered explores CL-based understandings of Korean locative markers -에 (-ey) and -에서 (-eyse) and is followed by a session on topic markers -은/는 (-un/nun) and subject markers -이/가 (-i/ka). After reviewing these, I discuss subsequent workshop sessions on evidentials -군 (-kwun), -네 (-ney), and -더라 (-tela) and completives -아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita) and -고 말다 (-ko malta). The first two topics, locative markers and topic/subject markers, were chosen for their high frequency across modes of discourse and their consistently insufficient and even misleading representations across several prominent Korean language textbooks. Evidentials and completives were chosen for their utility in conversational Korean and inconsistent explanations in the same textbooks. After a literature review and overview of the workshops and data collection procedures, I present each focus session one at a time.

Over a semester of researching and teaching CL-based approaches to Korean, I found not only that my frustrations with inadequate textbook explanations of Korean grammar were well-founded, but also that even relatively low proficiency students can build deep understandings of grammar and conceptualization through CL-based instruction.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

Cognitive Linguistics (hereafter ‘CL’) has been a growing field since its beginnings in the late twentieth century. Some accounts view that CL began in the 1970s (Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015; Langacker, 1986) with the groundbreaking work of a few scholars, while others see its start in the 1980s when the field began to gain momentum (Dancygier, 2017). The founding scholars of CL were frustrated with limitations of traditional approaches to grammar that emphasized prescriptive grammatical rules and derivations over practical usages and sought a model that would more accurately portray the presence of function and meaning in all dimensions of language (Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015). The resulting CL framework is informed by both cognitive science, particularly by gestalt theory of perception (Evans & Green, 2006), and theories of human social interaction (Heine, Narrog, & Langacker, 2015). It assumes that (1) language is directly based on human cognitive patterns, (2) our embodied experiences form the basis of linguistic meaning, and (3) grammar is meaningful because of how it is used (Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015).

Although individual scholars have their own approaches to CL, a few essential common understandings are found. First, CL values a so-called “usage-based” approach, which posits that meaning in language is formed by its usage, so language must be studied as it is actually used (Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015). Secondly, CL scholars agree that the most basic cognitive processes form a solid foundation for language. In observing the way humans articulate our experiences, CL scholars have found correlation to our senses, attention, categorization patterns, and more
(Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015; Evans & Green, 2006). Finally, CL argues that all aspects of language carry meaning (Dabrowska & Divjak, 2015; Tyler, 2012).

**Early works in CL**

The early beginnings of CL can be found in the works of a few scholars in the mid- to late 1970s. Beginning in 1976, Langacker developed “space grammar” (now known as cognitive grammar), arguing for an inherent link between linguistic meaning and human cognition (Langacker, 1986). He posited that syntax, morphology and the lexicon are aspects of the same system, and that grammar and lexicon are symbolic. In a major divergence from Chomskian grammar, Langacker’s space grammar also suggested that grammar is “almost entirely overt” and without “underlying structures or derivations” (Langacker, 1982).

Other scholars, such as Talmy, explored how our experiences in our physical world influence our language (Talmy, 1978a) and began to build up the field now called cognitive linguistics (Talmy, 1978b). Talmy’s framework of cognitive semantics details his claim that semantics is synonymous to conceptualization that has been situated within language (Talmy, 2000).

Cognitive linguistics saw a surge of new research in the 1980s as more scholars entered the field. Among those were Lakoff and Johnson, whose book, *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), challenged the linguistic world’s understanding of metaphor by claiming that far beyond functioning as an occasional and creative literary device, metaphor is an unavoidable and dominant part of our cognition and language. With metaphor redefined as an everyday, nearly unconscious phenomenon, Lakoff further argues in his 1987 book, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*, for the existence of conceptual categories stemming from our physical (“embodied”)
experience with the world. These categories, he claims, form the basis of our conceptual metaphor system, which is reflected in language (Lakoff, 1987).

Langacker (1987) put forth *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, a two-volume introduction to an approach to grammar based on conceptual symbolism, positing that grammar can be understood through gestalt theories of spatial perception. For instance, Langacker posits that relationships between two objects can be described in terms of “trajector” (the object in focus) and “landmark” (the reference point). This conceptualization shows a direct correlation to the “figure” and “ground” gestalts. Talmy illustrates this concept in the following example (** indicate an unexpected sentence) (Talmy, 2000, p. 314, in Thiering, 2011).

The bike is near the house

** The house is near the bike

In (1), the bike is the trajector and the house, the point of reference, is the landmark. This is logical according to gestalt theory of perception because the bike moves or exists in relation to the house (Langacker, 1987, p. 231, in Thiering, 2011); the house is stationary. Likewise, (2) is a less predictable construction because the bike (now the landmark) is much smaller and more likely to move than is the house (the trajector). However, certain instances do make (2) possible (Thiering, 2011). For instance, if the location of the bike is known and someone is looking for the house, the bike could become the landmark. In this way, the concepts by which the mind perceives the world are reflected directly in how we articulate our experiences in the world (Langacker, 1987). In his 2008 book, *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*, Langacker further argues that all grammar is inherently meaningful when considered an extension of human cognition.

Adding to the collective understanding of human cognition and language, both Fillmore and Talmy have worked extensively on theory of cognitive semantics. Fillmore, in particular,
developed a theory of frame semantics, which finds its basis in the concept of “frames” in psychology. Fillmore demonstrates that humans create sets of knowledge based on our experiences – collections of information that allow us to process, understand, and remember myriad situations and phenomena, from our five senses to highly specified concepts such as birthday parties (Fillmore & Baker, 2009). A frame for a kitchen, for example, might include all of the typical items that are found in a kitchen (appliances, dishes, counters, etc.) as well as an understanding of what happens in the kitchen, what the room symbolizes culturally, and personal memories within specific kitchens. Using these components of the kitchen frame, it is possible to recognize the kitchen of any home – from either a verbal or visual description – even though no two kitchens are likely to be exactly the same.

Talmy, on the other hand, defines his approach to cognitive semantics as “research on conceptual content and its organization in language, and hence on the nature of conceptual content and its organization in general”. In other words, the way we express our experience in language is a direct reflection of how we experience those ideas “generally” - physically, emotionally or perceptually (Talmy, 2000). This understanding of cognitive semantics differs from Fillmore’s frame semantics in that it focuses more on individual perceptions, rather than on the combinations of understandings for a composite idea.

**L2 Applications of CL**

Viewing language as a direct extension and result of human conceptual cognition, it logically follows that meaning can be found within all linguistic forms (Dancygier, 2017; Tyler, 2012). Expert users of a given language are generally able to navigate such intricacies in meaning with little difficulty – even subconsciously. However, for learners of a language, any given
utterance presents a chance for uncertainty: Which grammatical form is more precise? Which word better captures my intended meaning? Which verb tense should I use in this situation? With a perspective on language based directly in the cognitive experiences of its expert users, CL provides a strong foundation for language pedagogy. Rather than presenting learners with prescriptive rules (and exceptions to those rules), CL engages learners to think like expert speakers – to experience their world through the cognitive processes reflected in the target language.

Danesi’s (1995) concepts of conceptual fluency and metaphorical competence offer a useful angle for viewing learner mastery of the L2 in this light. In an introductory article in 1995, Danesi defines conceptual fluency as the ability to successfully use and comprehend metaphorical constructs in discourse, and argues for the inclusion of conceptual fluency as a target for L2 instruction (Danesi, 1995). Danesi (2016) also explains how metaphorical competence, or “the ability to glean figurative meaning from words in utterances”, is an essential aspect of language fluency due to the prevalence of figurative (conceptual) expressions in natural discourse (p. 146).

These concepts are especially relevant in areas of language education where focus is placed on developing learners’ abilities to use language naturally, appropriately, and strategically. To achieve conceptual fluency and metaphorical competence, language learners must understand how conceptualization factors into language use, and how context and expert user norms influence linguistic decisions. Curriculum based in actual target-language discourse (“usage-based approaches”) plays an important role in CL-based language instruction for this reason (Dancygier, 2017; Tyler, 2012). According to Tyler (2017), usage-based approaches “expose” learners to natural, contextualized language usage, allowing them to apply this input to the formation of their own meaningful language.
However, CL- and usage-based materials make up only a small portion of language curricula, which instead tend to oversimplify, diminish, or misrepresent the meaning and functions of target language forms (Jacobsen, 2015). Not only do such L1-centered materials fail to provide adequate explanations of target forms or contextually situated examples, they also lack the ability to demonstrate how those target forms are implemented by expert users of the language. According to Tyler (2012), language learners must develop an understanding of how target forms are used in interactions within expert speech communities before they can mimic those patterns for their own communicative benefit.

Several other scholars have been just as quick to attest the potential of CL-based second language (L2) curricula. Some authors have noted that conceptually-based errors are “most disruptive” (Danesi, 2008; Danesi & Grieve, 2010) and that this might be because conceptual systems differ by language, and a learner’s conceptual knowledge from the L1 can interfere with the development of an understanding of the L2 conceptual system (Jacobsen, 2015). Langacker (2008) notes that “compared to other approaches, [a CL description of language] is arguably more comprehensive, revealing, and descriptively adequate” (p. 8). Broccias (2008) points out the value of “noticing” on student learning through pedagogical applications of cognitive grammar.

Boers (2013) finds, through a composite analysis of nineteen studies on vocabulary instruction, that CL-based approaches to vocabulary instruction show consistently better results over other methods. In addition, Danesi (2003, as cited in Danesi, 2008) found that training students in CL concepts helps their conceptual fluency. Another study, in which students were shown diagrams illustrating the conceptual meanings of modals in relation to their root, metaphoric, and epistemic meanings, students who had access to these conceptual explanations
outperformed the control group in the application of modals to create boosters and hedges in their writing (Abbuhl, 2005, in Tyler, 2012).

A few scholars have pointed out possible benefits of applying Sociocultural Theory (SCT) as the pedagogical foundation for CL-based language instruction (Lantolf, 2011; Masuda & Arnett, 2015). SCT, developed in the early twentieth century by Vygotsky, has been widely applied to language education. Masuda and Arnett (2015) posit that SCT pairs well with CL-based instruction because both approaches understand that communication relies on “concept-forming” and claim that “both theories support concept-based linguistic explanations through highly visual models” (p. 14).

Combining usage-based approaches with sociocultural theories of learning, Verspoor and Nguyen (2015) propose a “dynamic usage-based approach” (DUB), a meaning-based approach to language study that relies of frequent exposure to authentic input and meaningful interaction involving target skills. Unlike traditional approaches to grammar, DUB focuses on interaction and negotiated meaning over emphasis on prescriptive forms, supporting the aim of CL-based pedagogy to emphasize the functions of target forms in specific settings (Verspoor & Nguyen, 2015).

Due to the emphasis on learner autonomy in the discovery-based Korean language workshops, much of the students’ learning processes in the workshops were self-monitored. Examining this phenomenon through Swain’s concept of “languaging” provides a revealing window into the learning processes of one particular student, “Jongyul”, who consistently verbalized his thoughts, connections, realizations, and questions. According to Swain (2009), the observable process of using language to reason through a concept (“languaging”) is evidence that language not only reflects thought, but also aids it. Further research, following nine students of
French as they took on learning grammatical voice in French, has also found that the more students use languaging to reason through a concept, the greater gains in understanding they see (Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki, & Brooks, 2009). Further, because languaging is a general cognitive process, Swain et al. (2009) show that the medium language of languaging does not necessarily have to be the target language. In other words, the fact that Jongyul’s languaging was expressed through English does not lessen its value in helping him to understand Korean grammar.
Chapter 3

Data and Methodology

3.1 Korean Language Program

The present study focuses on a series of weekly, student-led Korean language workshops hosted by an undergraduate student organization at a large research university in the United States. The parent organization to the language workshops was established to represent Korean culture within the university and educate the general student body on Korean history, tradition, and modern society. While serving as president of this student organization, I noticed that many of the members were primarily interested in learning or improving upon their skills in the Korean language.

The “Korean Language Club” was created to address a variety of needs indicated by both students and Korean instructors within the university. Several students who were enrolled in Korean language courses expressed frustration with having no setting outside of their classrooms in which to practice Korean, and other students’ schedules did not allow room to take Korean classes at all. In addition, the instructors in the university’s Korean language program suggested that students were curious about more aspects of the Korean language and culture than could be covered in University language courses. Additionally, within the executive board of the student organization, several students, both first language users of Korean and intermediate to advanced Korean language learners, expressed an interest in teaching Korean to other students.

The Korean Language Club meetings were held one evening per week for approximately 90 minutes. Four levels were created to match student needs and students placed themselves:
Hangul Class: Absolute beginning (starts with literacy in the Korean alphabet, Hangul)
Class 1: Beginning (assumes initial ability to read and write)
Class 2: Intermediate
Class 3: Advanced

The Korean Language Club was piloted for one semester before data were collected for the present study in its second semester. In both terms, the Hangul Class lacked consistent attendance. This was most likely because its members, absolute beginning speakers who were not enrolled in formal Korean classes, were presumably the least invested in learning Korean.

3.2 Participants

Participants for this study were recruited from the existing attendees of the Korean language workshops’ intermediate class (Class 2). The workshops were promoted heavily at the beginning of the semester through a campus-wide involvement fair and class visits to each section of university Korean language classes. The study was introduced primarily in the first and second workshop meetings, and individually to a few students who joined the meetings in the following weeks. Non-consenting students were carefully excluded from all data collection.

Class 2 had two consenting students throughout the semester. Jongyul (self-determined pseudonym), who appears in each session featured here, is a Korean-American student who sought out the workshops as a way to connect to his heritage. At the time, he was a second-year university student. Although he heard Korean being spoken in his home growing up, he was raised to speak English. As a result, Jongyul is able to understand and/or recognize a variety of simple and conversational words, phrases and grammatical features, but his capacity for oral expression is limited. Although he had attended 한글학교 (hankulhakkyo; basic Korean language classes for heritage children) when he was young, his busy academic schedule and the lack of coursework
that would complement his unique skills set kept him from enrolling in a University Korean language course.

The other student in Class 2, Anna (self-determined pseudonym) joined the workshops in the middle of the semester and is seen only in the final workshop featured here (Chapter 7, completives). Anna was at the time a first-year university student who was enrolled in a second-semester Korean language course at the University. She also reported speaking Kannada (a Southwest Indian language) as her mother tongue, as well as intermediate French, which she learned through school. She reported an intermediate to advanced ability to understand spoken Hindi. Anna’s goals in learning Korean included understanding Korean music and TV shows and later being able to successfully communicate when traveling to Korea.

### 3.3 Curriculum Design

Each workshop’s curriculum was designed to use cognitive grammar approaches to help students (1) see and interact with the connection between grammar and meaning and (2) increase their own conversational abilities, a goal articulated by both students (see 3.4 Data Collection). The content of each workshop was designed with input from one or more CL-based studies of the target forms. The lessons were occasionally supplemented by other relevant perspectives. Because the workshop topics were designed specifically for the students who regularly attended the sessions, sessions began by asking students what they already understood about the target forms. An explanation of a CL perspective on the form(s) was then presented and an analysis activity followed. Analysis activities relied on actual discourse samples, supplemented with example sentences from analyses cited. This emphasis on “usage-based” language is central to CL because
accurate language analysis – and thereby, effective language teaching – necessitates considering language as it is used and understood in actual practice (Tyler, 2012, pp. 23–25). Throughout, students were asked to lead the analyses and apply their background knowledge, concepts from our discussions, and evidence from example sentences to formulate an accurate picture of the target forms. This approach was intended to support learner autonomy and increase students’ understanding of the target forms by allowing them to engage directly in defining their meanings.

3.4 Data Collection

The first data gathered from participants was an initial survey, which collected information on participant age, year/degree in university, major, background in learning Korean, other languages spoken, self-described strengths and weaknesses in Korean, expectations for the workshops, and present and future applications for Korean. This was followed by a mid-semester survey as close to the middle of the semester as possible (depending on student attendance) and a final survey immediately following the last workshop sessions. Mid-semester surveys were designed to gauge student engagement in and satisfaction with the workshops. Questions focused on workshop attendance, study of Korean outside of the workshops, reasons for studying Korean, and how the workshop supports or fails to support individual learning styles and goals. The final survey asked about plans to pursue a minor in Korean (a major was not available at this point), self-described strengths and weaknesses in Korean, reflection on experience in the workshops vis-à-vis initial expectations, plans to take further Korean classes, and current and future applications of Korean language.
In addition to the surveys, each workshop session for each level was recorded through video. The camera angle was oriented to include the consenting students, the teacher and the chalkboard. Audiovisual data from four of these recordings were analyzed.

3.5 Data Selection

Out of eleven workshop sessions during the semester, four were chosen for analysis. Two sessions from early in the semester (sessions three and four, focusing on locative particles and topic/subject markers, respectively) were followed by a mid-semester workshop (session 5, evidentials) and an end-of-semester workshop (session 10, completives). Because there were a few weeks during the semester when workshops were cancelled for various reasons (i.e. weather, student scheduling conflicts, etc.), these workshops occurred in weeks 4, 5, 7, and 14 of the semester.

The topics of each workshop during the semester were chosen based on a few criteria. Most heavily considered was applicability of the topics to the students’ practical usage of Korean in comparison to their typical textbook representations. Both locative particles (session 3) and topic and subject markers (session 4) are high frequency forms, but their representations in textbooks often falls short of fully explaining their meanings. Evidentials (session 5) are commonly included in beginner or intermediate materials, but my attempts to find textbook explanations that accurately depicted their conceptual and aspectual meanings, as well as the differences between the forms, proved unsuccessful. In contrast to their cursory explanations, these forms are highly useful in conversation, narration, and self-talk. Completives were also chosen for their applicability. Although Class 2 was intended for students studying at the low-intermediate level, I was confident
that the students could build an understanding of two forms of completives, which are typically reserved for high-intermediate levels if they are covered at all. Completives provide an avenue to express both conceptual meaning and affective stance, so they were one tool I wanted to provide to the Class 2 students to aid their goal of building communicative skills.

3.6 Presentation and Analysis

Audiovisual data from the workshops were transcribed and analyzed according to student contributions to the workshop sessions. In transcriptions, students’ speech is noted by their pseudonyms, and “R” indicates “researcher” - my own speech. English and Korean were often mixed throughout the workshops; wherever Korean is used, an English translation is provided in brackets below the original transcription in Hangul.

Given the small-group setting afforded by the workshops and the students’ high level of engagement in analysis, it was possible to track student learning through their questions and articulated observations. Due to the timing of the workshops (sessions usually ended close to nine o’clock p.m. and were followed by teacher meetings), it was difficult to conduct stimulated recall or similar reflective interviews. However, information that students included in their surveys did provide some basis for understanding their own contributions to the workshops.
4.1 Motivation

The motivation for this topic stems from the author’s observation of a tendency within Korean textbooks and other materials targeted to second and foreign Korean language learners to present locative particles \(-\text{에} (-\text{ey})\) and \(-\text{에서} (-\text{eyse})\) with explanations based in English prepositions, despite the disparity between the conceptual meanings of English prepositions and these Korean postpositions. Rather than attempting to compare two disparate systems, this workshop aimed to lead students to develop an understanding of Korean postposition location markers without relying on English-based concepts. This is in line with CL work by Jacobsen (2015, p. 104), who notes that L1 conceptual systems can introduce substantial interference when relied upon to teach the conceptual frameworks present in another language.

4.2 Background

Below, I introduce the construction of locative particles \(-\text{ey}\) and \(-\text{eyse}\) and discuss their traditional representations in the literature as well as in popular Korean language textbooks.
4.2.1 Construction

Locative particles -에 (-ey) and -에서 (-eyes) are so-called postpositions; where an English preposition such as ‘at’ would precede the item it modifies (hence, ‘preposition’), Korean postpositions directly follow and are attached to the end of the constructions they modify.

4.2.2 Traditional views of -에 (-ey) and -에서 (-eyes)

Korean locative particles appear as postpositions attached to the ends of nouns or noun phrases. The traditional literature on locative particles was examined through the works of K. Lee (1993), Sohn (1999), Lee & Ramsey (2000), and H. Lee (2000). Here, analyses of the particles are reviewed chronologically.

