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Abstract

This paper seeks to shed light on the factors that contribute to the use of the Korean subject honorific -(u)si—a long-standing issue in the study of pragmatics and politeness in that language. We tested two groups of Korean speakers (younger versus older adults) on two patterns of honorification—(a) the classic pattern in which the referent of the subject outranks both the speaker and the hearer, and (b) the split pattern in which the referent of the subject outranks the speaker but not the hearer. In an online acceptability judgment task, younger participants (n = 40) showed a strong and quick preference for the use of -(u)si in the classic pattern, but manifested uncertainty in the split pattern. In contrast, older participants (n = 40) showed a significant preference for -(u)si in both the split pattern and the classic pattern when the referent of the subject outranks the speaker.
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1. Introduction

Korean is well known for its honorifics, whose strategic use is ‘the most systematic among all known languages,’ according to Sohn (1999:408). As noted in various overviews of Korean usage, honorific contrasts are found in the language’s pronouns, its terms of address, its lexical choices, and its nominal and verbal inflection (e.g., Sohn (1994:359–62, 1999:407ff); Lee and Ramsey (2000: ch. 7); Choo and Kwak (2008: chs. 1–3)). We focus here on the subject honorific -(u)si, a verbal suffix that has received very extensive attention over the years in studies of syntax, pragmatics and sociolinguistics.

A variety of views have been put forward about the conditions under which a subject honorific should be expected according to normative social conventions. One view, represented by Sohn (1999:412), holds that -(u)si is natural ‘when the subject referent deserves the speaker’s deference.’
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1 We use the term ‘subject’ advisedly; in fact, as Kim and Sells (2007:331–32) show, the target for -(u)si is better described as someone who the clause is about, or perhaps even someone for whom the clause is relevant.
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Consistent with this hypothesis, the honorific is expected in patterns such as (2) if the speaker is a student who is describing the activity of his or her teacher.²

A contrasting view, put forward by Kim and Sells (2007:310--11), is that -(u)si is natural only if the 'referent of the subject is socially superior relative to the hearer'; see also Ihm et al. (1988) and Lee and Kuno (1995).

On this view, an honorific would not be expected in (2) if the hearer were, say, the teacher's father.

Yet another idea, outlined by Choo and Kwak (2008:17--18) and Brown (2011:32) among others, argues for a multi-factor approach that takes into account (among other considerations) the status of both the speaker and the hearer relative to the referent of the subject.

These differences notwithstanding, there is general agreement (e.g., Kim-Renaud, 2001, among many others) that the system of honorification has undergone change in recent decades—a matter that is itself also worthy of study. We therefore seek here to shed light on the following two related questions.

- How does the relationship of the speaker and of the hearer to the referent of the subject impact the form of honorification that is expected?
- Are there generational differences in the way this part of the system of subject honorification works?

For practical reasons, we focus on two patterns that offer a particularly sharp and crucial contrast. In the first pattern, exemplified in (5), the referent of the subject has higher social standing than both the speaker and the hearer—a situation in which use of the honorific is expected on all accounts of its usage. We henceforth refer to this as the ‘classic pattern.’

---

² All Korean examples are presented using Yale Romanization. Allomorphic variants of -(u)si include -(u)sey (employed in the -yo register) and -(u)sy (representing the merger of the /i/ of the honorific with a following vowel). We use the following abbreviations: HON = honorific, NOM = nominative case, ACC = accusative case, DAT = dative case, PRS = present, PST = past, REG = register, SE = sentence ender, TOP = topic marker.
In the second pattern, exemplified in (6), the hearer has higher status than the referent of the subject, who in turn outranks the speaker. We dub this the ‘split pattern.’

(6) The split pattern: hearer > referent of subject > speaker

  e.g., a student talks about his teacher to the teacher’s father:

  hearer  >  referent of subject  >  speaker

  teacher’s father  teacher  student

  sensayng-nim-i  hakkyo-ey  o(-si)-ess-eyo.

  teacher-HON-NOM  class-to  late-HON-PST-REG

  ‘Teacher came to the school.’