“Static” and “dynamic” may be the most prolific descriptors of -ey and -eyes, respectively, particularly in the early literature (H. Lee, 2000). H. Lee (2000) argues that these descriptors are also the most accurate. By this analysis, -ey marks stationary objects or locations, while -eyes marks entities or events that involve motion or change within their boundaries (H. Lee, 2000).

Offering an expanded framework, K. Lee (1993) divides the usage environments of -ey into two categories: in “locative expressions” -ey marks a static location; in “movement expressions” -ey indicates a destination. According to K. Lee’s (1993) analysis, which is built upon the figure-ground framework (Talmy, 1978a), -ey in a locative expression most typically denotes the ground in relation to a figure. In the same sense, K. Lee (1993) posits that -eyes indicates a “source” (p. 44) or “general background” (p. 43) of an action.

Sohn (1999) also divides -ey into two functions, which are not unlike those determined by K. Lee (1993): the “static locative” and the “goal” (p. 333-334). Sohn’s (1999) analysis likens the
“static locative” -ey to English prepositions ‘in’, ‘at’, or ‘on’ and the “goal” -ey to ‘to’ (p. 333-334). Then, Sohn (1999) finds the morpheme -se to index “inception” and “dynamicity”, changing the “static target”-ey into a “dynamic source” -eyse. Because of this, -eyse is used with verbs that entail “motion” or “activity”, and functions as the source from which such dynamicity stems, rather than as its final target or destination (Sohn, 1999, p. 334).

Lee & Ramsey (2000) include -ey and -eyse in a category of “locative case”, which they argue encompasses both particles marking location or direction in time or space and dative particles associated with animate nouns. This analysis shows that -ey can be used in a variety of contexts: to mark “location, destination, point in time, duration of time, extent of space, or cause” (I. Lee & Ramsey, 2000, pp. 150–151). Lee & Ramsey’s (2000) analysis of -se equates the morpheme with “from” and supports the perspective of -eyse as a dynamic source.

4.2.3 -에 (-ey) and -에서 (-eyse) in existing textbooks

Due to their high frequency, locative markers -ey and -eyse are commonly included in the beginning texts of Korean language curricula. Below, explanations of these forms in a selection of popular textbooks are reviewed. Textbooks selected are 재미있는 한국어 1 (Fun Fun Korean 1) (Korea University, 2008), 경희 한국어 문법 1 (Get it Korean Grammar 1) (J.-S. Kim et al., 2014), Active Korean 1 (Seoul National University Language Education Institute, 2006), and Korean Grammar in Use: Beginning to Early Intermediate (Ahn, Lee, & Han, 2010).

The texts reviewed here take a functional approach to presenting the locative particles. All four texts introduce -ey as part of a collocated phrase with 가다 (kata, to go) or 있다 (issta, to be
located]) before explaining the particle’s role in time expressions. Notes in brackets and parenthesis are my own.

Usage of -ey: locative particle + motion verb
(1) 친구가 한국에 왔어요. (emphasis original) [(My) friend is coming to (-ey) Korea.]
(Ahn et al., 2010, p. 81)

Usage of -ey: locative particle + static existence verb
(2) 침대가 방에 있습니다. (emphasis mine) [(The) bed is in (-ey) the bedroom.]
(J.-S. Kim et al., 2014, p. 39)

Usage of -ey: time word + locative particle
(3) 일주일에 한 번 극장에 가요. (emphasis mine) [(I) go to (-ey) the movie theatre once a week (-ey).] (translation original; emphasis and parentheses mine) (Korea University, 2008, p. 209)

The meanings of the locative particles are also explained according to their functions. Some books, such as Get it Korean Grammar and Korean Grammar in Use propose English equivalents of the particles to aid explanations. However, the following examples demonstrate the flaw of this approach:

“에” [-ey] is a time marker and attached to a noun indicating time. It is equivalent to English at, in, on.”

(J.-S. Kim et al., 2014, p. 68)

“에” [-ey] expresses the direction in which a particular behavior proceeds. It corresponds to ‘to’ in English.”

(Ahn et al., 2010, p. 81)

“에” is also used with 있다 [issta; to be [located]/to exist] and 없다 [epsta; to not be [located]; to not exist] to express the location of a person or thing. It corresponds to ‘in’ or ‘on’ in English.”

(Ahn et al., 2010, p. 81)

With just three short explanations from two textbooks, the language learner is left with four English “equivalents” for one location particle. While it is true that -ey could be translated to ‘at’, ‘in’, ‘on’, or ‘to’, depending on the context in which the particle appears, providing these potential interpretations alone is not enough to comprehensively represent the meaning of the target form.
Conversely, other books, including *Fun Fun Korean* and *Active Korean*, rely more on mechanical explanations:

“-에서 [-eyse] is used after a noun indicating the location of some activity. This has to be used with action verbs.”

*(Korea University, 2008, p. 85)*

“‘에서’ [-eyse] is a particle that indicates the place where the action of the verb phrase takes place.”

*(Seoul National University Language Education Institute, 2006, p. 149)*

It is possible to argue that presenting grammar with such a functional approach could be useful for beginning learners of Korean, who may be overwhelmed by detailed CL-based instruction. However, the lack of in-depth explanations in more advanced materials means that these less-than-complete illustrations of the target forms presumably represent the entirety of formal instruction students will receive on the forms, unless teachers are supplementing the textbook materials with additional explanations. The present workshop aims to provide instruction to intermediate-level understandings of locative markers -ey and -eyse.

### 4.3 Prior CL Studies on -에 (-ey) and -에서 (-eyse)

A few studies have worked to apply CL to teaching Korean locative postpositions. Strauss (2003), in a study on the morpheme -se (as in -eyse), proposes a framework of “groundedness”, based in REALIS and IRREALIS, forming a continuum of grammatical expressions containing -se and their counterparts without -se (as in -ey), with -se at the “grounded”/REALIS end of the spectrum. Other expressions analyzed in Strauss (2003) include -한테 (-hantey; (roughly similar to ‘to’ [for animate indirect objects]) and -한테서 (-hanteyse; ‘from’ [for animate sources]); -면 (-myen; ‘when or if’) and -면서 (-myense; ‘while’); -로 (-lo, ‘into; direction toward’) and
-(으)로서 (-(u)lose; ‘in the capacity of’), and others. Her analysis is applicable consistently across all forms that she addresses in her analysis, but in the interest of brevity, I will summarize her description of -se only as it relates to the locative markers covered during the workshop session in focus.

Strauss’s (2003) continuum of REALIS measures the meanings of expressions with -se versus the meanings of those to which the morpheme could be attached, but from which it is absent. On one side of the continuum, she places “high groundedness” and REALIS, and on the other, “low groundedness” and IRREALIS. While noting that the traditional views of -ey and -eyse to this point attributed the particles to source and ground, respectively, Strauss (2003) argues that the actual distinction is in the degree to which the expression indicates a true, fulfilled reality. For instance, Strauss shows that in the sentence, “나는 한국에 가요” (I go to (ey) Korea), the destination, Korea, as it is marked by -ey, is still hypothetical because the subject has not yet arrived. She contrasts this to the sentence, “친구가 한국에서 와요” (My friend is coming from (eyse) Korea), in which Korea, now as the defined point of departure, is “highly grounded” in reality and therefore marked by REALIS (Strauss, 2003).

In contrast, Jeong (2011) illustrates a model of -ey and -eyse in which each particle has a fundamental, spatial meaning. According to this model, -ey represents an ‘occupied location’ (Figure 1) or ‘point of achievement’ (Figure 2) (translations mine) at the spatial level.
Figure 1 shows a location (the square) with a small circle in the center. The location of the circle (here representing an object, event or concept) inside of the square (a physical or conceptual space with clear boundaries) is marked by -ey. Examples put forth by Jeong (2011) include the following. Translations are my own.

**Occupied Location -ey: Example sentences from Jeong (2011)**

1. 부모님은 집에 계신다. ([My] parents are at (-ey) home.)
2. 포유동물에 무엇이 있니? [What is [included] in (-ey) [the category of] mammals?]
3. 이 무더위에 어떻게 지냈지? [How have you been in (-ey) this extreme heat?]
4. 나는 아침에 운동을 한다. [I exercise in (-ey) the morning.]
5. 그것은 예의에 어긋나는 행동이다. [That is an action that is counter to (-ey) manners.]

Jeong (2011) conceptualizes the nouns to which -ey is attached as spaces with defined boundaries. In the case of a home (1), these spaces are defined by concrete, physical borders (i.e. the walls). However, in other cases, such as those of conceptual categories (i.e. mammals (2) or manners (5)), the boundaries are abstract. Other “spaces”, such as (periods of) extreme heat (3) and the morning (4), are defined through start and end points in time. Despite apparent variation...
in the concreteness of examples, each case shows either physical or artificial boundaries defining the location of the object in focus (Jeong, 2011).

“Point of achievement” (도달점), the second conceptualization of -ey put forth in Jeong (2011) is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2: -ey as “point of achievement” (Jeong, 2011)

In contrast to the “occupied location” illustration, “point of achievement” represents not a current place of existence, but a target point of arrival. This is indicated by the arrow showing the movement of the circle (the object in transition) from the outside to the inside of the square (the “point of achievement”). Like the “occupied location”, the “point of achievement” can be either abstract (as in a “goal”, “standard”, “end point in time”, etc.) or concrete (as in a physical destination) (Jeong, 2011). Example sentences from Jeong (2011) illustrating the usage of this second conceptualization of -ey are reviewed below. Translations are my own.

Point of Achievement -ey: Example sentences from Jeong (2011)

1. 벽에 그림을 걸었다.  
[[I hung a picture on (-ey) the wall.]]

2. 수익금 전액이 문화 사업에 사용되었다.  
[All profits are being used for (-ey) cultural work.]

3. 반대했다고 해서 책임지라는 주장은 역지에 가깝다.  
[Telling (someone) to take responsibility just because he opposed (something) is far-fetched [close to (-ey) ‘unreasonable’.]
4. 그는 요란한 소리에 잠을 겪었다.
[He woke up at (-ey) the loud noise.]

5. 우리는 햇볕에 옷을 말렸다.
[We dried the clothes in (-ey) the sunshine.]

6. 한국 대학도 이제는 개방 시대에 도달했다.
[Korean universities now have arrived at (-ey) a liberal era.]

The wall in (1) represents a destination for the action of hanging the picture: the action is complete when the picture is mounted on the wall (Jeong, 2011). Following this, the concept of a destination is expanded abstractly in (2) through (6). The cultural work in (2) is a “goal” for the profits; it is the purpose of the profits to be used for cultural work. Jeong (2011) also relates the “point of achievement” -ey to a “standard” (기준; as in (3)), a “reason” (이유; as in (4)), a “method” (방법; as in (5)), and “the time when a certain moment arrives” (“어떤 순간이 이르는 시간”; as in (6)).

Following this line of analysis, Jeong (2011) introduces parallel visuals to represent -eyse in comparison to -ey. While Jeong’s (2011) first conceptualization of -ey shows an “occupied location” (Figure 1, p. 23), the first meaning of -eyse is of the “location of an action”, represented in Figure 3, below (reproduced and translated from Jeong, 2011).

Figure 3: Comparison of first meanings of -ey and -eyse (Jeong, 2011)
The first meanings of both -ey and -eyse, according to Jeong (2011), show an enclosed space. The first usage of -ey, as discussed above, denotes the location of an object within a container. The same is true of the first meaning of -eyse, except that the object in focus is in motion, or there is some element of motion (Jeong, 2011). Jeong (2011) illustrates this version of -eyse through the following example sentences:

1. 우린 도서관에서 만나기로 하였다.
   [We decided to meet at (-eyse) the library.]

2. 전체 채용에서 차지하는 비중을 확대할 계획이다.
   [They plan to increase the weight it carries in (-eyse) overall recruitment.]

3. 그 기업은 늘 위기에서 진정한 능력을 보여준다.
   [That company is always showing genuine effort in (-eyse) crisis]

In each of these examples, -eyse marks a defined ‘space’, either literal or figurative (the library, the process of recruitment, crisis) and an activity that occurs in that space or situation (meeting, carrying weight, showing effort). Next, Jeong (2011) suggests the second usage of -eyse: “point of departure”. This contrasts the second usage of -ey put forth by Jeong (2011), “point of achievement”. The diagrams for both forms are shown in Figure 4 (reproduced and translated from Jeong, 2011).

Figure 4: Comparison of second meanings of -ey and -eyse (Jeong, 2011)

![Diagram showing comparison of second meanings of -ey and -eyse](image)

Where the second form of -ey shows a motion leading to a “point of achievement” (which could also be translated as “point of arrival” or “destination”), the focus of the diagram is switched
to represent the second usage of -eyse. The second usage of eyse, according to Jeong (2011), represents an outward motion away from the area of focus (the box). Jeong (2011) exemplifies this usage of the -eyse in a few example sentences, a selection of which is reproduced below:

1. 나는 계단에서 굴러 떨어졌다.
   [I fell, rolling, from the stairs (-eyse).
2. 그들의 싸움은 아주 사소한 오해에서 비롯된 것이다.
   [Their fight started from a minor misunderstanding (-eyse).
3. 초봉은 70 만원에서 75 만원이다.
   [The starting salary is from 700,000 (-eyse) (to) 750,000 won.

In the sentences above, there is a clear starting point or “point of departure” (the stairs, a misunderstanding, 700,000 won), which then leads to another point or situation (the bottom of the stairs/ground, a fight, 750,000 won). Unlike the situations marked with the first usage of -eyse, these do not take close within one area, but across the space between two areas.

Turker (2013) proposes a more complex view of the particles, offering twelve related categories under which their usages fall. A summary of Turker’s (2013) framework for -ey can be found in Appendix A (Table 1). This analysis, due to its many categories, was deemed too detailed and perhaps not focused enough for application to the workshops.

4.4 Application to the workshops

The materials for the workshop on location particles were based on the analysis by Jeong (2011) and additional example sentences from Türker (2013). Jeong (2011) was selected for the theoretical foundation because of its CL-based approaches to the categorizing and teaching of -ey and -eyse specifically. Although the resulting lesson was not a full replication of the models represented in either paper, the contents of both contributed to the materials and data used.
The workshop began with the students explaining what they knew about -ey and -eyse. As expected, students quickly suggested equivalent English prepositions. Drawing on their own translations of sentences they had heard in Korean, students compared -ey to ‘at’ and ‘for’, and -eyse to ‘to’, ‘while’, ‘from’, ‘at’, and ‘in’. As I presented example sentences to encourage students not to rely on translations, students began to express doubt about what they had understood about the location particles (see Appendix B, Excerpt 1).

Without revealing the meanings of the location particles, I introduced a second accuracy judgment assessment, a cloze reading task about a Canadian citizen living in Korea, adapted from Yonsei Reading 2 textbook (H.-S. Cho, Yoo, Kim, Park, & Lee, 1995, p. 22). Due to the nature of the topic, the reading had numerous tokens of both location particles. The location particles were replaced with blanks, and in this activity, students engaged in a discussion to reason through which particle would fit into each blank. Students answers were recorded and feedback was withheld until they were finished (see Appendix B, Excerpt 2).

The students correctly filled five of six blanks (I decided that it would not be necessary to read the entire passage and ended this activity after six blanks), struggling to make a decision about the location marker in “저는 캐나다에서 왔습니다” (I came from (-eyse) Canada). Jongyul was able to correctly place -eyse in the blank after my prompting to consider where the author of the passage was currently living (in Korea).

Following this, the main activity was introduced. Students were given strips of paper, each with a sentence containing either -ey or -eyse. After explaining the meaning of each sentence (some the vocabulary was new for the students’ level), I introduced the basic conceptual categories for each location particle: -ey as ‘enclosure’ and -eyse as a place with a dynamic action. Students were then asked to articulate how the context of the given sentence related to the conceptual meaning
of the locative particle. In doing so, students articulated and created new conceptual categories of
-ey and -eyse, as well.

4.5 Data

Because locative markers were not a new concept for Jongyul (he had encountered them in the speech of others), the beginning of the session focused on identifying what he already knew (or thought he knew) about the particles. This at once served as both an assessment of his understanding of the particles and as a window into how he had been interpreting the particles until that point. Additionally, it provided a space to demonstrate very quickly the dangers of assigning English “equivalents” to Korean concepts.

Among the explanations that were offered for the particles were “at” for -ey and “to” and “while” under -eyse. An example sentence, “학교에 가요” [(subject omitted) go to school] showed that “to” can also be a translation of -ey. This lack of correspondence between English and Korean eventually seemed to confuse Jongyul, who expressed doubt that there would be any difference at all between the two particles:

Excerpt 1: Jongyul sees no difference between -ey and -eyse

Jongyul: Honestly.. I'm trying to think. If I were to use two different contexts.. 학교에서 친구 만났어요. 학교에 - Could it not be for....so- something's telling me they're kind of interchangeable, like..

[Honestly, I’m trying to think. If I were to use two different contexts.. I met a friend at (-eyse) school. At (-ey) school- Could it not be for....so- something’s telling me they're [the particles -ey and -eyse are] kind of interchangeable, like..]

Jongyul’s experience as a heritage learner gave him the advantage of being able to recognize patterns that he had heard before, even if he could not explain exactly what they were
or what they meant. Much of his analyses in the rest of the lesson and throughout the semester was also informed by his recollection of tidbits of speech that he remembered hearing. This strategy, though, as above, was not always accurate, did help him in the next activity, a formative assessment to gauge the students’ abilities to assign either -ey or -eyse to blanks in a story.

Excerpt 2: Jongyul recalls his own experience

Jongyul: (reading) 세계에서 두번째로 큰 나라입니다.
[“It’s the second largest country in (-eyse) the world”.]
R: 네

Jongyul: So (paraphrasing) "Canada...is a fairly large country"
R: Yes, 두번째로. ‘두번째로’가 무슨 말일까요? 두번째로.
[Yes, The second. What could “the second” mean? “The second”.

Jongyul: Uhh. 세계에서?
[Uhh. In (-eyse) the world?]
R: 세계에서 두번째로- second big country in the world.
[The second in the world- second big country in the world].
R: '세계에서'. '세계에'. 뭐가 맞을까요?
[In (-eyse) the world. In (-ey) the world. Which one do you think is right?]
R: (reaching toward Jongyul) 어떻게 생각해요?
[What do you think?]
Jongyul: Uh...저는...세계에서 같은 말 많이 들었어요.
[Uh...I...have heard a phrase like “in (-eyse) the world” a lot.
I've heard like the phrase '세계에서']

Here, Jongyul employs his prior exposure to Korean to inform his judgment of what sounds like natural speech. In this case, he was correct, though he did not yet know why.

The pre-assessment activity yielded positive results, with students correctly matching either -ey or -eyse to six of seven blanks. However, much of this was the result of Jongyul’s guessing based on what he had heard in passing. Following this, a series of sentences featuring -ey and -eyse was presented to the students. The sentences were taken and adapted from those used in Türker’s (2013) analysis. Because there was some vocabulary within the sentences that was new to the students, each sentence was presented individually and its meaning was discussed before
proceeding. The process inevitably led to translations of the focus particles, only further demonstrating the discrepancy between English and Korean locative expressions. The exchange below dealt with the use of -ey in the sentence, “이 옷을 오만원에 샀다” (I bought these clothes for (ey) 5,000 won):

Excerpt 3: Jongyul expands his understanding

R: So like fifty dollars. I bought these clothes for fifty dollars. Ok. So now, ok, but here's the thing. We just said, 'I bought these clothes "for" fifty dollars, but it's ' -ey'. So (points to the board) What are we doing here?

Jongyul: We're seeing more uses of the particular '-ey' vs. '-eyse', So in this new context, we could say "for", as well? for '-ey'?

Jongyul’s mention of a “new context” here appears to demonstrate an understanding that Korean and English locative expressions are based in different conceptual systems, thus leaving their translations between the two languages dependent on context.