If the status of the speaker (a student) in relation to the referent of the subject (a teacher) is the key factor in honorific usage, the honorific will sound natural in the split pattern. On the other hand, if the key factor is the higher status of the hearer (the teacher’s father) vis-à-vis the referent of the subject (the teacher), the honorific should not be expected. And if the status of both the hearer and the speaker has to be taken into account, we might expect uncertainty and variation, as the two speech-act participants differ in their status relative to the referent of the subject.

Table 1 summarizes the predictions of the three approaches. (We derive our prediction for the multi-factor approach from the version put forward by Choo and Kwak, 2008.)

Table 1: Summary of predictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Classic pattern: subj &gt; speaker/hearer</th>
<th>Split pattern: hearer &gt; subj &gt; speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker-oriented</td>
<td>-(u)si is expected</td>
<td>-(u)si is expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer-oriented</td>
<td>-(u)si is expected</td>
<td>-(u)si is unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-factor</td>
<td>-(u)si is expected</td>
<td>Uncertain/indeterminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(5) The classic pattern: referent of subject > speaker/hearer

  e.g., a young student talks to a fellow student about their teacher:

  referent of subject  >  speaker/hearer

  teacher  student/fellow student

  센생님이 수업에 늦(으)시켰어.

  sensayng-nim-i  suwep-e yuc(-usl)-ess-e.

  teacher-HON-NOM  class-to  late-HON-PST-REG

  ‘Teacher was late for class.’

In the second pattern, exemplified in (6), the hearer has higher status than the referent of the subject, who in turn outranks the speaker. We dub this the ‘split pattern.’

(6) The split pattern: hearer > referent of subject > speaker

  e.g., a student talks about his teacher to the teacher’s father:

  hearer  >  referent of subject  >  speaker

  teacher’s father  teacher  student

  센생님이 학교에 오(시)였어요.

  sensayng-nim-i  hakkyo-ey  o(-si)-ess-eyo.

  teacher-HON-NOM  school-to  come-HON-PST-REG

  ‘Teacher came to the school.’

If the status of the speaker (a student) in relation to the referent of the subject (a teacher) is the key factor in honorific usage, the honorific will sound natural in the split pattern. On the other hand, if the key factor is the higher status of the hearer (the teacher’s father) vis-à-vis the referent of the subject (the teacher), the honorific should not be expected. And if the status of both the hearer and the speaker has to be taken into account, we might expect uncertainty and variation, as the two speech-act participants differ in their status relative to the referent of the subject.

Table 1 summarizes the predictions of the three approaches. (We derive our prediction for the multi-factor approach from the version put forward by Choo and Kwak, 2008.)

The status of the split pattern is of interest for a second reason, since it falls under a prescriptive rule known as apconpep ‘restriction of respect.’ As traditionally understood, this rule calls for the suppression of the honorific in family and educational situations when the hearer has higher social status than the referent of the subject3—precisely the situation found in our split condition. We will return to this matter in Section 4.

In order to investigate our research questions, we employed an experimental method to measure acceptability ratings online. Although there are a few notable exceptions (e.g., Brown et al., 2014; Kim and Kaiser, 2009; Okamoto, 2002 for Japanese), studies of honorific usage rely primarily on the observation and analysis of naturalistic speech in conversation and/or media materials rather than experimental data. Nonetheless, experimental methods are potentially valuable, especially in the case of a phenomenon such as subject honorification, which is arguably sensitive to a multitude of factors.