After reviewing a few more sentences, Jongyul selected the next sentence to examine: “정부에서 국민들에게 돈을 줄다” [The government (eyse) gave money to the citizens]. At this point, the list of possible translations for -ey included ‘at’ and ‘for’, and -eyse had been compared to ‘to’, ‘at’, ‘while’, ‘in’, and ‘from’. I asked the students if there were any other ways to think about the meaning of -eyse, since we could see that translation was not clarifying anything. Jongyul spoke up, referring to the common analysis of the markers as variables depending on “static” versus “dynamic” features. (This analysis had been mentioned in passing earlier in the lesson):

Excerpt 4: Jongyul relates -eyse and -ey to “beginning” and “end”

Jongyul: It seems that the places or the entities when a sentence involves the phrase '-eyse' is more dynamic?
R: Ok. So-So this (pointing to -eyse) is the dynamic one?
Jongyul: Because usually there's... There's usually a beginning and an ending and I'm not sure how to phrase this, but especially with this sentence, 정부에서 국민들에게 돈을 줄다.
[The government (eyse) gave money to the citizens.]
R: Ok
Jongyul: It's from the government to... and for the time one the one that mentions time-한 시에서 다섯 시까지
[from (-eyse) one o’clock to five o’clock]
from one o’clock to five o’clock
R: Ok. So what is in - in that example, what is dynamic part.
Jongyul: It has...from beginning to end, it has-

Although Jongyul was not able to express a complete idea quite yet, he was moving toward a theme of -eyse that he would later identify and coin, “transition”. However, because the students were having a difficult time articulating his idea at this point, we moved a step deeper into the semantic analysis first. I asked the students to consider two aspects – space and time – as they analyzed the sentences. Although the target particles used in expressions of both space and time eventually fit into the same conceptual categories, breaking them down first made them more manageable to start. Beginning with spatial sentences, I wrote three example sentences with -ey on the board: “가방 안에 있다” [(It) is in (-ey) the bag], “서울에 산다” [(I) live in (-ey) Seoul], and “호수에 산 그림자가 비쳐 있다” [The reflection of the mountain shines on (-ey) the lake]. Through his comparison of these examples to those above that included -eyse, Jongyul made two important connections:

Excerpt 5: Jongyul relates -eyse to “change”

Jongyul: I mean we were going off of discussing how in this context we were talking about something that’s enclosed inside of another object, another idea, another place. And with’-eyse’. Ok so maybe with ’-eyse’ it's a change of a change of place or time?
R: Changing place or time?
Jongyul: Yeah

Jongyul’s realization about -ey reflects one of the particle’s key characteristics, which Türker (2013) calls PROTO-LOCATION SENSE and which we later called “enclosure”. The next step was to recognize what Türker (2013) names the PROTO-GOAL SENSE, or what we soon
would refer to as “destination”. Jongyul was very close to naming this concept, but was having difficulty articulating his thoughts, so I offered some input:

Excerpt 6: I explain the “goal” sense of -ey

R: Ok. I want to give you a...a clue about this. So we have.. let's find it.. it's what's called like goal. Alright, so if you think about it in terms of a goal (draws brackets around the sentence about entering university) Entering university. Ok. Umm..(draws brackets around the sentence about arriving at happiness) and arriving at happiness. (omitted) This is our destination, ok? So, here's one. (writes "destination" on the board)

Despite his realizations until this point, Jongyul still expressed doubt that there would be a difference in meaning between -ey and -eyse. However, upon resuming the group discussion, he immediately led the session to another discovery. This time, he was responding to -eyse in a sentence, “그는 졸업식에서 상을 받았다” [He got an award at (-eyse) the graduation ceremony].

He compares the sentence to another - 우리는 오늘 저녁을 식당에서 먹었다 [We ate dinner today at (-eyse) a restaurant] - which had been analyzed earlier as a “dynamic event contained within an enclosed space”.

Excerpt 7: Jongyul recognizes “dynamic events in an enclosed space” (-eyse)

Jongyul: If we're looking at it from the perspective of the student, and then he earned an award at the graduation ceremony, it would make more sense for him to look at through the context of like we went to go out eat at a restaurant so during this- like while, during- it's that kind of thing

R: Yeah

Jongyul: It's that kind of setting. It's like 'while' at the graduation. While he was at the graduation ceremony, he earned an award so yeah I'd fit it best with that

R: Yeah, and you're right. So there's often a way you can look at things where events are like places in space. Like in English, we say, 'you're in trouble'. Where's trouble? It's just a situation that we think of it as a physical space. And that's what's going on here. The graduation ceremony of course has a location, but we're thinking of this event as a space in and of itself. And so while he's at that event, something happens and he gets an award. A dynamic event within an enclosed space.
In this way, Jongyul ventures that receiving a prize at (-eyse) a graduation ceremony and eating dinner at (-eyse) a restaurant employ the same conceptual meaning of -eyse. I took this opportunity to introduce abstract conceptualizations of space. Explaining the graduation ceremony event as a ‘space’ allowed me to demonstrate how the conceptual meaning of an event is similar to that of a physical place defined by physical boundaries.

Directly following this, I asked Jongyul to analyze -eyse in another sentence, “그는 가방에서 흰봉투를 꺼냈다” [He took a white envelope out of (-eyse) the bag]. Again, Jongyul draws a comparison to the same target form in a previous example and identifies a usage pattern.

Excerpt 8: Jongyul articulates “transition” (-eyse)

Jongyul: It’s not as clear of a connection as the previous phrase, but I think for this one, the connection can be made to a transition like (pointing to the board) 정부 [government] to 국민 [citizen].
R: A transition?
Jongyul: Yeah

The “transition” that Jongyul was describing was the movement of the envelope from the inside to the outside of the bag. He compares this to the movement of money from the government to people (정부에서 국민들에게 돈을 줬다 [The government (-eyse) gave money to the citizens]). Although the former is certainly more concrete than the latter in terms of physical movement, his description of a “transition” covers both and may be comparable to Jeong’s (2011) idea of “movement” (이동).

After employing another example sentence to test and affirm Jongyul’s term “transition” as a feature of -eyse, we began to explore how -eyse is used in expressions dealing with time. Following Türker’s (2013) analysis, I explained that -eyse as a time marker indicates a temporal starting point, which can be likened to a physical or abstract starting point, such as the government in “정부에서 국민들에게 돈을 줬다” (The government (-eyse) gave money to the citizens):
Excerpt 9: Jongyul understands “starting” (-eyse) and “ending” (-ey) points

Jongyul: So from one until five he taught class
R: But if you think about it this way, alright so let's say we have (drawing a timeline) here's one o'clock and here's five o'clock right? So starting here (draws an arrow from '1' to '5') and going until that time? So… it's… (pointing to '1') this is our starting point, right?

Jongyul: (nods)
R: And in- in any case like in this (points to 'government' in ‘government --> 'citizen') case, too, this is a starting point Right? And it ends here (pointing from 1 to 5) it ends here (pointing to 'citizen'). So, it's kind of similar. Right? Starting and ending. And then you know, you have to (drawing a wavy line under '1--->5') you have to have some time going past. Does that make sense?

Jongyul: That makes a lot of sense, actually
R: That makes a lot of sense? Good=
Jongyul: Well considering (points to the board) what couldn't be compared before, you know? Like for this, it's not ra- it's not rather not a- it's not a location it's a continuum of time so
R: Uh huh
Jongyul: From one point of time to another

After seeing the students apply the same analysis to another transition -eyse sentence, I helped the students to summarize our analysis and applied the students’ findings to the remaining sample sentences. In contrast to Türker’s (2013) study, the simplified analysis by Class 2 yielded two key categories of -ey (destination/goal and enclosure) and two categories of -eyse (and transition). The remaining workshop time was used to test these categories against additional sample sentences. By this point, Jongyul had become more confident in his understanding and offered his interpretations freely, such as below:

Excerpt 10: Jongyul’s analysis becomes faster

R: Ok so (reading) 그는 책상 사이에 연필을 끼웠다. He put the pencil in like stuck it into the gap between the desks.
Jongyul: And that's definitely something regarding an enclosed.. space.
The session was concluded with this testing of the students’ analyses. Although the conceptual categorizations of -ey and -eyse covered in the session were far from comprehensive according to Türker’s (2013) analysis, both students expressed having enjoyed the discussion and expanded their understandings of locative particles:

**Excerpt 11: Jongyul’s take-away**

Jongyul: **Oh- this was really, really like thorough like I actually legitimately learned**
I was able to wire together the aspects of day-to-day communication.

### 4.6 Discussion

The analyses on the -ey and -eyse locative markers conducted in this workshop session vaguely resembles that of Jeong (2011). However, as the analysis was mostly student-led, we finished with different names for the categories of usage of the two markers. While Jeong (2011) found -ey to indicate either an “occupied location” or a “point of achievement”, we called these “enclosure” and “destination”, respectively. What Jeong (2011) called “location of an action” and “point of departure”, Jongyul called “action within an enclosed space” and “transition”. Although Jeong’s (2011) labels may be more accurate (i.e. ‘transition’ refers more to the phenomenon following -eyse than to -eyse itself), these labels are functional and helped Jongyul to process the same information using labels that made sense to him.

Our analysis was not intended to be comprehensive, simply because the scope of Jongyul’s knowledge, his Korean proficiency, and the temporal constraints of the workshops made such depth unrealistic. Instead, the goals lay in creating a foundational understanding of the key conceptual categories of each particle, as well as providing the analytical tools to continue to consciously include other instances of the particles in their overall understandings of the forms.
For these reasons, our analysis mimicked, but do not claim to fully resemble all that is presented in other studies.

As I had expected, Jongyul began his analysis of the target forms by comparing and correlating them to their apparent English counterparts, prepositions of location. Through the initial analysis, however, he realized that English and Korean (and any other two languages, for that matter) do not necessarily overlap in the conceptualization of linguistic items that on the surface appear to serve the same purpose. The importance of considering Korean as a unique, complete system of its own is one that is repeatedly referenced in workshop sessions throughout the semester.
Chapter 5

Topic Markers (-은/-는) and Subject Markers (-이/-가)

5.1 Motivation

The third week of Korean language workshops focused on so-called topic and subject markers – a basic, but arguably complicated, grammatical feature. The two topic markers (-은 (-un) & -는(-nun)) carry the same meaning and function, but -은 (-un) follows when the related item ends in a consonant, and -는 (-nun) follows a word phrase or clause ending in a vowel. Likewise, subject marker -이 (-i) follows a consonant ending and -가 (-ka) follows a vowel ending. Thus, the two sets of variants, -은/-는 (-un/nun) as topic markers and -이/-가 (-i/ka) as subject markers, are merely phonological variants. However, the topic marker and subject marker do vary significantly from each other, both semantically and pragmatically.

Topic and subject markers are not only a primary element in the Korean grammatical system; as this study will argue, they are also useful and essential tools for meaning construction. Despite this, these markers are frequently described with little more than their grammatical labels, leaving students to guess what “topic” and “subject” really mean. A sample of Korean language textbook and other material explanations exemplifies the problem.
5.2 Background

Below, I introduce the construction of the topic marker -un/nun and the subject marker -i/ka and discuss their traditional representations in the literature as well as in popular Korean language textbooks.

5.2.1 Construction

The so-called “topic” and “subject” markers – -은/는 (-un/nun) and -이/가 (-i/ka), respectively – are bound morphemes known as case particles, or 격조사 (kyekcosa) (Lee & Ramsey, 2000). They directly follow and are attached to the constructions they modify.

5.2.2 Traditional views of -은/는 (-un/-nun) and -이/가 (-i/ka)

However, Lee & Ramsey (2000) clarify that the definitions and functions of “subjects” and “topics” marked by these particles do not align with common understanding of grammatical subjects. In fact, these case particles can be attached to both nominative and certain non-nominative constructions (Lee & Ramsey, 2000) and can even occur multiple times within one clause (Lee & Ramsey, 2000).

The precise meanings of Korean nominative markers are highly debated, but seminal research by Sohn (1994, 1999) provides one traditional view. Referring to -이/가 (-i/ka) as “nominative case particles” and -은/는 (un/nun) as “constituent delimiters”, Sohn (1994, 1999) posits that both particle sets are weak in meaning without explicit emphasis on their usage. When emphasized, -이/가 (-i/ka) are understood to express emphasis, “focus”, “exclusiveness”, and/or
“contrastiveness” (Sohn, 1999, p. 347). Emphasized -은/는 (-un/nun) are likened to English expressions “as for” and “regarding” (Sohn, 1994, p. 226; Sohn, 1999, p. 347). Because their meanings depend on emphasis, each marker can also be omitted from oral communications, except for -이/가 (-i/ka) when used to express “exclusiveness” (Sohn, 1999).

Sohn (1994) calls -은/는 (-un/nun) the “most neutral and productive” of delimiter particles, which include object markers -을/를 (-u/lul) when used for emphasis, -을 (-to; also), -만 (-man; only), and others (p. 226, 243). Sohn (1999) also claims that the differences between -이/가 and -un/nun are apparent only when the particles are stressed. In that case, -이/가 is understood to index “exclusiveness” or “contrastiveness”, while -un/nun indicates “topic” or “contrast” (p. 347).

5.2.3 -은/는 (-un/nun) and -이/가 (-i/ka) in existing textbooks

Because of their indispensability in basic grammatical structure, so-called topic and subject markers, like locative markers, are commonly included in the beginning levels of Korean language curricula. In Active Korean (Seoul National University Language Education Institute, 2006), Korean Grammar in Use: Beginning to Early Intermediate (Ahn et al., 2010), and Get it Korean Grammar (J.-S. Kim et al., 2014), these particles are covered before locative particles are introduced. All four textbooks reviewed here introduce -un/nun as a “topic” marker, and -i/ka as a “subject” marker:

-un/nun as “topic” marker:

1. “-은/는 (-un/nun) is a particle that indicates that the noun to which it is attached is the topic of that sentence.”

(Korea University, 2008, p. 35)
2. “Attached to a noun, ‘은/는’ [-un/nun] indicates that the preceding noun is the topic of the sentence.”

(J.-S. Kim et al., 2014, p. 12)

3. “은/는 [-un/nun] designates the topic, or the target of exposition, of a particular sentence or group of sentences. Thus it means the same as ‘as for’ or ‘regarding’.

(Ahn et al., 2010, p. 71)

4. “은/는’ [-un/nun] follows a noun, indicating that it is the topic under discussion. The topic is often, but not necessarily, the same as the subject.”

(Seoul National University Language Education Institute, 2006, p. 79)

-\(i/ka\) as “subject” marker:

1. “이/가 [-i/ka] is a subject particle attached to a noun to indicate the subject of a sentence.”

(Korea University, 2008, p. 79)

2. “이/가’ [-i/ka] is attached to a noun and indicates that the preceding noun is the subject of the sentence.”

(J.-S. Kim et al., 2014, p. 22)

3. “이/가 [-i/ka] is added to the end of a subject to designate it as the subject of the sentence...이/가 [-i/ka] also functions to particularly emphasize the preceding subject.”

(Ahn et al., 2010, p. 68)

4. “The subject marker ‘이/가’ [-i/ka] is attached to a noun to indicate that it is the subject of the sentence.”

(Seoul National University Language Education Institute, 2006, p. 79)

While “topic marker” and “subject marker” are the established English terminology for -un/nun and -i/ka, respectively, these terms do little in the way of conveying the particles’ actual meaning and usage to the typical Korean language learner who is unfamiliar with these concepts. To students who are familiar with basic grammar terms, “subject” is already a familiar term, but not in the sense that it is being used in the above examples. “Topic” as a grammar term is likely unfamiliar to the majority of learners, who are then left to determine for themselves, often unsuccessfully, how it compares in meaning and usage to “subject”.

5.3 Prior CL studies on 은/는 (-un/-nun) and 이/가 (-i/ka)

This lesson in the Korean language club cites two differing, but not contradictory studies on the meanings of topic and subject markers. Oh’s (2011) analysis of -un/nun and -i/ka was selected because of its approach to representing the topic and subject markers graphically, rather than through extended written description. Kim’s (2012) review of -un/nun adds another angle with which to understand the topic marker and provides several more example sentences to analyze. Below, a review of Oh (2011) is followed by a summary of Kim (2012).

Oh (2011) determines that -un/-nun indicates a “selected item” in comparison to the “remaining items” or a “general and universally valid” claim (translations mine). Figure 5 is a replication of the diagram Oh (2011) proposes to convey the “selected item” meaning of -un/-nun.

Figure 5: -un/nun (Oh, 2011)

![Figure 5: -un/nun (Oh, 2011)](image)

Figure 5 shows an enclosed space (or situation) in which there are several potential objects of focus. Among those, just one – the shaded square – is the selected item of focus, in comparison to the other items, which are not selected. An example sentence, “나는 밥을 먹었다” I (-nun) ate rice), shows that in the situation of “whether or not one ate rice” (my translation). ‘I’ is selected as the relative focus of the sentence (Oh, 2011). This demonstrates that “I” ate rice, but that others did not, or that “I” does not know whether or not they ate. Figure 6 illustrates the second meaning of the topic marker, according to Oh (2011).
Figure 6: Contrastive -un/nun (Oh, 2011)

Figure 6 represents the contrastive nature of the topic marker, in which there are two objects of focus being compared to each other. Oh (2011) illustrates this with an example sentence: 동생은 키가 크고 나는 키가 작다 (tongsayngun khika khuko nanun khika cakta; My younger sibling (-un) is tall and I (-nun) am short). In this case, there are two objects of focus: the younger sibling and the speaker. Each focal point is represented by one square and the line between the squares signifies a contrast.

Next, Oh (2011) presents a diagram (Figure 7) to represent the subject markers, -외/가 (-i/ka).

Figure 7: -i/ka (Oh, 2011)

Figure 7 shows an object of focus (the shaded square) that exists in its own space. An example sentence, 저기 사과가 있어요 (ceki sakwaaka isseyo, There are apples (-ka) over there),
is used to show how ‘apples’ are singled out for focus, aside from other fruits that could possibly occupy the indicated space, but do not (Oh, 2011).

In another interpretation, J. Kim (2012) presents three principles of -un/nun. Kim’s (2012) study does not address -i/ka directly, but its usage in examples throughout the study reinforce her argument. In sum, J. Kim (2012) claims that -un/nun is (1) “specific”, (2) “generic”, and (3) “cognitively active”. In our workshop, we focused on the latter two characteristics.

“Genericity” here refers to the broadening effect that -un/nun has on nouns referring to a group or set of subjects in general (J. Kim, 2012). J. Kim (2012) cites minimal pair sentences as an example (underlining and bolding my own).

1. 비가 내린다 [Rain (-ka) falls → It is raining]

2. *비는 내린다 [Rain (-nun) falls → As for rain, it falls]

The first sentence is an unmarked expression used when it is raining at the moment of speech. The -ka subject marker indicates the specific rain that is falling in the given area. However, “rain” in the same sentence, when followed with -nun, refers not to a specific selection of rain, but to rain in general and its usual tendencies (J. Kim, 2012).

Furthermore, J. Kim (2012) argues that -un/nun also carries a sense of “cognitive activeness”. In other words, using -un/nun, she claims, indicates that both the listener and speaker already have an established awareness of the subject and context at hand. This is reactivated by -un/nun. Likewise, usage of -i/ka, according to J. Kim (2012), supposes the listener’s lack of familiarity of the topic while at the same time establishing the awareness necessary to switch to -un/nun as soon as the next mention.
These representations of the topic and subject markers formed the basis for the content of the third week of the Korean language workshops. The lesson progression is outlined in the next section.

5.4 Applications to the workshops

Like the lesson on locative particles, the lesson on nominative particles aimed to apply analysis to guide students to an understanding of the target forms. Throughout, student understanding was established as the basis for instruction, and familiar and new examples were used to prompt critical thinking.

5.5 Data

As in the previous week, the workshop on topic and subject markers began with collecting input on Jongyul’s prior knowledge. Again, the target forms were not new to him, but I had observed him using the particles incorrectly or entirely omitting them from his speech. However, this lesson was designed as more than a review; the concepts presented here were very different from (though not necessarily in absolute contrast to) what I found to be the typical classroom explanation of the markers. In this case, for Jongyul, this workshop was the first explanation of the concept at all. Nevertheless, he was able to provide anecdotes from his experiences from the very beginning of class.

Excerpt 1: Jongyul provides his background knowledge on -un/nun

R: 은/는 하고 이/가를 언제 쓰는지 알아요?
[Do you know when we use -un/nun and -i/ka?]
How do we use it, or when do we use them?
Curious to see whether Jongyul’s understanding of the particles extended beyond their mechanical usage, I asked him to consider sentences in which he had heard the particles in use. He began with a sample usage environment of so-called “topic marker”, -un/nun.

**Topic marker -un/nun**

Though Jongyul was not able to provide a full sentence with -un/nun, he did refer to his existing repertoire to offer that -nun is often used to draw attention to a specific object (i.e. “this thing (-nun)”)

**Excerpt 2: Jongyul relates the topic to his repertoire**

Jongyul: I can give really basic examples
R: That's good
Jongyul: 오 [this] - when you're saying 'this' when you're describing something like 'this is' 오 가 [this thing (-nun)]

This may seem like a very simple response, but it is impressive considering that Jongyul’s experience with Korean is almost entirely aural; he heard Korean at home, but speech in Korean was never directed towards him, nor did he use Korean as a communicative tool. Seeing that he was capable of segmenting morphemes, however, I proceeded to explain the first conceptual representation of -nun. I began by drawing Figure 5 (p. 42).

After explaining that the square represents the object in focus and the circles other objects in the vicinity, I showed Jongyul that the larger rectangle symbolizes the situation or physical
boundaries of the environment. From here, we began the analysis of a sentence: “나는 밥을 먹었다” (I \textit{-nun} have eaten). We discussed that the box represents the question of whether or not the person has eaten and the square inside represents the person in focus. The circles stand for other people. I explained that the analysis of the situation could take two directions: either that the person in focus (marked by \textit{-nun}) has eaten, but others have not; or, that the person in focus has eaten but is not aware of whether other people have or have not also eaten. This was followed by another example of a self-introduction in which is the first to mention “focus” as a factor in the analysis.

Excerpt 4: Jongyul articulates “focus” for \textit{-un/nun}

\textbf{R:} I’ll give you another example. So, let’s say you are in a group of people like the three of us and we have to introduce ourselves to somebody.

\textbf{Jongyul:} Mm hmm

\textbf{R:} Ok? And I say, ‘안녕하세요, 저는 그레이스라고 하고요 회장을어요.’ [Hello, \textit{I(-nun)} am Grace and I am the president of the club]

So, 'I'm Grace and I'm the president.' Ok? And I use 저는\textsuperscript{1} \textit{I(-nun)} . 저는 그레이스예요 \textit{I(-nun) am Grace}.

\textbf{Jongyul:} Ok

\textbf{R:} Ok, so why would I use \textit{-nun} in this case?

\textbf{Jongyul:} Clarifying that you are...you're putting the focus on yourself, essentially.

Jongyul’s realization of the concept of “focus” was key in this moment, and it helped guide the rest of his analysis of the subsequent examples. After establishing that the first meaning of \textit{-nun} deals with one object of focus without necessarily separating it from the rest of its group, we moved on to discussing the second meaning of \textit{-nun}, which addresses contrast (Figure 6, p. 43).

\textsuperscript{1} The word for “I” here, 저 (ce), is the deferential form of the first person pronoun. The non-deferential form 나 (na) is also found in examples throughout this paper.
I provided the example of the person from excerpt 4 coming back into our classroom and asking me for the names of other people in the room and asking the names of two other students. This led Jongyul to a realization of the structure of contrastive -un/nun.

Excerpt 5: Jongyul recognizes parallel structure with contrastive -un/nun

R: And I could say, (pointing to Jongyul) "이 친구 는 종율이고 요 (pointing in another direction) 이 친구 는 수빈이에 요." [And I could say, “This friend (-nun) is Jongyul (pointing to Jongyul) and this friend (-nun) is Subin* (pointing in another direction).]
You guys are both objects of focus. We care about both of you. Right? So, I just used -un/nun for both.

Jongyul: But in separate forms. Like essentially you- you went on and said.. wait never mind. That was a confusing way of looking at it. But when you're using two objects.. you use the same sort of ending.

R: What do you mean by that?

Jongyul: In separate sentences. Like when you're saying uhh...

R: We could also use this if we are comparing two people or like talking about different things. So, like…이 사람 전공 은 역사고 요 이 사람 전공 은 공학이에 요. [This person’s major (-un) is history, and this person’s major (-un) is engineering.]
So, they’re asking about their majors and it’s the same topic, but I’m comparing the majors between them. So, in that case, 전공 은 [major (-un)].

* Subin is not the name of anyone present at the workshop, but a character created for the purpose of this example.

Although it is hard to determine what Jongyul was thinking at first when he began to describe the “separate forms,” this articulation does imply that he had begun to realize that two parallel subjects are marked with the same particle, in this case, -un/nun. I provided additional examples to demonstrate the element of contrast (i.e. reporting majors of students who are in different departments) and checked Jongyul’s understanding again. The “two” in the first line refers to two parallel subjects.
Excerpt 6: I clarify “sentence” vs. “connected” clauses

R: Does that make sense? We can just have two.
Jongyul: In somewhat separate sentences.
R: Well, this is a connector (circling -ko [and] in the example sentence)
Jongyul: Yeah
R: So they're technically the same sentence.
I could say, ‘이 친구는 종율이에요. 그리고 이 친구는 수빈이에요.’
[That also works, but a little softly, naturally]
Like softly and naturally to express it=
Jongyul: Yeah
R: To express it, I just connect them-
Jongyul: Ok
R: -with -ko (circling the connector in the original sentence - marked with a double underline in Excerpt 5). This one.
Jongyul: Ok

Jongyul’s confusion about the syntax of the sentence was easily addressed, but it showed that he recognized the positioning of the contrasting topics in separate clauses. Without the vocabulary to say as much, Jongyul demonstrated an understanding that contrastive -un/nun pairs typically need to occur within separate clauses (or perhaps separate sentences) in order to convey their contrastive meaning.

With the mechanics of -un/nun usage established, we moved on to our analysis of authentic discourse samples. One of the excerpts came from an illustrated blog entry on the differences between American and Korean cultures in the understanding of punctuality (Appendix A, Figure 14). The story, illustrated with a comic, presents a host (presumably American) as he prepares for a party that starts at eight o’clock in the evening. His guest, whom we can guess is Korean, arrives exactly at eight o’clock, just as the host is getting out of the shower, clearly far from being prepared to host the party. The blog explains the author’s view that Koreans value arriving on time, while Americans consider it polite to arrive somewhat late. In the workshop session, we identified the
instances of -\textit{un/nun} in the text and discussed their functional meaning within its context. The following exchange discusses an instance of contrastive -\textit{un/nun}:

\textbf{Excerpt 7: Arriving for a party (contrastive -\textit{un/nun})}

“저는 한국 사람이다보니 문 앞에 있는 남자처럼 8 시에 시작하면 8 시에 정확하게 가는 것이 매너라고 생각합니다. 하지만 미국에서는 8 시 시작이면 적어도 30 분 정도는 늦게 도착하는 것이 매너라고 합니다.”

\textbf{[I (-\textit{nun}), being a Korean, like the man at the door, think that going exactly at 8 o’clock if they say the party starts at 8 o’clock is (good) manners. However, in the US (-\textit{nun}) they say that arriving at least around 30 minutes (-\textit{nun}) late is (good) manners.”]}

The use of -\textit{nun} to mark both “I” and “in the US” functions to contrast the cultural norms of each party (i.e. the author and Americans). Without explaining this, I asked Jongyul to consider our discussion so far and determine why the author used -\textit{nun} to mark these two grammatical subjects. Other instances of -\textit{nun}\(^2\) are seen with “arriving”, “thirty minutes”, and other constructions, but because these were not part of the contrastive construction achieved, I did not address them at this time.

\textbf{Excerpt 8: Jongyul recognizes contrastive -\textit{un/nun} in discourse}

Jongyul: They're drawing the comparison between like I am... looking at it in a Korean point of view and then there's a comparison between uhh Korea and America? Or...

R: Yeah

Jongyul: For- for punctuality?

R: Yeah, so here and here (pointing to Jongyul's paper), right?

저는 한국 사람으로서... 생각하는 방식?

\textbf{[I (-\textit{nun}), as a Korean person... the way I think?]}

Like my way of thinking according to my identity as a Korean. Or, but in America it's different. So that's comparing between these two. (Jongyul nodding)

\[^2\] -\textit{Nun} has several functions in Korean. Three of the other instances of -\textit{un/nun}, which are marked but not discussed, in Excerpt 7 are tokens of a verb modifier form of -\textit{nun}. They are phonetically identical, but semantically and functionally different, from “topic marker” -\textit{un/nun}.
At this point, Jongyul accurately identified not only the space of focus (ideas of “punctuality”), but also the fact that these sentences mark a comparison between the author’s culture and that of Americans. I then prompted him to continue his analysis with another instance of -un within the same text. This time we considered the usage of -un with the “start time of the party” as in “파티 시작 시간은 8시입니다. (The party start time (-un) is 8 o’clock)”. This is the first sentence in the description of the scene and is followed by an explanation of the people at the scene (Appendix A, Figure 14). I asked Jongyul to consider why the start time of the party would be marked with -un. Specifically, I asked him whether this instance of -un could be explained by the constrastive model of -un/nun we had just reviewed.

Excerpt 9: Jongyul recognizes single-subject -un/nun in discourse

R: 파티 시작 시간은
[The party start time (-un)]
Is that this? (gesturing to the constrastive -un/nun visual) The time of the party?
Jongyul: I think the difference is in the actual arrival. Like who was ready, who was not.
R: Ok
Jongyul: Uhh but you were asking the start of the time of the party starts.
R: Ok
Jongyul: It's its own sort of subject and it wouldn't be like a comparison, but we use this (pointing to -un/nun).
[The party start time (-un) [is] eight o’clock]

At first, Jongyul misinterpreted the focus of the sentence to be on whether or not someone was ready, but he corrected himself as he realized that I was asking about the time because of its appearance with -un. His self-correction led him to see that the focus is on one aspect of the party within itself – the start time. He recognized that this is not a comparison, but an indication of focus
on a single item. As such, the most matching conceptualization is the first usage environment of -un (Figure 5, p. 42).

From here we analyzed the following sentences in the same blog story, which explain the scene when the guest arrives “on time” for the party.

Excerpt 9: Arriving at the party

한 명은 모든 준비를 마치고 파티 장소로 도착을 했고 나머지 한 명(maybe 집주인)은 이제 방금 샤워를 마치고 나왔습니다.

[One person (-un) has gotten all ready and arrived at the party, and the other person (maybe the homeowner) (-un) has just now finished his shower and come out.]

The pair of topic markers in the sentence above show a direct contrast between the state of preparedness of the guest and that of the host. Again, without explaining this to Jongyul, I asked him which usage of -un/nun he thought would best describe the tokens in focus.

Excerpt 10: Jongyul applies the full analysis

R: 어떤 것 같아요? (pointing to the explanation of the first usage of -un/nun)
   이거예요? (pointing to the explanation of the second usage of -un/nun)
   [What do you think? (pointing to the explanation of the first usage of -un/nun) Is it this one? (pointing to the explanation of the second usage of -un/nun) Is it this one?]

Jongyul: (reading the sentences to himself)
R: 생각 있어요?
   [Do you have an idea?]
Jongyul: Uhh 생각 있어요 [Uhh I have an idea.] (pointing to the paragraph)
   여기서 한 명은 [here, one person (-un)]..Uhh because they were talking about like were people invited? 한 명은 [one person (-un)] is referring to one person (reading to himself) one person like keeps good time commitments. Or his or yeah, his time commitments. And the rest were... well the other person (gesturing to the host) so in that case we're also looking at one situation with two subjects in it.

Jongyul’s recognition of the two parallel subjects indicates his understanding that this example fits with the second usage of -un/nun. I elaborated on this to emphasize the double,
parallel subject construction (e.g. “One person… and/but the other person…”). From here, I presented another conceptualization of -un/nun, as described in Kim (2012) as a transition to discussion of the so-called subject marker, -i/ka. We began with minimal pair sentences from Kim’s (2012) study:

1. 비가 내린다  
   [Rain(-ka) falls \( \rightarrow \) It is raining]
2. 비는 내린다  
   [Rain(-nun) falls \( \rightarrow \) Rain (by its nature) falls]

Without providing any information other than an explanation of the verb 내리다 (neylita; move in a downward direction), I asked Jongyul which sentence seemed more natural as a way to express “It is raining”. He chose (1), the sentence with subject marker -ka, because it sounded more like what he remembered hearing people say. However, Jongyul was not able to explain why (2) would not be used to express the same meaning. To demonstrate this difference, I presented another sentence: 저는 당근을 싫어해요 (I (-nun) dislike carrots). Applying the first representation of -un/nun in Oh (2011), in which the item marked by -un/nun is the sole target of focus without any comparison, Jongyul translated (2): “As for the rain, it’s coming down”.

Following Kim’s (2012) analysis, I explained the idea of a “general concept” marked by -un/nun.

Excerpt 11: -un/nun marking a “general concept”

R: Yeah, as the for rain, it comes down. So, what we mean by general statements is when we look at rain as like a general concept, what does it do? It comes down.

Jongyul: (nodding)

R: But it’s kind of strange, right? Even if we say it in English, “Well, as for rain, it falls from the sky”. Like we just don’t say that.

After explaining that (2) refers to rain as a general concept and that (1) indicates a single instance of rain, I presented another pair of minimal pair sentences, also from Kim (2012).

3. 공주들은 뛰어 다니지 않는다.
Jongyul was quickly able to identify that (3) was a general statement about the nature of princesses, so I asked him what he thought would be the difference between (3) and (4). As I began to offer another hint, Jongyul stepped in with an astute observation about the role of context in the difference between -i/ka and -un/nun.

Excerpt 12: Jongyul recognizes -i/ka as marking an item “in context”

R: (Gesturing to (3)) So this is generic-
Jongyul: But (pointing to (4)) that’s putting princesses in context.
R: Yes! That’s it. This [(2)] puts princesses in context. We have a basis- These are actual princesses we are talking about now. Not just in general, right?
Jongyul: Oh, right.

I next presented J. Kim’s (2012) analysis, which explains (3) as describing the nature of princesses (as a generalized group of people) to not “run around”. Jongyul noted that this differentiation between “in general” and “in context” made sense to him, so we shifted our discussion to another set of minimal pair sentences from J. Kim (2012). These sentences demonstrate the element of “cognitive activeness” proposed by J. Kim (2012). J. Kim (2012) posits that in (6), the -un topic marker indicates that both the speaker and listener group are already aware of the president’s condition. However, in (5), the subject marker -i serves the opposite purpose, showing that this news of the president’s death was unexpected; the listeners were not anticipating any news on the president (J. Kim, 2012).

5. 여러분, 대통령이 돌아가셨습니다.
   [Ladies and gentlemen, the president (-i) has passed away.]
6. 여러분, 대통령을 돌아가셨습니다.
   [Ladies and gentlemen, the president (-un) has passed away.]
Just as was presented in J. Kim (2012), I explained that (5) would be a useful sentence to announce that the president had suddenly died, such as in an assassination, while (6) would more appropriately fit a situation in which the president had passed away after a known struggle with a life-threatening condition. Although Jongyul had not yet received any explanations on why a difference in topic versus subject markers would cause this semantic change, I asked him to consider possible rationales.

Excerpt 13: Jongyul attempts to explain -un vs. -i in the “president’s death” examples

Jongyul: Uh... because... the in the circumstance where the president’s been assassinated, you kind of want to keep that information vague. Not vague, but like you don’t wanna- you kind of wanna generalize the cause of death and at that point, you don’t want to immediately say, “Oh, the president has been shot”, or something like that, to prevent mass panic.

R: Ok, so if we’re going with that theory, in either case, he didn’t say how the president died.

Jongyul: Right.

R: So let’s just go with, these two sentences are exactly the same, except for -i and -un.

Jongyul: Uh-huh

R: What’s the difference? Why specifically would those things change?

Having brought attention to the exact area of focus (the role of -un in marking additional information on a “cognitively active” (J. Kim, 2012) subject versus the role of -i in marking unanticipated news), I guided Jongyul’s analysis with a clue on the nature of the markers’ roles in this context:

Excerpt 14: Introducing “cognitive activeness” (J. Kim, 2012)

R: Ok, think about it this way. In case I[sentence (5)], this is something that the people never could have expected. 상상도 하지 못할 일이었을 거예요. [It was probably something they were not able to even imagine]

Jongyul: Yeah

R: They could have never even imagined it. But, in the case where he has a long-term illness, 사람들이 알고 있을 거잖아요. 알고 있었을 거예요.
people will be aware, of course. They would have known.

Jongyul: Oh: Ok.
R: What’s the difference?
Jongyul: In that case, with the long-term illness, this is just one of those inevitable events. Well, not inevitable, but it’s not unusual. It’s not sudden; it’s not unexpected.
R: There you go. It’s not unexpected. Why? Because they have been thinking about the president. They know that the president has this condition, right?

From here, I offered a further explanation of the meaning of -un, pointing out that (5) reports on a subject – the president – who, presumably, was already in the recent news for concerns about his/her health (J. Kim, 2012). On the other hand, -i in (6) suggests a sudden, unplanned, and “unexpected” incident (J. Kim, 2012). Jongyul summed up the discussion by noting, “So, [(5)] is used in sort of a breaking news sort of context”; I add that (6) could be seen as an “update”.

Continuing this story, we compared two more sentences, also from J. Kim (2012). They are labeled as witness responses to a question from the police: “On the day that the murder happened, what did you see?”.

7. 그날, 벤(이) 복도에 쓰러져 있었어요.
   (On that day, Ben (-i) collapsed and remained motionless in the hallway)
8. 그날, 벤(은) 복도에 쓰러져 있었어요.
   (On that day, Ben (-un) collapsed and remained motionless in the hallway)

Although the examples are not connected in the original study, we imagined that “Ben” is the late president and that the detective is questioning a witness on the president’s death. I asked Jongyul to consider how the meanings of the two sentences might differ, prompting him by pointing out that the choice of topic or subject marker reveals something about what sort of information the witness expects the detective to be looking for. Specifically, I noted, choosing to use -un, as in (8), demonstrates the witness’s interpretation that the detective is seeking information specifically on Ben (the president). I asked Jongyul to contrast this to the meaning expressed when
using -i in place of -un in the same sentence, but he was unable to reply. To aid his analysis, I showed Jongyul that inside the sentence “그날, 벤의 복도에 쓰러져 있었어요” (On that day, Ben (-i) had collapsed and remained motionless in the hallway), -i shows a lack of any assumption that Ben was or was not cognitively active in the mind of the listener (J. Kim, 2012). In other words, the choice of the topic versus subject marker depends on what the speaker assumes about the listener’s cognitive orientation towards Ben, whereas the news about Ben having collapsed in the hallway is “new information” in either case (J. Kim, 2012). Using a context illustrated in J. Kim (2012), we consider the situation where the detective is holding a picture of Ben and discuss that the witness would be more likely to use Ben (-un) in this case, as it is clear that the detective is both familiar with Ben and probably searching for information specifically about him.

This concluded our discussion of the topic marker -un/nun. I briefly summarized the conceptualizations we had reviewed: Oh (2011) provided a view of -un/nun as a marker either of an independent object of focus (Figure 5, p. 42) or of two parallel objects of focus in contrast to each other (Figure 6, p. 43); J. Kim (2012) noted that an item marked with -un/nun could be generalized or cognitively active (we skipped her concept of “specificity” for the sake of simplicity and time). These concepts provided the foundation on which to introduce -i/ka.

**Subject marker -i/ka**

With notes on the board of the conceptualizations we had learned for -un/nun, it was simple to introduce the so-called subject marker, -i/ka, as a contrasting counterpart of -un/nun. Beginning with Kim’s (2012) description of -un/nun as a marker of a generic topic, I reminded Jongyul that -i/ka can indicate specific individual or group subjects (as in Excerpt 12 and explanation, p. 46) or a concept that is not necessarily cognitively active (refer to Excerpt 14 and explanation, p. 47). To
introduce Oh’s (2011) representation of -i/ka, Based on Oh’s (2011) analysis, I presented a sentence, “저기 사과가 있어요” (There are apples (-ka) over there) in the context of an observation made at a market. I explained that -ka, unlike -un/nun, which focuses solely on one item, simultaneously places attention on the apples while also indicating that other fruits are not present in the same area (Oh, 2011).