---

3 The details of the recommended practice can be found in a 2011 publication of the National Institute of the Korean Language, entitled Phyocwunene Yeycel – Kyengepep ‘The standard language etiquette – use of honorifics.’
(e.g., Brown, 2011) that cannot be easily teased apart in naturalistic situations. Not only does an experimental approach allow the relative status of the speaker, the hearer, and the referent of the subject to be systematically manipulated, it is also able to measure the amount of time that it takes to arrive at decisions about whether honorification is expected, thereby providing additional clues as to which contrasts are most clear-cut.

We begin in the next section by reporting on an experiment involving young adult speakers of Korean. Section 3 presents the results of a parallel experiment involving older speakers, and Section 4 offers a general discussion of our findings. We present our concluding remarks in Section 5.

2. Hearer versus speaker in university students

2.1. Participants

Forty-seven native speakers of Korean, all undergraduate or graduate students at a university in Seoul, participated in our study. Statistical analysis of the data led us to identify 7 of the participants as outliers. After their elimination, we were left with 40 participants (20 males) ranging in age from 19 to 30, with a mean age of 24. All the participants had been born and raised in Seoul or its vicinity, and all had the same dialect background.

2.2. Method and materials

Participants were shown a series of illustrated scenarios on a computer screen with the help of E-prime software. The first part of each scenario consisted of two images, accompanied by two orally presented background sentences that briefly described the speaker, the hearer, and who they were talking about—always someone in their family or educational institution. When the participants were ready, they pressed a key on the keyboard to bring up a third image accompanied by an orally presented test sentence, corresponding to the speaker's description of an event.

The task of the participants was to rate the test sentence's acceptability on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = 아주 나늦음 ‘completely bad’ to 5 = 아주 좋음 ‘completely good,’ by pressing the appropriate key on the computer keyboard. The software automatically recorded both the participants' judgments and the response latency, corresponding to the time (in milliseconds) between the end of the uttered sentence and the response.

Figs. 1 and 2 provide examples of test items for each of the two conditions we investigated; a complete list of test items can be found in the Appendix.4 (The bracketed sentences beneath each image correspond to the background context and the test item itself; they did not appear on the images in the actual experiment.)

There were a total of 12 critical items, 6 exemplifying the classic pattern of honorification and 6 exemplifying the split case. Half the items for each pattern appeared with -(u)si and half without it. An additional 12 items were included as fillers in each experimental session in order to minimize the possibility that participants might realize the purpose of the experiment. These fillers had the same general structure as the critical items exemplified in Figs. 1 and 2, except that the third person in the scenario corresponded to the referent of the direct object rather than to the subject, thereby drawing attention away from the issue of subject honorification.

(7) a. Context sentences (comparable to the classic pattern):
   Swuyen and Cinswu are Professor Kim's students.
   Swuyen was talking to Cinswu about Professor Kim.

b. Test sentence:
   아까 복도에서 마주쳤어.
   akka pokto-eyse macwuchi-ess-e.
   earlier hallway-in encounter-PST-SE
   ‘(I) ran into (him) in the hallway earlier.’

---

4 The choice of 'sentence ender' (-e versus -ta versus -eyo) reflects an independent set of register-related factors not directly related to the referent of the subject; see Choo and Kwak (2008: ch. 1) for extensive discussion.
a. Context sentences:

민지는 김 선생의 수업을 듣는다.
Minci-nun Kim sensayng-uy suuup-ul tut-nunta.
Minci-TOP Kim teacher-of class-ACC take-PRS-REG

‘Minci is listening to teacher Kim’s class.’

민지가 친구 동수에게 김 선생에 대해서 말했다.
Minci-ka chinkwu Tongswu-eykey Kim sensayng-ey tayhayse malhay-ss-ta.
Minci-NOM friend Tongswu-DAT Kim teacher-about speak-PST-REG

‘Minci was talking to her friend, Tongswu about teacher Kim.’

b. Test sentence: [Minci said...]

수업에 늦었어요.
suuup-ey wuc-usi-ess-e.
class-to late-HON-PST-REG

‘(He) was late to the class.’

---

Fig. 1. Sample test item for the classic pattern.

(8) a. Context sentences (comparable to the split pattern):

Minci is living with her grandmother.

Minci was talking to her grandmother about her aunt.

b. Test sentence:

어제 백화점에서 만났어요.
ecey paykwhoacem-eyse manna-ss-eyo.
yesterday department.store-at meet-PST-SE

‘(I) ran into (her) at a department store yesterday.’

All test materials were pre-recorded by a female or a male assistant, depending on the gender of the speaker in the depicted scenario. So as to avoid confusion, the background sentences were recorded by a different person. The full set of items was pseudo-randomized and distributed in a Latin square design.

Each experimental session began with a brief set of instructions and three practice items, and ended with a retrospective question on the purpose of the test (i.e., ‘What do you think this test was about?’). The task took approximately 20–25 min to complete. All participants were tested individually in a quiet place.
There were two dependent variables—the acceptability rating (on a scale of 1–5) given to each sentence and the amount of time (in milliseconds) it took to arrive at that rating. Given that response time is a standard measure of difficulty (more demanding patterns take longer to process), we can use this variable to test the prediction that the classic pattern of honorification creates less uncertainty than the split pattern.

2.3. Results

Fig. 3 summarizes the young participants’ acceptability ratings for the critical items. A repeated measures ANOVA shows that the difference between the classic and split patterns is significant ($F(1, 39) = 17.120, p = 0.000$), as is the difference between patterns with the honorific and those without it ($F(1, 39) = 145.057, p = 0.000$). Ratings for the classic pattern were higher when it included the honorific marker than when it did not ($t(39) = 22.565, p = 0.000$). In contrast, the acceptability ratings for the presence and absence of the honorific in the split pattern ($t(39) = 1.100, p > 0.10$) are not significantly different from each other. This suggests that the participants are uncertain as to whether -(u)si should be used in the split pattern.

The response time measure confirms this result, as shown by the data summarized in Fig. 4. A repeated measures ANOVA shows a significant effect of pattern ($F(1, 39) = 37.019, p = 0.000$), but no significant effect involving the presence or absence of the honorific ($F(1, 39) = 0.076, p > 0.10$). Consistent with our hypothesis that the need for an honorific is more clear-cut in the classic pattern, it elicits a significantly shorter response time compared to the split pattern ($t(39) = /C0/ 3.875, p = 0.000$) or not ($t(39) = /C0/ 5.198, p = 0.000$).
Although the gender of our participants was not a factor in our design, a post hoc analysis indicated no effect in any comparison ($p > 0.10$). There was also no indication that participants were in general aware of the purpose of the experiment. When queried about this matter, only 4 of the 47 respondents mentioned honorific usage as a likely factor.

2.4. Discussion

Our results support two conclusions. First, the status of both the speaker and the hearer relative to the referent of the subject seems to be relevant for honorification. Contrary to the prediction of the hearer-oriented theory, there is no clear-cut aversion to the honorific when the hearer outranks the referent of the subject. At the same time, though, there is also no clear-cut preference for the honorific in this case, contrary to what one would expect if the speaker-oriented theory is correct. Instead, we find evidence of uncertainty in the split pattern, consistent with the multi-factor theory.

Second, our reaction time data is also consistent with the multi-factor theory, suggesting that decisions about honorification are harder to make when the hearer and the speaker differ in their relationship to the referent of the subject. As a result, participants took significantly longer to rate the split pattern than the classic pattern.

3. The effect of generation

It is commonly observed that the expression of honorification in Korean is undergoing change and has become confusing to younger speakers. Our second experiment focuses on the possibility that older speakers may approach honorification differently from their younger counterparts.