Extending this analysis, I introduced a set of minimal pair sentences from Oh (2011). The sentences were presented with the context of deciding who will pay the bill at a restaurant:

9. ? 나눌게
[\textit{I (\text{-nun}) will pay; roughly: “As for me, I will pay (I don’t know about anyone else)”}]

10. 내가 낼게
[\textit{I (\text{-ka}) will pay; roughly: “I (not anyone else) will pay” \rightarrow “I’ll pay the whole bill”}]

Even if he would not be able to explain it, I was fairly certain that Jongyul would have heard a similar phrase beforehand and wanted to see whether he was able to identify the “promise” speech act (i.e. 내가 낼게; “I (\text{-ka}) will pay”). Without providing the explanations above, I asked Jongyul which sentence he would choose when offering to pay at a restaurant, and he corrected identified (10) as the logical sentence. Explaining this choice was more difficult for him, so I demonstrated its meaning with the earlier example of a visitor coming to our meeting and searching for a specific person:

\textbf{Excerpt 15: \text{-i/ka as an exclusionary marker}}

\textit{G:} Remember like when the [visitor] came in and zoomed in on one person? So, in this case, you’re saying, \textit{“not you guys, I will pay”}.

I showed Jongyul that just as the hypothetical visitor to the classroom searched for one person in particular, thereby excluding the other people in the room (누가 그레이스예요?, \textit{Who}}
(-ka) is Grace?), a person saying “내가 낼게” (I (-ka) will pay) is including himself and only himself in the group of people in focus (those who will pay).

At this time, the student teacher of the advanced workshop level suddenly came over to our group and proposed a puzzle for Jongyul. On the board, he wrote, “이 만화 __ 재미있다” (This cartoon (___) is fun) and asked Jongyul which particle (-i/ka or -un/nun) would fit in the blank. At first, Jongyul guessed that -ka would be the best choice, but with further prompting, was able to see how both particles can be used, depending on the context.

Excerpt 16: Swapping particles, swapping meaning

R: They both work. So, think about what we talked about. If we say, “이 만화는 __ 재미있어요” (This cartoon (-nun) is fun) or “이 만화가 __ 재미있어요” (This cartoon (-ka) is fun).

[They both work, but there is a difference in meaning] So, if we say -nun, what are we- what’s the meaning?

Jongyul: This particular drama

R: So, it’s like we said earlier, “As for this comic…” We’re just focusing on this comic. It’s fun. But what if someone gave you a bunch of comic books and said like, “Which one do you like?”

Jongyul: This one in particular

R: So, out of all of these options, I’m zooming in on one. It’s -ka, right?

In the meantime, the advanced class teacher had written another sentence for us on the board: “그 사람(____) 사과를 먹었다” (That person(__) ate the apple). Jongyul read the sentence aloud to himself, filling the blank with -un (i.e. “As for that person, he ate the apple”), so I asked him to also consider the effect of placing -i in the blank. Imagining a situation in which an apple was missing, eaten by someone in the room, we applied -i to identify the culprit (i.e. “That person (not anyone else) ate the apple”). Seeing this, Jongyul articulately summed up the meaning of -i/ka: “Out of many, one”.


5.6 Discussion

One of the grammar items that baffled me most as a learner of Korean, topic and subject markers are indeed intimidating. At the time of preparing this lesson, I had been studying Korean for nearly six years, a journey that had included a year of immersion and several intensive summer study programs. Yet, I had never heard an explanation of topic or subject markers that I found to come close to what I was noticing in the discourse around me. Because of this, I had been toying with the idea of examining the current CL research on the topic during one of our workshop sessions when Jongyul requested in the week before the present lesson that we study these markers during the next class. A week seemed almost insufficient for a topic this daunting, but reading the CL research, I began to see visuals and summaries, such as those presented in this chapter, that very closely resembled the conceptualizations I had wanted to articulate.

Although the data shows that Jongyul understands the concepts associated with topic and subject markers, he likely would have been better served by additional practice, as well. However, the story scenarios presented by Oh (2011) proved not only useful as logical examples, but also fun; Jongyul enjoyed imagining the scenes and providing commentary, which undoubtedly aided his thought process during the analysis. As each of the target forms taught in the present study demonstrate, context is highly important to meaning, so this idea of providing extended details and incorporating a storyline into a grammar lesson may be interesting for a future pedagogical study of topic and subject markers.
Chapter 6

**Evidentials** -군 (-kwun), -네 (-ney), and -더라 (-tela)

### 6.1 Motivation

Evidentials were chosen as the topic for the fifth week of the workshop because of their application in conversation and narrative, an area of interest for the workshop attendees. Specifically, this lesson focused on evidential verb endings -군, -네, and -더라 (-kwun, -ney, and -tela).

### 6.2 Background

Below, I introduce the construction of evidentials -kwun, -ney and -tela and discuss their traditional representations in the literature as well as in popular Korean language textbooks.

#### 6.2.1 Construction

Korean evidentials -kwun, -ney and -tela take the form of suffixes typically attached directly to the ends of verbs or adjectives. As Korean sentence structure dictates that a sentence ends with its main verb or adjective, these evidentials appear at the very end of sentences.
6.2.2 Traditional views of -군 (-kwun), -네 (-ney), and -더라 (-tela)

While all three evidentials -kwun, -ney, and -tela index a realization on the part of the speaker, they differ in the processes through which the realizations occur and in their relevance to the current scenario. Each evidential is discussed below.

-군 (-kwun)

According to K. Lee (1993), -kwun reveals an element of surprise due to an unforeseen event or outcome which the speaker notices through direct sensory information. Sohn (1999) adds that the timing of -kwun as “instantaneous perception” is critical to defining its meaning. Additionally, according to Sohn (1999), -kwun is only applicable in lower honorific speech levels.

-네 (-ney)

Sohn (1999, p. 357) claims that -ney conveys “counterexpectation”. This is explained in detail in K. Lee (1993), where -ney is examined as a marker of an event that disproves or contradicts the speaker’s expectation. Accordingly, K. Lee (1993, p. 27) also understands -ney to carry a meaning of “surprise”.

-더라 (-tela)

Unlike -kwun and -ney, -tela marks a realization that happens in the past, rather than in the exact moment of communication; the relevance of the realization is created in the moment of the dialogue. For this reason, -tela is commonly known as the “retrospective suffix” (Lee & Ramsey, 2000; Sohn, 1999) and can only be applied to declarative and interrogative sentences (Lee & Ramsey, 2000). Because -tela requires the speaker/writer’s direct observation of a phenomenon, it can be applied to the perception of external events or to the speaker’s realization of his/her own subconscious actions or emotions, but not to the speaker’s own conscious, intentional actions (Lee
Likewise, -tela cannot be applied to the inner emotions of others, as these are unobservable (Lee & Ramsey, 2000).

6.2.3 -군 (-kwun), -네 (-ney), and -더라 (-tela) in existing textbooks

According to the textbooks reviewed in this study (Fun Fun Korean 2 (Korea University, 2010a), Fun Fun Korean 3 (Korea University, 2010b), Korean Grammar in Use: Beginning to Early Intermediate (Ahn et al., 2010), Korean Grammar in Use: Intermediate (Min & Ahn, 2011), and Integrated Korean Intermediate 2 (Y. Cho et al., 2015)), -kwun, -ney, and -tela are considered upper beginning or intermediate grammar points. This is likely because, unlike the locative and nominative particles discusses in the previous chapters, these particles are not essential to basic sentence structure. Still, they provide a great deal of potential for nuance in spoken Korean and are, indeed, common discursive tools. Their presentation in the above textbooks is reproduced below. Explanations of mechanics and structure have been omitted for brevity.

-kwun

1. “-군요/는군요 [-kwunyo/nunkwunyo] is used to express surprise or wonder upon learning something new either by direct observation or experience or by hearing about it from someone else. It corresponds to ‘I see (that)’, ‘indeed, ‘how’, or simply an exclamation point (!) in English.”

   (Ahn et al., 2010, p. 304)

2. “-군요/군나 [-kwunyo/kwuna] is an exclamatory expression that is used when something new enters the speaker’s consciousness. The statement expressed with -군요/군나 [-kwunyo/kwuna] is not a factual statement from the speaker’s prior knowledge, but an immediate reaction to what has just been perceived...Recall that -네요/네요 [-neyyo] can also be used in expressing what the speaker has just recognized. There is a subtle difference, however, between -군요/군나 [-kwunyo] and -네요/네요 [-neyyo]. What the speaker has just recognized in the case of -군요/군나 [-kwunyo] is a simple perception. What the speaker has just recognized in the case of -네요/네요 [-neyyo], on the other hand, is more like surprise, usually contrary to what the speaker has been expecting.”

   (Y. Cho et al., 2015, pp. 123–124)
-ney

1. “-네요 [-neyyo] is used to express surprise or wonder upon learning something through direct experience or when agreeing with something said by someone else…It corresponds to ‘really’, ‘certainly’, ‘wow’, or ‘My(!)’ in English.”
   (Ahn et al., 2010, p. 306)

2. “-네요 [-neyyo]…is an exclamatory ending that expresses surprise of exclamation at the moment when the speaker is talking about something. It is often used in informal settings.”
   (Korea University, 2010a, p. 31)

-tela

1. “[더라고요; -telakoyo] is used to express the speakers’ recollection that he or she directly saw, heard, or felt some prior event or action.”
   (Min & Ahn, 2011, p. 148)

2. “-더라 (-tela) is attached to a verb, and adjective, or ‘noun+(to be)’ [noun +(to be)] and is used when the facts that the speaker actually experience in the past come to mind.”
   (Korea University, 2010b, p. 260)

3. “Recall that -더 (-te) is used to describe a situation in the past when the speaker experienced that situation. Combined together, -더라고요 (-telako(yo)) is used to report, in the self-quotation form, the speaker’s own past experience about a situation he/she happened to witness or experience in a moment in the past…The self-quotation form -라고요 (-lako(yo)) is used to emphasize the validity of the report; the speaker has the authority because it is his/her experience. It gives an effect of saying ‘I am telling you’ or ‘Let me tell you’.
   (Y. Cho et al., 2015, p. 55)

Notably, both -kwun and -ney are described as conveying “surprise” (Beginning Korean Grammar in Use, Fun Fun Korean 2) and “wonder” (Beginning Korean Grammar in Use). Accordingly, these explanations alone do not begin to convey the difference in meaning between these two expressions. The Integrated Korean Intermediate 2 book also provides a confusing account in which -kwun is described as a “simple perception”. In contrast to the “surprise” or counter-expectation the book suggests to be encoded in -ney, this description of -kwun seems to suggest that -kwun lacks any element of affective stance.

Equally confusing are the explanations of -tela. None of the explanations found for this review incorporate any mention of affective stance, and the English translations mentioned in
the Integrated Korean Intermediate 2 book are hardly applicable to every (or even most) instances of - tela, even in the book’s own examples.

6.3 Prior CL studies on -군 (-kwun), -네 (-ney), and -더라 (-tela)

Chung (2010) explores the roles of evidentials -te (as a so-called retrospective marker, not addressed here) and -ney in conveying the origin of information in a statement. The study explains that -te is “spatio-temporal” in that the event at hand is one that had been previously and directly witnessed or experienced by the speaker. On the other hand, -ney describes realization that occurs in the moment of communication (Chung, 2010).

A prior study by Strauss (2005) additionally targets epistemic stance encoded into the above evidentials, plus a third evidential: -kwun. Epistemic stance, as defined by DeHaan (1999, in Strauss, 2005), goes beyond conveying that evidence for a claim exists and “EVALUATES (emphasis original) evidence and on the basis of this evaluation assigns a confidence measure to the speaker’s utterance”. Accordingly, Strauss (2005) explores not only the source of evidence in each of the three forms, but also the degree to which a speaker commits to the claim.

Analyzing natural oral data, Strauss (2005) finds that both -ney and -kwun indicate a “realization at the moment of speech”, but that they differ in the terms of the context of this realization. According to Strauss (2005), -kwun indicates not only the existence of an inference, but also the speaker’s own meta-awareness of this sudden understanding. Contrastingly, -ney encodes a somewhat more involved process of discovery that is achieved through the receipt of information from an outside source, coupled with the speaker’s own mental process to make sense of this input (Strauss, 2005). Following this, Strauss (2005) demonstrates that because -kwun only
focuses on the occasion of an inference, it is speaker-centered. However, -ney was found to be more interactive, as it acknowledges the role of outside input (Strauss, 2005). Strauss’s (2005) finding that unlike -kwun and -ney, -tela marks realization that occurred in the past is echoed in Chung (2010), above.

All three of these evidentials are found to index “surprise and unexpectedness”, though tokens of -tela overall were more negative than those of -kwun and -ney and also conveyed an emphasis on discovery in the moment of realization (Strauss, 2005).

6.4 Application to the workshops

As in previous weeks, the workshop session began by collecting input about students’ prior understandings of the target forms. This week, a second student, Anna, joined Jongyul. Anna was at the time enrolled in a second-semester university Korean language course, through which she had not yet learned any of the realization markers (-kwun, -ney, or -tela) covered in the present workshop session. However, like Jongyul, she had encountered the particles before. While Jongyul’s background in Korean was built on snippets of conversations he had overheard, Anna’s exposure to Korean outside of class had mostly come from popular culture sources such as Korean television shows and music. As -kwun, -ney, and -tela are relatively common elements of conversational Korean, it would not have been difficult for either student to have heard each particle numerous times. Given their previous exposure to the particles, I opted not to spend much time on their mechanical constructions and to enter directly into analysis. After allowing the students to experiment freely with a selection of example sentences containing each token, we
entered a deeper analysis focusing on the concept of evidentiality, specifically emphasizing the timing and pragmatic nature of the realization encoded.

Unlike the other workshop sessions discussed in this study, the workshop on -kwun, -ney and -tela did not end with significant steps toward student mastery of the target forms. As will be shown through the data, the students were mostly unable to differentiate between two of the particles, -kwun and -ney, even at the end of the workshop. Several factors likely contributed to this outcome, but I suspect that one major reason was the lack of visual representations of the target forms. In previous weeks, visuals had been used to familiarize the students with the conceptual meanings of locative markers and subject/topic markers. In this workshop, we not only took on analysis of more forms, but also attempted to do so with only written and verbal explanations. Not predicting the value of a visual representation of the target forms, I presented the students instead with a table outlining the forms’ key characteristics (Appendix A, Table 2). In the discussion below, I present a potential visual to aid student understanding of -kwun, -ney and -tela.

6.5 Data

The class began by determining how much the students knew about evidentials -kwun, -ney and -tela. I distributed reference sheets for students (Appendix A, Table 2) and asked the students about any prior experience they had with the particles. The students’ exposure to the forms was not surprising, given the particles’ frequency; however, neither of the students had a concrete sense of any of the form’s meanings.

Excerpt 1: Identifying students’ prior knowledge of -kwun, -ney, and -tela
Have you learned or are you familiar with either of these three expressions -kwun, which could be like -kwunyo [polite form of -kwun] -kwuna [intimate form of -kwun] at the end, like kulehkwna [“I see”; intimate form] kulehkwunyo [“I see”; polite form] or -ney would be like haneyyo mwemwe haneyyo [I see that (you) are doing- I see that (you) are doing something] issneyyo [I see that (it) exists], kulehneyyo [I see that (such) is the case].

Jongyul: (nods)
Anna: I've heard it, but I don't what exactly it means (shaking head)
R: Ok. And -tela is another one. Have- has anybody heard of -tela? Isstelako [I've noticed that (it) exists; intimate form], isstelakoyo [I’ve noticed that (it) exists; polite form], hatelakoyo [I’ve noticed that (you) do; polite form].

Totally new?

Jongyul: (looks up and nods)
R: You've heard about it?
Jongyul: I've heard about it, but it's like I couldn't explain it.
Anna: Yeah

The students’ previous exposure to the target forms had allowed them to at least recognize the markers in discourse, but had not led to a functional understanding of how to use them meaningfully. Before describing how the items differ, I explained how they belonged to the same category of “realization” and “evidentiality”.

Excerpt 2: I explain evidentiality

R: What it means is that (reading off of the student worksheet) "They [evidentials] rely on there being some specific form of evidence for the claim to which they are attached." Ok, so you will have a sentence and at the end it will have one of these. They're endings. (I draw a wavy, horizontal line to represent a statement and a straight, horizontal line to represent a verb ending). So, whatever is here (pointing to the wavy line), this statement is- has to be backed up with a certain form of evidence. Ok, and that's different for each of these expressions.

Korean syntax requires the main verb to be the final item in a sentence. So-called “verb endings” are morpheme constructions attached to the end of a verb (and thereby, to the end of the sentence). They contain a variety of information, including tense, honorific levels, affective stance,
and, in this case, evidentiality. The image we used to represent a sentence with a specific verb ending looked somewhat like Figure 8, below.

Figure 8: Korean Sentence Endings

I explained to the students, who were already familiar with numerous other verb endings, that the verb endings in focus during the present workshop would each indicate a specific type of evidence leading to or validating a claim. After a brief demonstration of how to attach the particles to a verb stem, students began analyzing blog titles containing the target forms. Blog titles were chosen as a data source for their brevity and easy access to context (the blog post itself). Importantly, they also served as natural discourse samples, allowing the students to see specific examples of how expert speakers of Korean would use the particles. As the students analyzed the blog titles and made assumptions about their meanings, I took notes on the board, neither validating nor rejecting any ideas.

The first blog title, 역시 서울에 가면 연예인 볼 수 있구나 (As expected, if you go to Seoul, you can see (-kwuna) celebrities), introduced a blog documenting the writer’s experience of seeing a famous person while traveling in Seoul. Jongyul suggested that the story sounded like a “past instance” of a “personal experience” that the blogger wanted to share with others. After recording these ideas on the board, I asked the students if they thought the blogger had been expecting to see celebrities in Seoul.

Excerpt 3: Analyzing 역시 (yeksi, as expected)

R: Do you think this person was expecting to see celebrities or not?
Jongyul: I'd say yes because of the phrase 역시 [yeksi; as expected]
R: Ok (adding "expected? --> yes" to the board)
Jongyul: And big city where most stuff in Korea happens

As his explanation reveals, Jongyul’s analysis is based on the usage of yeksi and the context of the discourse, rather than on the inclusion of -kwun in the sentence. Although Jongyul said he had heard -kwun in use prior to this workshop, he was not yet able to identify or articulate its meaning. The topic of conversation moves to the discussion of -kwuna and Jongyul offers his interpretation.

Excerpt 4: Jongyul interprets -kwuna

Jongyul: Maybe it denotes like "such is the case"?
R: Such is the case? That's what this means? (Pointing to -kwuna on the board)
Jongyul: Well it could imply that. I wouldn't say it's a direct translation. But it's the kind of tone it implies.

Looking back on this excerpt, I wonder what Jongyul might have said had I asked him to explain this interpretation in more detail. However, because the class time was very limited, I was not able to do so. I wrote his answer on the board and we continued to the next example sentence, 요새는 계속 사 먹기만 하네요 (These days I continuously only buy (-ney) [prepared food]).

The construction of the main verb, 사먹다 (samekta), was new to the students. Samekta is a compound verb including “buy” (sa-) and “eat” (mek-), which together mean “purchase and eat” (rather than “cook and eat”). In other words, the blog author was describing her pattern of continuously buying prepared food and not cooking for herself. After explaining this to the students, I introduced part of the blog contents:

사실 요리를 잘 하는 건 아니지만 그래도 집에 있으면 해먹는 편이었는데 요새는 왜 그런 요리를 거의 안 하네요.

(Honestly, it’s not that I’m good at cooking, but still if I’m at home I usually ’cooked and ate’, but these days for some reason I almost don’t cook (-ney)).

Jongyul offers his interpretation of the author’s stance in writing about this topic:
Excerpt 5: Jongyul interprets blog author’s stance

Jongyul: I think that part of it is just like implying (shaking his head) 'Gee, I've just been eating out all the time'. Like it's almost like a state of like, I don't know, disappointment? Or uh... like a matter of fact. It's just like (shrugs shoulders) it's just what happened.

Jongyul again recognizes the overall purpose and tone of the excerpt, but is unable to relate this to -ney. According to Strauss (2005), -ney can occur with both positive and negative stances, meaning that the blog author’s disappointment in herself for not cooking more is not necessarily the reason behind the appearance of -ney in this excerpt. Before explaining anything, I directed the students to look at a third sentence, this one featuring -tela:

요새 향초가 인기더라구요

These days scented candles are popular (-telako)

This time, Anna offered her interpretation of why the blog author choose to use -tela. Like Jongyul, Anna relied mostly on her assumptions of the larger context of the blog, as we had not yet discussed the meanings any of the target particles, beyond that they were markers of realization. This process of making assumptions allowed the students to interact with the data in an open-ended, low pressure setting before adding in analysis of the implications of the verb-final particles.

Excerpt 6: Anna interprets “These days scented candles are popular (-telako)”

Anna: They're probably going to explain it afterwards? Maybe that's why they're starting off with that?
R: Ok
(I write "3) Going to explain" on the board)
Anna: They don't know why? Or expressing like a confusion about why? Or- or I don't know what I'm saying (laughs)
R: (I start to take notes on the board)
Not sure why?
Anna: Yeah, like they're uneasy or like yeah expressing like uncertainty that the reader might (laughs)
Although it is hard to say that Anna was correct in her analysis of -tela, guessing did allow her the chance to work with the data and begin to picture the content, if not yet the context. With this pre-analysis activity complete, we moved on to explore the meanings of the particles as they are presented in Strauss (2005). I choose a quote from Strauss (2005) to introduce the concept of an evidential:

“...all three of these markers emerge at a point in the discourse where the speaker has seen or heard something that instantaneously triggers a shift in consciousness and concomitantly produces a cognitive realization.” – Strauss (2005)

These two features of direct experience and realization are essential to understanding and using all three of the target forms, -kwun, -ney, and -tela. I elaborated on the above quote to be sure the students would understand:

**Excerpt 7: I explain evidentials**

**R:** In other words, so the speaker has found whatever they are talking about by their own experience, somehow… In this case it says "seen or heard" but it could also be "feel". You know, the candle is really hot, whatever. Or the candle smells really good. That's not something you would have seen or heard, but something you've sensed. On your own. **And each of the expressions carries an element of realization or discovery of information that was new to that person.** Ok, so it wouldn't have to be new to everybody. But at least that person realized something from some sort of stimulus.

**-kwun: speaker-centered, instantaneous realization**

Having established evidentiality as the common thread between the three particles, we moved to analyzing each particle independently. Beginning with -kwun, I first introduced Strauss’s (2005) study results (for a summary of Strauss’s (2005) analysis as was presented to the students in the workshop, see Appendix A, Table 2). The defining features of -kwun, according to Strauss (2005), are a realization directly following sensory input and the speaker’s own consciousness of the realization that follows. As such, -kwun can be referred to as a “speaker-centered” realization.
marker (Strauss, 2005). To this, Anna asked whether -kwun could be used with the “have verb”, by which she meant 있다 (issta; have, exist).

**Excerpt 8: Anna asks about -kwun with issta (have; exist)**

Anna: Can you use it in a sentence with the have verb?
R: Ok so if you said something about your sister, like I don't know, you have an older sister, so '우리 언니는 뭐뭐뭐뭐' (my older sister blah blah blah blah) and then I could say '어 연니 있다' (Oh, you have (-kwun) an older sister) 'You have an older sister! I didn't realize that before, but now that you just talked about her, I realized that you have one.'

Anna: Oh ok, that makes sense

The key point that I emphasized here was regarding the immediacy of the realization associated with -kwuna. Importantly, the speaker in the above example could arrive at the conclusion that the other person had an older sister simply by hearing her comment referencing the sister; further logical thought would not be required for this instantaneous realization (Strauss, 2005).

**-ney: interactive, reasoned realization**

The students seemed fairly comfortable with the explanation for -kwun, but I knew that it would have to be compared and contrasted with-ney before they could clearly see the defining characteristics of each of the two markers. According to Strauss’s (2005) study, -ney, like-kwun, marks the articulation of a discovery occurring directly prior. However, rather than denoting a “speaker-centered” utterance, it marks a realization that somehow involves the interlocutor(s) and requires more cognitive effort than does a simple realization marked by -kwun (Strauss, 2005). To demonstrate this, I used an example from Strauss’s (2005) paper.

**Excerpt 9: Contrasting -kwun and -ney**
R: Ok so there's an example that I'll show to you from this paper. And it was, if we imagine we are at a restaurant, all of us, and we get out all of our cards to pay and we all have the same exact credit card. Ok? And then I could say, like - so maybe we all have Visa cards, and I could say like, "어, 우리 다 비자네" (Oh, we are (-ney) all Visas). We are all Visa cards and it's more like I'm trying to connect with you guys in some way, rather if I said, '어, 다 비자구나' (Oh, we are (-kwun) all Visas). Then it's just- I'm just telling you that I realized this and it has nothing to do with you guys. I'm not trying to get a response or make a connection. I'm just like, 'Oh. We all have Visas.' Right, but if I said, '어 다 비자네', then somebody might like reply to that or acknowledge what I said somehow. It's not just my own realization; it involves all of us.

Jongyul: It's- it's kind of funny picturing like that- that situation. Like everybody's just pulling out their cards and you're looking at each other's cards. That sounds like a very materialistic thing to do.

Although at first glance it appears that Jongyul fails to see the point of the example, his response does reveal that he has understood the context in which the utterance including -kwun or -ney would occur, i.e. everyone’s card is in view and it is by that visual information that a realization is made. To emphasize the meaning of -ney, I introduced the adverb 그려면 (kulemyen) and its contraction, 그럼 (kulem). Both can be understood roughly to mean ‘then’ or ‘in that case’ in English and occur frequently in sentences ending in -ney. According to Strauss (2005), the frequency of these adverbs’ co-occurrence with -ney illustrates the deep level of cognition leading to the indicated realization. To demonstrate this to the students, I suggested a scenario in which we were trying to find a time to have tea.

Excerpt 10: Kulemyen (then, in that case) with -ney

R: ...And you're telling me about your schedule. 'I have class from ten to twelve and from like twelve to two, and then from four to six.' And then I could say 'Ohh 그려면 두시반쯤 되겠네요? (Then (kulemyen) around two-thirty would work (-ney?)) Kulemyen, in that case, because you have that gap in your class, in that case, maybe we can meet at like two thirty. OK, so this is in response to what somebody else said. You tell me your schedule. I say, 'in that case', and what would be the reason that we could use kulemyen with -ney?
Anna: I feel like **realizing something** and then…
R: Yeah, it's like, I'm using what you said and it's not -kwun because you didn't- I'm making it a little bit like one more step of I'm taking the information from your schedule and I see you have a gap from two to four. Ok so I'm taking that information, thinking about it, realizing 'Ok, then two thirty could work'. **So I didn't realize something as soon as she said it. Right, I had to think about it. Then, I realized something. And I'm trying to engage her again by suggesting two thirty. I'm expecting a response from her. So, -ney.**

Anna was not able to fully articulate what she was seeing with *kulemyen* and -ney, so I decided to illustrate the effect of using -ney compared to using the unmarked, basic conjugation. I did so while introducing -겠-(keyss), an epistemic modal (Strauss, 2005). This infix indicates future conditions and is used in both promises and assumptions. Like *kulemyen* and *kulem*, -keyss-demonstrates an in-depth thought process (i.e. to reach an assumption) and thus is frequently used with -ney (Strauss, 2005). ‘

**Excerpt 11: Epistemic modal -keyss- with -ney**

R: What I also said was, '그럼 두시반에 만나면 되겠네요. 되겠-. [Kulemyen, it would work (-keyss-) to meet at two-thirty. Would work (-keyss-)].
This one (I write "-겠(keyss)" on the board). This is really commonly used with 뭐뭐-네요 [something, something...-ney] because... Any guess about why?

Jongyul: Uh
R: What does this mean?
Anna: We just learned that in class. But I forget it.
(We briefly discuss -keyss-)
R: **What if I just said, '그럼 두시반에 보면 되겠어요'?” 2 시반에 보면 되겠어요. [Then two-thirty works]. I'm not giving you much of a choice, am I? I'm just, "Well, great, we can meet at two-thirty". But in this case (with -ney), I'm offering- This is my inference, right?**

At this point, I could see Jongyul staring at the board, frowning with a puzzled expression.

I ask him if his is confused.
Excerpt 12: Jongyul asks how the target endings influence meaning

Jongyul: Well. You know, you said for the other example 보면서 되겠어요 (It would work (-keyss) to see[meet]) like you're saying that's not implying choice and rather it’s saying 'This works. Let's stick to this"? I was confused as to how it could change based on the things we just covered.

With this question, I realized that either the students were being presented with too much information or the method of presentation was not effective for them. Although I was confident that -tela would be easier because of its difference from -kwun and -ney, I did not want to move on too quickly. I explained to Jongyul that using an unmarked verb ending (i.e. 되겠어요, 되겠다; toykeysseyo, toykeyssta) shows a simple statement of fact. Because of this, if such a verb ending were used to express an assumption that two-thirty would be a possible time to meet (as in our ongoing example), the resulting message would not option for the interlocutor to counter the suggestion. On the other hand, -ney, because of its interactive nature, would almost expect a response from the other person. This, I explained, is illustrated by the frequent practice of including a question mark after similar usages of -ney when texting. Jongyul’s second reaction was somewhat more encouraging:

Excerpt 13: Jongyul understands -ney in assumptions

Jongyul: Like I can see that because that gives like the way that's toned, you communicate that, or essentially, you're saying like 'that would work', rather than saying in a decisive manner, 'this works, let's stick to it'.

Differentiating -kwun and -ney

To further exemplify the contrast between -ney and -kwun, I changed the -ney in the sentence 그러면 두시 반에 만나면 되겠네요. (Then it would work (-ney) to meet at two-thirty) to -kwun: 그러면 두시 반에 만나면 되겠군요 (Then it would work (-kwun) to meet at two-thirty).

Anna immediately caught on to a possible usage of this phrase, demonstrating her understanding of the difference between the discourse contexts of -ney and -kwun.

Excerpt 14: -kwun as a marker for self-talk

R:  

Anna:  

R:  

In recognizing that -kwun might co-occur with self-talk, Anna demonstrated her recognition of -kwun as a speaker-centered marker. I validated her analysis as a possible context and Jongyul mentioned that he initially had difficulty understanding the change in tone between -ney and -kwun, but that he now understood. We next moved back to the list of interpretations the students initially made about -kwun and -ney in the sentences 역시 서울에 가면 연예인 볼 수 있구나 [As expected, if you go to Seoul, you can see (-kwuna) celebrities] and 요새는 계속 사먹기만 하네요 (These days I continuously only buy (-ney) [prepared food]).

We established that two items (past instance and wanting to share the experience) on the list are implied more through the context of the first story than through the use of -kwun, to which they had been applied in our earlier discussion. Specifically, the fact that seeing celebrities in Seoul is an experience from the past is implied by the date of blog, though at the time of writing, the author’s realization could have been very new. The desire to share the experience is also conveyed not through -kwun, but through the fact that the author wrote and published a blog post on the topic.

At the same time, I emphasized that personal experience is indeed central to the meanings of both markers. Anna also suggested that -kwun might express a conclusion because of the cumulative process of arriving at a realization. This idea was also accepted into our analysis.
Next, we revisited the idea of disappointment as it relates to -ney (from our discussion of 요즘 사먹기만 하네요; These days I just buy and eat ³ (-ney)). We discussed that -ney in this context could potentially indicate disappointment, but this is not a necessary characteristic of expressions with -ney. Next, as Jongyul reasoned through his suggestion of “matter of fact” as a descriptor of -kwun, he perceptively noted the layers of cognition that lead to the realization encoded in the particle:

Excerpt 15: Jongyul recognizes the cognitive process of -ney

R: 'As a matter of fact’. What did you mean by this, Jongyul?
Jongyul: Like, because it happened. Like, it happened and then the blogger realized it. Like kind of like what you were alluding to earlier, like 'Oh, I just, looking back upon it. I've been buying food quite often.'

The process of “looking back” necessitates cognitive processing that surpasses simple responses to a stimulus. The action of remembering and making connections (i.e. recalling what one had for meals in the recent days and remembering how those meals were acquired) is one of the key characteristics of -ney that separates it from -kwun. With Jongyul’s articulation of understanding, we moved on to discuss -tela.

-tela: recollection of a past realization

The so-called “retrospective” evidential, -tela, differs from -kwun and -ney in the timing of realization that it expresses. While the immediacy of the realizations encoded by -kwun and the

³ The verb 사먹다 (samekta) here combines verbs “buy” (사다; sata) and “eat” (먹다; mekta) and describes the act of buying prepared food and eating it. Its opposite is 해먹다 (heymekta), “do (cook)” (하다; hata) and “eat” (먹다; mekta)- prepare and eat one’s own food.
processual realization shown through -ney can make differentiating the two markers a challenge, -tela is unique in that it marks past realizations that are mentioned at a later time because of their relevance in that moment. However, as the tense involved in conjugating -tela is different from that of -kwun or -ney, I decided to present -tela’s structure first. I first wrote two phrases on the board: 책상 밑에 책이 많더라 (chayksang mithey chayki manhtela; there are (-tela) a lot of books under the desk) and책상 밑에 책이 많았더라 (chayksang mithey chayki manhasstela; there were (-tela) a lot of books under the desk). I explained their differences with a scenario:

Excerpt 16: past and present -tela
R: Ok, so imagine I walk into a room. Here’s the difference. I walk into the room and I see under the desk there are all of these books. And then I talk about it later. I would use this one (pointing to manhtela, present tense). When I realized it, presently at that time, there were a bunch of books under the desk. Ok, this one (pointing to manhasstela, past tense) could be maybe I saw a picture of the room a long time ago. It’s an old picture. And in that picture, there were a lot of books under the desk. So, because it’s a picture, it’s capturing a time before now. Ok, so I know it was in the past. And that’s when I would use this one (pointing to manhasstela, past tense).

Anna expressed understanding of this by confirming that -tela is showing a “past realization”. I added on to her analysis, paraphrasing from Strauss (2005) that -tela is also a marker of potential surprise and unexpectedness, and is mostly speaker-centered, serving to primarily relay one’s past experiences without requiring input from the interlocutor (as the realization has already occurred). With this established, I asked Jongyul and Anna to consider the source of information that can lead to a realization marked by -tela.

Excerpt 17: Sources of evidence for -tela
R: So if we go to the thing about the candles, 요새 향초가 인기더라요 [“These days fragrant candles are popular (-tela)”]
Jongyul: How could the person have realized that the candles are in popularity?
Jongyul: Like that they heard of or saw in the past.
R: Ok, right. Right. So this was- this was in the past- a past experience. And it could be anything, really. Like, um, they saw a news story, suddenly noticed they're selling many more candles in the stores, saw it in a magazine, saw it on- like in dramas all of a sudden all of the houses have fragrant candles, whatever it is, they've seen or heard, felt, experienced something.

Jongyul immediately demonstrated understanding of -tela’s evidence from the past. He gave one concrete example of an evidence source – a previously viewed news story – and I added that any sort of past sensory experience is sufficient as evidence for -tela, as long as it was direct.

Anna asked if this is not the same as the meaning contributed by -ney to 요즘 사먹기만 하네요; These days I just buy (food) and eat (-ney), which we imagined could take evidence from various past events to make a conclusion in the present (i.e. recalling dinner from the past week to realize that each meal came from a restaurant). I explained that while both may make use of past experience, -ney makes a processual realization in the moment of speaking, while -tela recalls a realization that was made in the past. I also explained that because of the nature of observation involved in realizations marked with -tela, -tela also is difficult to use in expressions about oneself.

However, because -tela can mark a conclusion made through several observations over a period of time, I asked students for examples of observations they made over time. Anna offered the realization that there are fewer and fewer pencils in one’s pencil case, and we noted that the realization of the pencils’ disappearance could be labeled with -tela, as in 네, 연필이 점점 사라지더라고요 (Yes, my pencils are gradually disappearing (-tela).

On the same note, I mentioned that -tela (like the other evidentials) should usually not be used with a very obvious fact unless the speaker is attempting to sound sarcastic. Anna immediately provided an entertaining example:
Excerpt 18: -tela with obvious statements

R: So you don't want to use this with something that is really obvious, because it is a realization. So like..
Anna: Oh like 'potatoes grow in the ground'?
R: Yeah, potatoes grow in the ground (laughing) [Yes, they do (-tela)]
All: (laughing)
R: That could be like a sarcastic response, like 'Oh, yeah, I noticed that, too.'
Anna: That's just a realization my friend came to. That's why I thought of that.
All: (laughing)

Anna’s humorous example reminded us of the importance of relevance in using -tela. Although such simple facts, such as that potatoes grow in the ground, come as realizations at some point, they are generally considered obvious enough that the way in which the realization took place (i.e. through direct experience, as with -tela) becomes extraneous information later on. With the characteristics of -tela laid out, we moved to a phase of data analysis.

Discourse samples were taken directly from Strauss’s (2005) paper on -kwun, -ney, and -tela. I adapted them for this activity by removing the evidential endings. Anna and Jongyul were asked to use context clues to reason through which ending they imagined would have been used in the original. The first example situation shows an office worker, Namhee, as she notices that her coworker, Keedong, is not answering his phone. Finally, she decides to intervene and walks to his office. She finds that he is not there and answers the phone. The caller is a woman named Younghee. I asked Anna and Jongyul to consider a possible ending of a sentence spoken by Namhee.

Example 1:

Younghee: ᄇ ᄉ 아니 김기동 씨 자리에 안 계세요?
[Haha but is KIM Keedong not there?]
Namhee: 글쎄. 없______.
Hmm, he’s not here (_____)

Younghie: 어

Oh

Namhee: 계속 전화 안 받길래 받을게요 그랬더니 또 끊어지고

Since he was not answering the phone, I decided to answer it, but it then the call dropped again…

Anna guessed that the evidential in the blank would be -kwun because Namhee would be making the observation to herself in the present moment. I reminded Anna of the context and explain that -ney is a better choice because while it is true that Namhee is making that realization in the moment, that realization also contains important information for Younghie – it answers her question. We then examined another brief dialogue together.

A second example features a phone dialogue between a woman (Younghie) and her niece (Hyeykyeng). Younghie recognizes that her niece’s voice sounds weak and articulates her concern.

Example 2:

Hyeykyeng: 나도 보고 싶어
[I miss you, too]

Younghie: 얼마나?
[How much?]

Hyeykyeng: 이~만큼
[This~~ much]

Younghie: 해경아, 아파서 기운이 하나도 없____?
[Hyeykyeng, you don’t have (_____ ) any energy because you’re sick]

Hyeykyeng: 음
[Yeah]

Anna guessed that the realization would be marked with -ney and Jongyul expressed agreement. Although the original version uses -kwun, we discussed that both are possible, but that the meaning would change depending on the ending chosen. I explained that -kwun marks a simple realization in the moment, and that the question mark indicates a request for confirmation.
Another dialogue, also from Strauss (2005), shows two hosts (Mr. Lee and Ms. Song) and a guest (Mrs. Youngran) on the show Achim Matang (Morning Garden), which features long-lost family members as they reunite. In the featured episode, a daughter is interviewed before meeting her mother in person. The hosts try to calculate how long it had been since the two women had seen each other.

Example 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Lee:</th>
<th>오늘 이렇게 만나면 이십 한-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you meet today, it will be about-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Youngran:</td>
<td>(19)76 년도에 제가 잃어버렸거든요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lost her in ‘76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lee:</td>
<td>이십삼년..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Song:</td>
<td>예</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lee:</td>
<td>(이십) 삼사년 됐_____.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been (______) twenty-three, twenty-four years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jongyul successfully predicted that Mr. Lee would finish his last sentence with -kwun because he “realizes it at that moment with the help of others”. After initially guessing that the blank would be filled with -ney, Anna changed her own answer to support the rationale for -kwun, adding that -kwun would make more sense “because it's his own realization” (i.e. Mrs. Youngran and Ms. Song are already aware of how many years have passed). These two factors – immediate realization and speaker-centeredness – make -kwun the most logical choice.