3.1. Participants

Fifty native speakers of Korean took part in this experiment. Statistical analysis led to the identification of 10 outliers, leaving us with 40 participants (20 males) ranging in age from 65 to 87 (mean = 75 years). Although all the participants had
been residing in Seoul and nearby Seongnam City for many years, fifteen of them had been born and had grown up in
other areas in Korea. However, they showed no clear dialectal accent, and there were no significant differences in the
performance of participants from Seoul and its vicinity and those from other areas ($F(1, 38) = 2.697, p > 0.10$ for
acceptability rating; $F(1, 38) = 0.371, p > 0.10$ for RTs). All participants had normal hearing, normal or corrected-to-normal
vision, no history of neurological/psychological illness, and 12+ years of education.

3.2. Method and materials

The same method and materials employed in the first experiment were used for this experiment.

3.3. Results

Fig. 5 summarizes the ratings given by the older participants for the critical items. A repeated measures ANOVA shows
a significant effect of the presence or absence of the honorific ($F(1, 39) = 41.089, p = 0.000$), but no significant effect of the
pattern ($F(1, 39) = 0.063, p > 0.10$). In other words, like the young participants, the senior participants showed a strong
preference for use of the honorific in the classic pattern ($t(39) = 7.246, p = 0.000$). However, unlike the young participants,
they also showed a statistically significant preference for the honorific in the split pattern ($t(39) = 4.358, p = 0.000$), where
the hearer outranks the referent of the subject. A significant interaction effect was also found between pattern and
honorific use ($F(1, 39) = 6.031, p < 0.05$), which indicates that the effect of honorification is somewhat greater in the
classic pattern than in the split pattern.

These results fit well with the response time data for the senior participants, summarized in Fig. 6. A repeated
measures ANOVA shows no significant effect of pattern type on RT ($F(1, 39) = 0.085, p > 0.10$) and no significant effect of
the presence or absence of the honorific within those patterns ($F(1, 39) = 0.051, p > 0.10$). In other words, the older
participants accepted or rejected the honorific at the same speed in both the classic and the split patterns, suggesting that the decision is equally straightforward in the two cases.

As was the case with the young participants, a post hoc analysis revealed no gender effects in any comparison ($p > 0.10$). There was also little indication that participants were aware of the precise purpose of the study. When asked about this matter, they tended to say only that the test sentences were about conversations in family or school situations; six expressed the opinion that the test was about the appropriate use of sentence enders, but no one mentioned subject honorifics.

3.4. Discussion

Unlike our young participants, older speakers show no sign of a slowdown in accepting the subject honorific in the split pattern, where the referent of the subject outranked the speaker, but not the hearer. Moreover, unlike young speakers, they showed a significant preference for -(u)si in that pattern, which suggests that the status of the speaker with respect to the referent of the subject was a major factor in their reasoning about the appropriateness of the subject honorific. These results point to the possibility of a significant generational difference in the use of honorifics ($F(1, 78) = 11.237, p = 0.001$).

4. General discussion

We set out to investigate two questions relating to the use of the Korean subject honorific.

- How does the relationship of the speaker and of the hearer to the referent of the subject impact the form of honorification that is expected in a given situation?
- Are there generational differences in the way this part of the system of subject honorification works?

Our results allow us to offer tentative answers to both questions.

Our younger participants showed a strong and quick preference for the use of an honorific in the classic pattern, where the referent of the subject outranks both the speaker and the hearer. On the other hand, they manifested vacillation and uncertainty in the split pattern, where the hearer (but not the speaker) outranks the referent of the subject. This result suggests that the participants were attending to the status of both speaker and hearer relative to the referent of the subject, consistent with a multi-factor approach. However, there is no indication that the honorific is actually expected in the split pattern, contrary to what the hearer-oriented theory would predict.

Our senior participants differed from their younger counterparts in favoring an honorific not only in the classic pattern, but also in the split pattern. This preference also runs against the hearer-oriented theory, as well as against apconpep, the traditional proscription against use of the honorific when the hearer has higher status than the referent of the subject (Section 1).

It has long been known that speakers vary in their attention to apconpep, as acknowledged by the National Institute of the Korean Language and documented in the linguistic literature (e.g., Kim, 2004; Shin 2011; Brown, 2011:22 & 33; Lee, 2012). This fits well with the historical record: reports of inattentiveness to apconpep date back to at least the early 1980s (e.g., Suh, 1984). Indeed, Kim-Renaud (2001:37) goes so far as to suggest that ‘the complex calculation’ of inter-relationships associated with apconpep could contribute to its relative lack of impact.

But what about young speakers, who show signs of uncertainty and hesitation about using the honorific in the split condition? Paradoxically, this might be interpreted as evidence for a sensitivity to apconpep, the very rule ignored by the older speakers who one would expect to be more conservative in this regard. But the preference of the younger participants is also consistent with the possibility that they are simply confused about what to do in light of recent changes in honorific usage in Korea.

As noted by Kim-Renaud (2001) and others, the subject honorific is undergoing reanalysis that has resulted in its use, especially by younger people, as an apparent general politeness marker. An extreme manifestation of this is found in examples such as the following, observed in actual speech by Choo and Kwak (2008:19).

(9) a. 전화 오셨습니다. (uttered by a hotel front desk clerk)
   cenhwa  o-ess-supnita
   phone.call  come-HON-PST-HON.SE
   “Here is a phone call for you.”
Kim-Renaud (2001:37) offers another example.

(10) ☞ 니 아르바이트 들어오시면 소개 좀 해 주세요.
    hoksi alupathu tuleo-si-myoon, sokay com hay-cwu-sey-yo.
    perhaps part.time.job come.in-HON-if introduction little do-give-HON-SE
    ‘If a part-time job becomes available, please let me know.’

Such innovations trigger puzzlement and even annoyance among many speakers of Korean, since the subject is inanimate and therefore not eligible for honorification. Indeed, a colleague reports having seen the sign in Fig. 7 on a cup holder in a franchise coffee shop in Seoul, admonishing staff who overuse the honorific—in this case in a sentence whose subject is ‘coffee.’

With this kind of shift occurring and with the negative reaction that it can trigger, younger speakers may be confused about all but the most prototypical contexts for the honorific (i.e., the classic pattern), as reflected in their slower reaction time for split patterns. This matter clearly calls for further investigation.

5. Conclusion

Our study has focused on the importance of the relationship of the speaker and hearer to the referent of the subject in the usage of the honorific suffix -(u)si, yielding the results reviewed in the previous section. Obviously, however, much remains to do, and many factors and patterns other than those considered in our study call for attention, including the way in which the subject honorific interacts with the special honorific nominative marker -kkeyse (Kim and Sells 2007:308), not used in our experiment, and with the system of register, marked by sentence-ending suffixes (e.g., Brown, 2011).5

---

5 Lucien Brown suggests that the contrast between ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’ (e.g., Brown, 2011:33) may also be relevant. A post hoc analysis of test items that differed in this respect (e.g., a test item involving a child speaking to a sibling about their grandfather versus a child speaking to a non-family-member friend about the same topic) showed no signs of an effect. Nonetheless, the matter clearly calls for additional investigation.
These and other issues notwithstanding, an experimental approach to the study of honorification appears to have considerable promise. Manipulation of the scenarios in which honorifics are used can provide information to supplement insights that come from the observation of naturalistic speech. Moreover, data from on-line measures such as reaction time offer an entirely new set of clues about how the decisions underlying honorific usage are made.

Of course, using experimental methods to study honorific usage is not without limitations. As an anonymous reviewer points out, it remains to be seen how the results from experimental studies relate to real-world usage, which involves many discursive, contextual and attitudinal factors not controlled for in our experiment. We acknowledge this, but we hope and believe that work combining the study of naturalistic speech with information gleaned from experimentation will eventually help clarify the many complex issues surrounding the use of honorifics in Korean.
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Appendix

A. The classic pattern with -(u)si

(1) Context: 민지는 김 선생의 수업을 듣는다.
   'Minci is taking teacher Kim's class.'
   민지가 친구 문수에게 김 선생에 대해서 말했다.
   'Minci was talking to her friend, Tongswu about teacher Kim.'
   Test Item: "수업에 놓으셨어요."
   '(He) was late to the class.'