6.6 Discussion

The present workshop was noticeably more difficult for the students than any other workshop in the series presented in the same semester. Although the students were able to recall the three particles’ characteristics and describe them, recognizing and predicting usage patterns
proved to be a stretch for this lesson. Several factors likely contributed to this, not the least of which was the absence of visual tools to aid conceptual understanding of each form. After relying on prominently displayed visuals and keywords in the first two sessions featured here, we attempted an analysis based entirely on discussion and written data. As both students were studying -*kwun*, -*ney*, and -*tel*a for the first time, a display of their meanings in nonlinguistic forms may have been more accessible. With this in mind, I propose a set of visuals, which future learners may find useful as they study these three evidentials.

**Figure 9: -*kwun*: INPUT --> REALIZATION**

This representation of -*kwun* shows the direct path (straight arrow) between sensory input and a consequential realization. No further steps are present between the input and the realization (Strauss, 2005). The star, representing “now”, shows that this realization happens in real time.

**Figure 10: -*ney*: INPUT --> PROCESSING --> REALIZATION**

The realization marked -*ney* also occurs in the moment of input, but passes through an additional step of processing before reaching completion (Strauss, 2005). The triangles in the middle represent this step.
In the case of -tela, the realization comes first in the representation, because the present situation is where an observation from a previous event is mentioned again. Because this realization has already been processed, no additional steps are necessary, thus the straight arrow.

Had the students been able to work with visuals such as these during the present workshop, I hypothesize that understanding would have been faster and more solid. Future research may focus on applying these or similar visuals to the teaching of evidentials to observe how spatially-represented visual aids can support Korean conceptual development.
Chapter 7

Completives V/Adj.+ -아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita) and V/Adj. + -고 말다 (-ko malta)

7.1 Motivation

Completives V/Adj. + -a/e pelita and V/Adj. + -ko malta are often reserved for upper intermediate level grammar instruction (see textbooks cited in 7.2.3). However, given the nature of the Korean language workshops as an enrichment environment, my focus was on supporting conversational and pragmatic ability, which sometimes led me to introduce “advanced” concepts that I knew would be both helpful and within reach for the class. I felt that completives could be a useful stance-marking tool. Additionally, because students like Jongyul have quite a bit of exposure to Korean language outside of any sequenced curriculum, it was my hope to establish the present expressions’ meaning and usage patterns as a tool for both analyzing and applying elements of affective stance in communication.

7.2 Background

Below, I introduce the construction of completives V/Adj. + -a/e pelita and V/Adj. + -ko malta and discuss their traditional representations in the literature as well as in popular Korean language textbooks.
7.2.1 Construction

Each target expression (V+ -a/e pelita, V + -ko malta) contains two components. In the case of V+ -a/e pelita, another verb – the main verb of the construction - is conjugated onto the pelita verb (either -a or -e, depending on the final vowel in the main verb’s stem, is the allomorph resulting from the conjugation of the main verb). Malta is also connected to a main verb in V+ -ko malta, but through a connecting morpheme, -ko.

7.2.2 Traditional views of V/Adj. + -아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita) and V/Adj. + -고 말다 (-ko malta)

Falling under the umbrella of completives, both V+ -a/e pelita (“do and discard”) and V+-ko malta (“do and fail to complete”) convey the finality of a completed action. Sohn (1994) calls this the “terminative aspect” (p. 333). Both constructions contain an auxiliary predicate (pelita, malta); even though these verbs can each stand on their own in other environments. Sohn (1999, p. 318) argues that their manifestations in these completive constructions have become separate in meaning from the otherwise identical standalone verb forms. While pelita on its own is generally translated to “throw away” and malta roughly means to “not do”, in 1994, Sohn defined V+ -a/e pelita as “finish[ing] up” (p. 333) and V+ -ko malta as “end[ing] up” or “do[ing] once and for all” (p. 333). The connection between the original and auxiliary meanings of both pelita and malta are briefly explored in the present workshop session.
7.2.3 V/Adj. + -아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita) and V/Adj. + -고 말다 (-ko malta) in existing textbooks

Completives V+ -a/e pelita and V+ -ko malta are notably more difficult to find in textbooks than are the other target forms addressed in this study. Explanations were found in *Korean Grammar in Use: Intermediate* (Min & Ahn, 2011), Yonsei University’s *Korean Grammar Practice for Foreigners: Intermediate level* (Yonsei University Korean Program, 2012), and *Integrated Korean Intermediate 2* (Y. Cho et al., 2015). Below, explanations of each target form are reviewed:

**V/Adj. + -ko malta**

1. “[고 말다; -ko malta] is used when the speaker performed an unrelated action or when something which should not have occurred took place.”
   (Yonsei University Korean Program, 2012, p. 17)

2. “[고 말다; -ko malta] refers to an unplanned event or action that continued until it was completed or thoroughly finished in a way undesired by the speaker. Thus it includes the speaker’s feeling of regret or sorrow with regard to the resulting state of affairs.”
   (Min & Ahn, 2011, p. 350)

After reading these explanations of -ko malta, a student is likely still confused. Particularly, the wording of the explanation in *Korean Grammar Practice for Foreigners* could leave a student wondering what an “unrelated action” could be. As will be explained in the following section, -ko malta has a strong meaning tied to cognitive struggle between potential actions and then a final action that puts an end to that struggle (Strauss, Lee, & Ahn, 2006). Such elements of indecision or finality of the decision are not mentioned in either of these textbook examples.

**V/Adj. + -a/e pelita**

1. “[아/어 버리다; -a/e pelita] is used to indicate that nothing is left, a burden is relieved, or there is a sense of regret and sorrow once an action is completed.”
   (Yonsei University Korean Program, 2012, p. 172)
2. "[~아/어] 버리다; - a/e pelita] refers to the complete and thorough finishing of an action or event. It can refer to the fact that nothing remains after the completion of the event or action, and it can also express a variety of feelings and attitudes toward the completed event or action. For example, it can express the speaker’s feeling of regret, sorrow, and lament at an unfortunate result, the speaker’s feeling of relief about a positive change of events, or the speaker’s feeling of anger or surprise about how a situation turned out.”
   (Min & Ahn, 2011, p. 347)

3. "~아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita), literally meaning ‘throw away an action of ~’ is used to refer to the emotional effect of swiftly finishing or cleaning up something. Thus, it has the meaning of ‘to do completely’, ‘to get it done’, or ‘to do it all (away, up, etc.)’ In [example sentences], the emotional effect of the action is regret, disappointment, or feeling of emptiness. In [another example sentence] the emotional effect is relief.”
   (Y. Cho et al., 2015, p. 62)

The above explanations for V+ -a/e pelita are largely similar to each other, including elements of “completely finishing” and various emotional responses to the results. However, none of the explanations mention the concept of “irreversibility”, which is what truly makes this construction a completive (Strauss et al., 2006).

7.3 Prior CL studies on V+ -아/어 버리다 (-a/e pelita) and V+ 고 말다 (-ko malta)

The present workshop lesson is based primarily on Strauss et al.’s (2006) study on CL-based pedagogical approaches to auxiliary constructions V+ -a/e pelita and V+ -ko malta. Strauss groups the two expressions on the basis of their “completive” aspect. Bybee et al. define “completeness” as the characteristic describing an action that in its “thoroughness” brings about some absolute and irreversible effect on the object involved (Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994, in Strauss et al., 2006). Strauss et al. (2006) conducted a corpus-based analysis of V+ -ko malta and V+ -a/e pelita in various discourse media and across diverse contexts. Their results show that V+ -ko malta indicates “finality with resistance or struggle”; in other words, the outcome of the situation marks the end of a conflict between possible actions, possibly with the result being
“unfavorable” (Strauss et al., 2006). Contrasting, V+ -a/e pelita is found to focus not on the background of an action, but on its result, emphasizing “totality” and irreversibility (Strauss et al., 2006).

7.4 Application to the workshops

Among the target forms featured in this study, the completives were least familiar to Jongyul (the only student who joined this workshop). However, this did not mean that he had no basis at all on which to build an understanding. The auxiliary position of pelita in V+ -a/e pelita is similar to other auxiliary verb constructions he had already encountered, and -ko was already familiar as a sequential connector roughly similar to “then” in English. After explaining the formation of each expression and introducing the concept of a completive, I presented a series of example sentences featuring each target form and led Jongyul in an analysis of the meaning each target form contributed to its example sentences.

7.5 Data

V+ a/e pelita

The lesson began by introducing pelita and malta as independent verbs (outside of the target constructions). I suspected that Jongyul had already encountered these verbs elsewhere, and, regardless, it was important for him to understand the words’ independent meanings before he was asked to form a deep understanding of them as part of a larger construction. We began our analysis by focusing on pelita.
As I had expected, Jongyul had heard of *pelita* and offered the translation “throw away”. I moved on to explain that *pelita* could also have a role as an auxiliary verb. Through the example “-해 주세요” (*Please do ~; lit. DO + GIVE + Honorific imperative*), I demonstrated how some verbs can be added to others, as “give” was added to “do”, to create new meaning. In the case of the auxiliary verb *pelita*, as we would see, the added meaning is that of finality or completion (Strauss et al., 2006).

I next encouraged Jongyul to consider several example sentences, both with and without the *pelita* auxiliary verb. The first example was “렌즈를 까고 자버렸어요” (*I fell asleep with my contacts in; lit. I put in my contacts and slept (+ pelita)*)). He was quick to offer an interpretation:

**Excerpt 1: Jongyul interprets auxiliary *pelita***

Jongyul: Uhh well the sentence in parentheses (without *pelita*) is kind of the simple way of saying, "I wore my contacts while sleeping". But with 자버렸어요 (*slept + pelita*) means... well it has a more consequential meaning to it. Like, once I wore my contact lens, then fell asleep.

Jongyul’s interpretation was strikingly accurate. Although he was not able to completely articulate the meaning of the “sleep + pelita” construction, he recognizes that *pelita* carries the meaning of potential consequences for an action. I encouraged him to continue with this pattern of analysis as we considered the next sentence: “이 약 유통기한 지났는데 먹어 버렸어요” (*This medicine’s shelf life has passed, but I ate(+pelita) it*). This time, Jongyul did not respond, so I offered an explanation:

**Excerpt 2: I elaborate on auxiliary *pelita***

R: **There is nothing in either of these situations that the person can do about the situation now.** Right? The person fell asleep, and so 야예 생각이 없잖아요 이제? (*They don’t have any thoughts now, right?*) They're sleeping, so they can't even realize this or wake themselves back up. There's not much you can do if you've already eaten expired medicine.
Right? So, think about it this way - as in, there is some sort of finality...

There's something about irreversible completedness that we're looking for. Let's see if it applies to the next one.

In a following example, Jongyul demonstrated his understanding of the irreversibility of *pelita*. The sentence in focus was 화장을 지우다가 면봉으로 눈을 찌러 버렸어요 (As I was removing my makeup with a cotton swab, I poked(+pelita) my eye). Through his interpretation, Jongyul showed a progression from describing a “consequence” (Excerpt 1) to specifically articulating the completive sense of *pelita*.

**Excerpt 3: Jongyul expands his interpretation of *pelita***

R: Ok, so she’s of course, asking for advice. What does she have to do in this case. But, why do you think she used "plyesseyo" [past tense, polite form of *pelita"]?
Jongyul: **Because once her eye was stabbed, it can't be unstabbed.** It was like, there was a lot of pain and probably some damage.

**V+ -ko malta**

With Jongyul’s increased understanding of auxiliary *pelita*, we moved on to discuss -ko malta. We first brainstormed *malta* as it appears in common, everyday expressions. Among the phrases we identified were 하지 마세요 (haci maseyyo; imperative: do not do), 하지 말자 (haci malca; inclusive imperative: let’s not do), and 할 거야, 말 거야? (halkeya, malkeya? Interrogative: Are you going to do it or not?). From this, we were able to see that *malta* on its own roughly means ‘to not do (something)’. I elaborated with two more example sentences, showing *malta* can mean stopping an action before or after its initiation.

**Excerpt 1: Explaining *malta* vs. -ko *malta***

R: 그는 그 책을 읽다가 말았다.  
[“He **stopped** reading that book after starting/in the middle.”]

“책을 읽다가 말았다” 근데 여기서 중요한 게 ’말었다’예요.
He didn't complete it. So, in this case it means something like he never finished, he gave up. **So, we can see that malassta in this case means that it never made it to completion.** You never finished. Ok, that's *malta*. And it's the same thing with like *hacima, hacima* (imperative: “don’t do”), you can say that even if somebody already started to do something. It at least means ’don’t finish’. Right?

After establishing that *malta* shows a sense of ‘not finishing’ an action, we began our analysis with an excerpt of Hans Christian Andersen’s story, *The Red Shoes* (as in Strauss et al., 2006). The short story presents Karen, a young girl preparing to go to church, as she decides between wearing black shoes and red shoes. Aware that it would be unacceptable to wear red shoes, but desiring to do so nonetheless, she spends a moment considering her options before finally selecting the red shoes. The consequence of wearing the red shoes, detailed in a later part of the story, is a curse to never stop dancing. The Korean translation of this scene is as follows (from Strauss et al., 2006, emphasis edited).

**Excerpt 2: Karen chooses the red shoes** (from The Red Shoes by Hans Christian Andersen, original and translation as in Strauss, 2002)

그 다음 주일엔 성찬식이 있었습니다. 집에서 나서기 전에 카렌은 검은 구두를 내려다 보고 다시 빨간 구두에 눈길을 쳤어요. 카렌은 빨간 구두에서 눈을 떼지 않아 한참을 망설이다가 기어이 빨간 구두를 신고 말았습니다.

Next Sunday was communion, and Karen looked at the black shoes and she looked at the red ones—and unable to take her eyes off of the red shoes, she hesitated and finally **put the red ones on** (-ko *malta*).

I asked Jongyul why he thought the Korean translation of this excerpt might include V+ -ko *malta*. He articulates the ‘finality’ encoded in V+ -ko *malta*, but did not yet see the complete set of characteristics that separate V+ -ko *malta* from V+ -a/e *pelita*.
Excerpt 3: Jongyul’s first analysis of V+ -ko malta (in The Red Shoes, Excerpt 2)

Jongyul: It's an indication that she made the decision to wear the red shoes. We are going back to the idea of finality where you knew what was going to happen if you wore those red shoes, and you wore them. Now you can't turn back.

Jongyul’s interpretation apparently relied on the finality of the result, as encoded in V+ -a/e pelita, rather than on the end-of-struggle finality found in V+ -ko malta. In describing the decision to wear the red shoes, he also missed that V+ -ko malta typically encodes passive results (similar to “end up doing”), rather than calculated actions, which are possible with V+ -a/e pelita.

I explained this further using an example from another fairytale, Hans Christian Andersen’s “The Ugly Duckling” (as in Strauss, 2002). The excerpt contains both completive expressions, but our focus was on the V+ -ko malta expression at the end.

Excerpt 4: “The Ugly Duckling” (as in Strauss, 2002, emphasis edited, translation original)

겨울은 점점 깊어가고 날씨는 갈수록 싱늘해졌습니다. 둘레에 있는 물이 꽁꽁 얼어버리지 않게 하려고 아기 오리는 잠시도 쉬지 않고 헤엄을 치었습니다. 밤새 물이 얼어 붙으면 오리는 두 다리로 버둥거려 얼음을 깰고 물이 다시 얼지 않게 하려고 심이 없이 다리를 움직여야 했습니다. 하지만 마침내 아기 오리도 지쳐서 못하게 되고 말았어요.

Winter gradually grew deeper and the weather got colder and colder. The baby duck swam without rest to keep the water around him from freezing (-a/e pelita) solid. The duck spent the night struggling to break the freezing ice with his legs, and he had to move his legs without rest to keep the water from freezing. But in the end, the baby duck was exhausted and ended up (-ko malta) unable to move.

After explaining the construction V/Adj.+ -게 되다 (V/Adj.+ -key toyta; to end up (doing or being in a state)), I showed Jongyul that V+ -ko malta is used in the above excerpt because the duck ended up exhausted and unable to break the ice. The ice will now likely freeze over, a situation that he had been struggling to prevent. For this reason, becoming unable to move was a final result in that the duck’s struggle between physical strain and a desire to keep the water from
freezing was over. However, as is often, but not always, the case with V+ -ko malta, the result was not the one desired by the baby duck.

From here, we moved on to analysis of several example sentences, which I had found from Korean blog posts. I presented each sentence with and without the completive aspect and encouraged a discussion of why the given completive may have been included in the sentence and what meaning it adds.

The first blog title was “제주도 갈치조림에 푸욱 빠져버리다!!” (Falling (-a/e pelita) for Jeju Island’s braised cutlassfish⁴ [kalchicolim]!!). I prompted Jongyul to consider why the author might have chosen to include pelita as an auxiliary to this construction. His response demonstrated his understanding of the totality encoded in V+ -a/e pelita.

Excerpt 5: Foods we fall (-e pelita) for

R: It's like "fallen in love with Jejudo [Jeju Island]'s kalchicolim. But, they said "ppacitepelita" [fall for + -e pelita]

Jongyul: It’s like they’ve become completely drawn to it

R: And...they've fallen into this trap of the kalchicolim and [since they’ve fallen (-e pelita) for it, now they can’t get out]

They can’t get out.

Jongyul: (laughing) It's a strong passion

R: It's a permanent - yeah, it's like a permanent mistake. They've tasted kalchicolim and there's no going back.

R: Jongyul 씨는 빠져버린 음식이 있어요?

Jongyul: Oh that's an easy one. Ccacangmyen. I get crazy. Every time I go home- every time I drive home, I stop to eat c cacangmyen, then go home. I'm not even kidding....They know me very well at that restaurant.

Jongyul’s use of the word “completely” fits precisely with the totality encoded in -a/e pelita.

The Korean verb ppacita, here translated as “fall for”, also has a literal meaning of “fall into” (i.e.

---
⁴ Braised cutlassfish [kalchicolim] is a regional food of Jeju Island, South Korea.
물에 빠지다, *fall into water*). Accordingly, the opposite of *ppacita* is *나오다* (*naota*, come out), or another verb with a similar outward trajectory. I reinforced Jongyul’s analysis by adding that the person who has fallen (-*e pelita*) for braised cutlassfish (*kalchicolim*) cannot “get out” (of this situation). Jongyul demonstrated his understanding by providing his own anecdote about his favorite food, *ccacangmyen*, a Korean noodle dish with black bean sauce. In describing his “crazy” attachment to the food and ritual for stopping at a particular restaurant on his way home (from university to his family home), he provided a clear example of the depth of obsession that would constitute adding -*e pelita* to the main verb *ppacita*.

We repeated this analysis of auxiliary *pelita* with seven more examples sentences, and Jongyul consistently proved his understanding of the completive expression. The last sentence analyzed, a title of an advice forum post, read, *휴대전화를 잃어버렸어요* [I lost (-*e pelita*) my cell phone]. It is common to add -*e pelita* to “lose” (*잃다*, *ilhta*) to mark the finality of the lost item’s disappearance. Jongyul responded accordingly after reading the sentence:

**Excerpt 6: “I lost (-*e pelita*) my cell phone**

Jongyul: Oh no
R: 학생이 학교에서 휴대전화를 잃어버렸어요.  
*The student says he lost (-*e pelita*) his cell phone at school*

Jongyul: That’s not good.
R: So why will they use *pelyesseyo* (past tense of *pelita*) here?
Jongyul: It's- it's super lost. You know, it's like- it's like they looked all over it's like *'Wow, I really, really lost it'*. Like for good. I didn't even pay attention; it just happened.
R: Ok, yeah
Jongyul: *Because there's those times where you completely forget you even brought your coat* and then when you go home, it's like, 'Oh, that's right, I brought it! And then I forgot it.'
With Jongyul’s understanding of \( V^+ -a/e\) pelita well established, we moved to examining additional sentences containing \( V^+ -ko\) malta. The following three blog titles were presented and explained first:

**빵의 유혹에 넘어가, 다이어트 최대의 적. 빵을 사먹고 말았어요.**
[Falling to the temptation of bread, the biggest enemy of a diet. I bought and ate (\(-ko\) malta) bread.]

This blog post title details its author’s attempt at a diet, which was hindered when she bought and ate (\(-e\) pelita) bread. Particularly, we discussed, most Korean bread, such as the sort pictured in the blog post, tends to be more desert-like and sugary than is standard bread from Western cultures. As such, eating Korean bread could indeed be a significant interruption to a serious diet.