(2) Context: 수미는 할아버지하고 같이 산다.
   'Swumi is living with her grandfather.'
   수미가 친구 준우에게 할아버지에 대해서 말했다.
   'Swumi was talking to her friend, Cwunwu about her grandfather.'
   Test Item: " 아주 건강하시어요."
   '(He) is very healthy.'

(3) Context: 민지는 남동생하고 같이 집에 있다.
   'Minci is at home with her younger brother.'
   민지는 남동생에게 할머니에 대해서 말했다.
   'Minci was talking to her younger brother about their grandmother.'
   Test Item: "병원에 가셨어요."
   '(She) went to the hospital.'
B. The split pattern with -(u)si

(1) Context: 수미는 박 선생의 학생이다.
'Swumi is a student of teacher Park.'
수미가 박 선생 아버지에게 박 선생에 대해서 말했다.
'Swumi was talking to teacher Park's father about teacher Park.'

Test Item: "학교에 오셨어요."  
'(He) came to the school.'

(2) Context: 동수는 할아버지하고 같이 집에 있다.  
'Tongswu is at home with his grandfather.'
동수가 할아버지에게 어머니에 대해서 말했다.  
'Tongswu was talking to his grandfather about his mother.'

Test Item: "지금 요리하세요."  
'(She) is cooking now.'

(3) Context: 수미는 할머니하고 드라마를 보고 있다.  
'Swumi is watching a TV drama with her grandmother.'
수미가 할머니에게 아버지에 대해서 말했다.  
'Swumi was talking to her grandmother about her father.'

Test Item: "밖에서 운동하세요."  
'(He) is exercising outside.'

C. The classic pattern without -(u)si

(1) Context: 동수는 박 선생의 수업을 듣고 있다.  
'Tongswu is taking teacher Park's class.'
동수가 친구 민지에게 박 선생에 대해서 말했다.  
'Tongswu was talking to her friend, Mincí about teacher Park.'

Test Item: "열심히 가르치."  
'(He) teaches diligently.'

(2) Context: 민지는 할머니하고 같이 산다.  
'Mincí is living with her grandmother.'
민지가 친구 동수에게 할머니에 대해서 말했다.  
'Mincí was talking to her friend, Tongswu about her grandmother.'

Test Item: "요리를 잘 해."  
'(She) cooks well.'
(3) Context: 동수는 어동생하고 숙제하고 있다.
'Tongswu is doing homework with his younger sister.'
동수가 어동생에게 아버지에 대해서 말했다.
'Tongswu was talking to his younger sister about their father.'

Test Item: "방에 있어." 
'(He) is in the bedroom.'

D. The split pattern without -(u)si

(1) Context: 동수는 박 선생의 학생이다.
'Tongswu is a student of teacher Park.'
동수가 교장에게 박선생에 대해서 말했다.
'Tongswu was talking to the principal about teacher Park.'

Test Item: "잘 가르쳐요." 
'(He) teaches well.'

(2) Context: 수미는 할아버지하고 얘기하고 있다.
'Swumi is talking with her grandfather.'
수미가 할아버지에게 아버지에 대해서 말했다.
'Swumi was talking to her grandfather about her father.'

Test Item: "많이 바빠요." 
'(He) is very busy.'

(3) Context: 동수는 할머니하고 같이 산다.
'Tongswu is living with his grandmother.'
동수가 할머니에게 어머니에 대해서 말했다.
'Tongswu was talking to his grandmother about his mother.'

Test Item: "시장에 갔어요." 
'(She) went to the market.'
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