**결국 사주고 말았어요, 미니멀 라이프 어디로? 장난감 없이 살기는 어디로?**
[In the end, I bought (\(-ko\) malta) it for him. Where did our minimal life go? Where did life without toys go?]

This blog post told the story of a mother who had purchased a toy train table, including various train components and accessories, for her child. Until the point of buying the train table, the mother had tried to live minimally, without bringing home toys for her child. She sees the introduction of the train table as the end of this era of living a “minimal life”.

**누텔라 와플 악마의 유혹에 넘어가고 말았어요.**
[Nutella waffle, I have fallen (\(-ko\) malta) to the temptation of the devil.]

In another food blog, a writer introduces her homemade Nutella waffles: Two slices of sandwich bread with Nutella in the middle, toasted in a waffle iron. Specifically, she emphasizes a comment from her children’s tutor regarding the conflict between knowing how unhealthy the dessert is and wanting to enjoy its flavor.
After presenting these sentences, I asked Jongyul for his thoughts on the role of V+ -ko *malta* in the given contexts. His response was not directly about V+ -ko *malta*, but still demonstrated his understanding of the personal struggle and finality it entails:

**Excerpt 7: Jongyul responds to -ko *malta***

Jongyul: This is- this is fascinating. *Like when I go eat breakfast I don't have like some little devil sitting on my left shoulder who's like "Yeah, come on! Do it, do it."* I'm just like "Yeah, I'll have the Nutella waffles". But it's not really like a "Oh no, I've sinned".

...Eating pastries is an event. Like that, *I can get why they said that because it's like, 'Oh no, you just broke your healthy streak.*

Through his comment about the role of the devil (as mentioned in the third example sentence), Jongyul showed his focus on the struggle that occurs before an action marked by -ko *malta*. Further, he contrasted his own experience of guiltlessly eating Nutella waffles with the experiences of mild shame and regret detailed by the blog author. This comment suggests that Jongyul recognized the role of unfavorable or unpredictable outcomes in the expression -ko *malta*.

A moment later, Jongyul added that he understood the blogger’s wording based on the fact that a diet, which was otherwise presumably successful, was halted by the writer’s consumption of bread. With that, the diet came to an end without achieving the blogger’s desired outcome.

To finish the workshop, I asked Jongyul to look again at the example sentences for each completive expression and determine if there were any examples that could also work with the completive discussed (and how the meaning would be affected) or any that could only logically be used with one of the completive endings. I gave the example of 네는 너를 잊어버렸어 (*I forgot* -e *pelita* you), which had appeared during our analysis of V+ -a/e *pelita*. Changing the completive ending to V+ -ko *malta* (나는 너를 잊고 말았다; *I forgot* -ko *malta* you), as we then saw, implies not a totality of forgetting, as with V+ -a/e *pelita*, but rather a struggle between remembering and
forgetting that eventually ended in forgetting. To this, Jongyul offered an example of a sentence with V+ -a/e pelita that cannot be used with V+ -ko malta. The sentence, 보내버려요 (Send away (-e pelita) your herniated disk forever) is from a blog advertising a medical center’s treatment for herniated disks.

Excerpt 8:

Jongyul: I picked something that doesn't work. "허리디스크 영원히 보내...말...
[“Send away your disk forever...”]

R: (writing the sentence on the board) 허리디스크
[“herniated disk”]

Jongyul: 영원히 보내- the original term is 보내버려요. Forever send-
[send (-e pelita)].

R: (Writing on the board) So 보내버렸어요 is the original sentence, right?
[send (-e pelita)]

Jongyul: Yes

R: And then we have 보내고 말았어요. So what would this mean if we said this?
[sent (-ko malta)]

Jongyul: So you got rid of the disk problems...

R: So but did you intend to get rid of the disk problems?

Jongyul: No?

Jongyul recognized that using V+ -ko malta does not match this context because a patient would be unlikely to waver at all in the desire to remove his herniated disk. In other words, there would likely be no struggle of deciding whether or not to proceed with treatment - and even if there were, the medical clinic would not want to reinforce that struggle by using V+ -ko malta in their advertisement and thereby suggesting that the decision to resolve the herniated disk would come after much debate over whether or not to treat it.
7.6 Discussion

The present workshop was conducted toward the end of the semester, so by this time Jongyul was familiar with the CL-based approaches we again used for analysis. During the workshop, Jongyul referenced instances of V+ -a/e pelita he had heard growing up (i.e. his father asking, “또 (물건을) 잃어버렸어?”; “Did you lose (-e pelita) something again?”), so it was not surprising that he was able to analyze and describe the meaning of the V+ -a/e pelita construction with only a brief introduction. On the other hand, V+ -ko malta seemed to be new, or at least less familiar, to him. The process to differentiate V+ -ko malta from V+ -a/e pelita required a bit more guidance, but he steadily formed an understanding of the expression as it includes struggle and potential unintended outcomes.

As in our other workshop lessons, I employed numerous actual discourse samples to help illustrate the target forms’ meanings and connotations. Particularly in this session, Jongyul connected with the examples, commenting and adding his own anecdotes on several occasions. This engagement with natural language and relatable situations played a role not only in keeping Jongyul’s attention, but also in allowing him to see the target forms in environments similar to those he may have encountered previously.

The first two workshops featured here (on locatives -ey and -eyse, and on topic marker -un/nun and subject marker -i/ka) made use of graphic representations of the target forms, but like the lesson on evidentials -kwun, -ney and -tela, this lesson was almost entirely based in text and oral explanations. As some students may lack the linguistic background that Jongyul brings as a heritage speaker, I would like to propose visuals to help other students conceptualize V+ -a/e pelita and V+ -ko malta.
Figure 12: V+ -a/e pelita: Irreversible Action

In this representation of V+ -a/e pelita, the arrow represents the trajectory of the given action. The completion of the action is conceptualized through the box, which has a permeable, dotted outer edge, but a solid inner border, showing that actions that have once been complete could not again been reversed (i.e. cannot pass back through the solid boundary), as is the nature of events marked by V+ -a/e pelita (Strauss et al., 2006).

Figure 13: V+ -ko malta: "STRUGGLE" -- IRREVERSIBLE DECISION

Here, (A) and (B) represent two potential actions or choices (there could be more) between which the agent of the context must decide. The arrows represent the back-and-forth internal conflict that the agent faces before finally (three vertical dots) deciding on one of the options (in this case, A). The horizontal line in the middle represents the irreversibility of the final decision on which action to take; the action cannot be undone and the decision cannot be reversed.

Although these visuals were developed after the workshop on completives and have not yet been applied to a pedagogical setting, I put them forth as a possible tool in a future pedagogical study.
Chapter 8: Discussion and Conclusion

As we were finishing the workshop on topic and subject markers, the advanced class teacher questioned the utility of instruction on such seemingly minor grammar points. I had asked him to try the same lesson in his class, but he reported having given up halfway through because the system was hard to explain and the students “didn’t need it”.

“I asked,” he said in Korean, “and they get these wrong a little bit, but they don’t think it’s fun because I couldn’t teach it well…Anyway, ‘나는 널게’ ((I -nun) will pay; As for me, I’ll pay) also works”.

After swallowing my disappointment at the idea that there are aspects of a language to which learners “do not need” access, I realized that this was a good opportunity to articulate in front of Jongyul why I was teaching something that, to some, may indeed seem minor. As we continued to find throughout the semester, language is meaningful in all of its aspects (Tyler, 2012, p. 28) and pragmatic implications of linguistic content cannot and should not be separated from their semantic features (Tyler, 2012, p. 5). I was fortunate to have the time with the workshop participants to spend ninety minutes talking about two particles. As extreme as that may sound, I was doing it, I told the advanced class teacher, because the students deserve to be given the tools to “make their own decisions” about the meaning they want to create. I am also confident that with more research and attention to effective and efficient teaching methods, including visuals to graphically represent conceptual components of the target grammar, the time required for CL-based instruction could be reduced.

In their final questionnaires, Jongyul and Anna reflected positively on their experiences with CL-based instruction. Jongyul noted that the workshops helped him to be “more dynamic
than he anticipated” he could be when adjusting to and using the Korean grammar system. Anna reported that the lesson on evidentials was her favorite because the numerous examples had increased her ability to “notice” the forms in other contexts and continue to build an understanding of their usages. She also said that she wished that her university Korean curriculum covered such communicative tools earlier on in the course trajectory.

There are several important takeaways from this feedback. First, as Jongyul’s comment testifies, CL-based instruction provides students with a whole image of a language as a unique system. Time and time again, we found that attempting to draw comparisons between Korean and English only confused our analyses. However, when Korean was presented as its own, independent system, students were able to begin to piece together that new puzzle and rely less and less on what they knew to be true in other languages.

Secondly, although this study has not attempted to cover the idea of “noticing” as a part of language learning (see Schmidt, 1990), it is worth observing that as Anna and Jongyul built an appreciation of Korean as a language with its own system and gained exposure to the cognitive processes of its expert speakers, it became easier for them to make and incorporate new observations into their growing understandings of the language. This much was evidenced by both students’ abilities to engage in successful language analysis in most workshop sessions.

Finally, Anna’s comment about wishing she had encountered evidentials earlier in her Korean studies (she was at the time in the middle of a second-semester Korean course) particularly struck me. Most notable was the fact that, of the four sessions recounted here, the lesson on evidentials was the least successful in terms of observable results. Yet Anna felt she had learned something valuable in that lesson - something she could directly apply to her goals of building conversational fluency in Korean. The weakness of the lesson certainly lay in the span of the
content that was presented and in the lack of a visual aid to assist conceptualization. For a short
time, I had wondered if the lesson was also “too much” for the students - beyond their abilities as
still relatively new learners of Korean. Yet, Anna’s reflection suggests that perhaps with the right
approach to CL-based instruction, students may be not only capable, but also willing and eager to
build more complex understandings of target languages than educators have typically deemed
appropriate or achievable for them.

Carrying these observations forward to future Korean language pedagogy, I suggest that
there is a clear need for greater work in CL-based grammar instruction. As Korean language
textbooks built on traditional approaches to grammar demonstrate, incomplete explanations of
prescriptive grammar are all too common - and in many cases, represent the entirety of information
on the target grammar across all levels of a textbook series. Now, as more and more students across
the world decide to study Korean, it is becoming increasingly important to give them their own
voice.

Language is a not a black and white equation or a fill-in-the-blank formula, but a creative
and highly flexible system. Likewise, humans use linguistic tools not merely for the practical
exchange of information, but also for expressing ourselves, fostering relationships, and sharing in
emotional experiences with others. More than some might realize, these pragmatic aspects of
language are intimately tied to grammar. As Jongyul and Anna realized through the workshops,
grammar is inseparable from context and intent. Even combinations that are seemingly senseless
or awkward (i.e. ?비는 내린다; As for rain, it falls) could be useful in the right context, such as
when explaining the water cycle.

When first setting out to learn a language, it is expected and natural that the practical
conveyance of information be the initial goal for many learners. However, as language learners
begin to build upon their new linguistic repertoires and develop a need for more complex applications of language involving interpersonal relationships, affective stance, and pragmatic strategy, they need an understanding of grammar that depicts not a static, rule-driven system, but a descriptive, dynamic one that they can use to build the messages they want to convey. In order to provide this, it is essential for language educators to have a deep understanding of how meaning is formed. Only after language educators are taught to view language as a creative and meaning-central process will students also be able to see that most elements of meaning, stance, and affect go far beyond what could be delineated within the pages of a textbook or discussed within the span of a single class period. The reason that language learning is an on-going process is because of the time, exposure, and trial-and-error it takes to create something out of the blank canvas with which we start. However, by showing students how to approach language learning observantly, with an analytical and curious lens, language educators can prepare students to become continuous learners whose processes of discovery extend far beyond the walls of the classroom.

Language learners need and deserve recognition that they are both capable of producing expressive meaning in their target languages and worthy of the chance to try. Likewise, language teachers need more extensive and deliberate training in working with language and discourse from a meaning-based perspective. It is not sufficient for a language teacher to be a “native” or even highly proficient speaker of a language. Systematic training in grammatical and pragmatic analysis is also crucial to successful language teaching. Then, using this understanding to instill in students the knowledge to engage in their own learning processes and to understand, negotiate, and create meaning in their own communication should be one of the most basic aims of all language teachers and curricula. Only with these tools can language serve its true purpose.
## Appendix A

### Images and Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ey</th>
<th>Goal sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location sense</td>
<td>오늘 하루 종일 집에 있었다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal location sense</td>
<td>어제 일 시에 친구를 만났다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract location sense</td>
<td>마음 깊은 곳에 항상 추억을 간직하고 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract goal sense</td>
<td>그는 유혹에 빠졌다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sense</td>
<td>그는 좋은 대학에 입학했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event(Activity sense)</td>
<td>그는 제사를 참석한다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose sense</td>
<td>그 계획은 국가 일에 크게 기여했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason sense</td>
<td>나는 그녀의 당돌한 질문에 얼굴이 붉어졌다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental sense</td>
<td>그는 칼에 팔을 베어 입원했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive sense</td>
<td>정월 대보름이면 오곡밥에 아홉 가지 나물을 장만한다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value sense</td>
<td>이 옷을 오만원에 샀어요.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-eyse</th>
<th>Location sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source sense</td>
<td>나는 지금 부산에서 오는 길이다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal source sense</td>
<td>오후 두 시에서 새 시 삼십 분 사이에 수업이 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract location sense</td>
<td>그는 인생에서 모든 문제를 돈으로 해결해 왔다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract source sense</td>
<td>그는 잠시 후 생각에서 깨어났다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sense</td>
<td>그는 국회에서 답변하기를 기다리고 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event sense</td>
<td>그는 이번 선거에서 많은 지원을 받았다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason sense</td>
<td>그는 그런 경험에서 그녀의 성격을 확실힄 알 수 있었다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Sense</td>
<td>나는 그녀의 당돌한 질문에 얼굴이 붉어졌다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure sense</td>
<td>그는 칼에 팔을 베어 입원했다.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Türker’s (2013) distribution of -ey and -eyse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>학생이 학교에 갔다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studentNOM school-<em>ey</em> went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student went to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>오늘 하루 종일 집에 있었다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today all day house-<em>ey</em> existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) was at home all day today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal location sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>어제 일 시에 친구를 만냈다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesterday ten o’clock-<em>ey</em> friend met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract location sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>마음 깊은 곳에 항상 추억을 간직하고 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract goal sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그는 유혹에 빠졌다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그는 좋은 대학에 입학했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event(Activity sense)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그는 제사에 참석한다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그 계획은 국가 일에 크게 기여했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 그녀의 당돌한 질문에 얼굴이 붉어졌다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그는 칼에 팔을 베어 입원했다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additive sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>정월 대보름이면 오곡밥에 아홉 가지 나물을 장만한다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value sense</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>이 옷을 오만원에 샀어요.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14: Arriving for a party (contrastive -un/nun)

```
“파티 시작 시간은 8 시입니다. 위 그림에서 8 시 정각에 한명은 모든 준비를 마치고 파티 장소로 도착을 했고 나머지 한 명(집주인이)은 이제 방금 샤워를 마치고 나왔습니다. 
파티장에는 아직 아무도 도착하지 않았습니다. 둘다 당황하고 있는 모습이 재미있습니다.^^
왜 이런 걸까요? 저는 한국 사람이라 보니 문 앞에 있는 남자처럼 8 시에 시작하면 8 시까지 정확하게 가는 것이 메너라고 생각합니다. 하지만 미국에서는 8 시 시작이면 적어도 30 분 정도는 늦게 도착하는 것이 메니라고 합니다. 시간을 따 맞추는 것이 오히려 이상하게 보이겠죠?”
```

Translation:

**The party start time (-un)** is 8 o’clock. In the picture above, **one person (-un)** has finished all his preparations and arrived at the party location at exactly 8 o’clock. The **other person (the home owner) (-un)** has just finished his shower and come out. **At the party site (-nun),** no one has arrived yet. Their perplexed expressions are entertaining 😊

Why might this have happened? **As for myself (-nun),** since I am Korean, I think that if the start time says 8 o’clock, it is (good) manners to arrive by exactly 8 o’clock. However, **in America (-nun),** if the start time is 8 o’clock, they say it is (good) manners to arrive at least 30 minutes late. Matching the time exactly would actually look strange (to Americans), right?
### Table 2: Strauss’s (2005) Analysis of Evidentials \(-kwun, -ney, \text{ and } -tela\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Timing of Evidence</th>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-\text{군}) ((-kwun))</td>
<td>Realization at the moment of speech – realization due to outside evidence.</td>
<td>“Unexpected or newly perceived information or fact”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A newly perceived or unexpected event”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The speaker’s newly perceived awareness of having just made a connection between pieces of evidence—the realization of having just made sense of this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. 그럴구나 ((kulehkwuna): \text{ ‘Oh, I see now [‘I’ve just now made the connection.’]}).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-\text{니}) ((-ney))</td>
<td>“Inductive reasoning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realization at the moment of speech – using contextual clues to arrive at the conclusion, which is what is said.</td>
<td>Using contextual clues to arrive at the conclusion, which is what is said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less “speaker-centered” than (-\text{군}); the realization has some relevance to the other person/people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Used in “compliments, expressions of empathy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often co-occurs with 그럼/그러면 ((kulem /kulemyen; then, in that case), -\text{겠}) ((-keyss; future-marking particle)).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-\text{더라}) ((-tela))</td>
<td>Realization in the past</td>
<td>Surprise and unexpectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly “speaker-centered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can occur in both narratives and conversation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Romanizations have been added and were not included on the version provided to students.
Appendix B

Workshop Audio Transcript Excerpts

Excerpt 1: Week 3, Introduction to locative markers

R: (pointing to and touching the chalkboard) [I will, write just a few (examples) on the board. I’ll write them here.]

Jongyul: Ok

R: (writes "집 에 있어요" ([I am at -(ey) home]))

Jongyul: (writes "학교 에 가요" ([I go to -(ey) school]))

R: (pointing to 'to', which is written under '-eyse')

Go to school 안데 뭐죠?

Jongyul: Honestly.. I'm trying to think. If I were to use two different contexts

Could it not be for....so- something's telling me they're kind of interchangeable, like..

Excerpt 2: Week 3, Exercise 1

Jongyul: (reading) 세계에서 두번째로 큰 나라입니다.

[Canada is the second largest country in the world]

R: [Yes]

Jongyul: So (paraphrasing) "Canada...is a fairly large country"

R: [Yes, The second. What could “the second” mean? The second.

Jongyul: Uhh. 세계에서?

R: 세계에서 두번째로- second big country in the world.

['세계에서' '세계에' 뭐가 맞을까요?

[In -(eyse) the world, in -(ey) the world. Which one do you think is right?]
Jongyul: Uh...저는...세계에서 같은 말 많이 들었어. I've heard like the phrase '세계에서'

[Uh... I...have heard something like 'In (-eyse) the world' a lot. I've heard phrases like 'In (-eyse) the world.']
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Honors coursework, thesis, study abroad and internship, ethics study, leadership University Park, PA Fall 2013-Spring 2018

INTERNSHIPS
Literacy Corps
  • Held 40+ hours of one-on-one English tutoring for an international resident of Centre County
  • Focused on reading, conversation and writing skills based on novels, the learner’s journal, and
topical discussions
• Adapted lessons and materials to uniquely fit learner’s strengths and goals
• Collaborated with other tutors to organize an end-of-the-year gathering for learners and tutors to meet each other, share their cultures, and converse in English in a group setting

Global Overseas Adoptees’ Link (G.O.A.’L.) Seoul, South Korea
6-week Internship Program June-Aug. 2016
• Compiled membership data into an Excel document with self-updating graphs for efficient data mining
• Analyzed aggregated membership data for patterns of service usage based on demographics
• Created follow-up questionnaires for each service provided by the organization and constructed a system for their automatic dissemination and data analysis using CiviCRM and Google Forms

SKILLS AND CERTIFICATIONS

Language
Korean: Advanced
Level 6 TOPIK (Test of Proficiency in Korean) April, 2016
Advanced-Mid OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview) Aug. 2015

French: Low Intermediate

Teaching
Schreyer Institute of Teaching Excellence Instructional Foundations Certificate November, 2017

Technology
Canvas Learning Management System, Schoology
CiviCRM (Basic experience)

REFERENCES
Provided upon request.