

Use of Expressions of Suggestion and Advice by Korean L2 Learners of English

Min, Sujung

Kongju National University

ABSTRACT

The Journal of Studies in Language 35.1, 097-108. Taking a socio-pragmatic approach, the current study explored the production of speech acts of suggestion and advice in English as L2 context. Specifically, the study investigated how Korean learners of English expressed suggestion and advice in terms of strategy use. The study compared the two speech acts realized by Korean L2 learners and native English speakers. The participants encompassed 49 Korean university students and 20 native English speakers. The data consisted of responses to eight situations of written discourse completion test per participant to elicit advice and suggestion speech acts. The responses were coded using 9 categories for advice and 10 categories for suggestion to determine the strategies adopted, and then were analyzed according to the frequency of the choice of strategies for each speech act. Findings revealed that Korean L2 learners of English were not well-balanced in the selection of strategies between making suggestions and giving advice, and linguistic formulae selected to realize certain strategies.

(Konju National University)

Keywords: speech act, suggestion, advice, inter-language pragmatics, DCT



<https://doi.org/10.18627/jslg.35.1.201905.097>

pISSN : 1225-4770

eISSN : 2671-6151

Received: April 15, 2019

Revised: April 30, 2019

Accepted: May 12, 2019

This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial License which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Copyright©2019 the Modern Linguistic Society of Korea

본인이 투고한 논문은 다른 학술지에 게재된 적이 없으며 타인의 논문을 표절하지 않았음을 서약합니다. 추후 중복게재 혹은 표절된 것으로 밝혀질 시에는 논문게재 취소와 일정 기간 논문게출의 제한 조치를 받게 됨을 인지하고 있습니다.

1. Introduction

The accuracy of language use has gained an impetus in the long tradition of L2 teaching and learning, in which the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary of the target language is of great importance. Nevertheless, successful communication requires the knowledge of socio-pragmatic and cultural components of the target language as well. The acquisition of pragmatic competence is more significant in cross-cultural communication (White, 1993) because the pragmatic knowledge makes language users understand the appropriateness of production of speech acts in a given situation (Cheng, 2005). Therefore, L2 learners' production and comprehension of speech acts and how their knowledge of pragmatic and cultural components is acquired has been the main concern in the field of interlanguage pragmatics. To develop a pragmatic competence in L2 classrooms, undeniably, it

becomes more significant to teach language learners how to produce the most of speech acts and how to interpret them in regard to the strategies used to realize specific speech act.

The pragmatic competence also includes the ability to comprehend a variety of intended meanings of the addresser. This knowledge, therefore, comprises illocutionary and sociolinguistic components of speech acts (Olshtain and Cohen, 1991). The illocutionary aspect is not always easily caught from the utterance itself. This is why the language learners need to acquire socio-pragmatic rules which enable the learners to produce appropriate forms of language. The scope and category of strategies used to realize speech acts vary culture to culture (Cheng, 2005). Therefore, the sociocultural appropriateness and politeness in a given situation is great importance. Otherwise the intended meaning of addresser may not be properly understood by the addressee. This often brings about misunderstanding or communication breakdown in cross-cultural context (Kasper, 1992).

Reflecting the social and cultural norms, speech acts themselves clearly demonstrate the need to enhance pragmatic knowledge in L2 context (Babaie and Shahrokhi, 2015). This also applies to the speech acts of suggestion and advice. Making suggestion and giving advice are daily used to influence others. In any speech community, the cooperation between interlocutors is the base of daily communication. Such cooperative manner and stance are well reflected in the speech acts of advice and suggestion (Hussein, 1984). Suggestion and advice are performed in order to present something either to be accepted or refused. Although they are milder than orders given that the choice of action is in the hands of the addressee, still they are resourceful ways of giving orders or instructions. Thus, they are considered as face-threatening acts due to their directive and commissive nature (Barron, 2005). In order to soften and mitigate the face-threatening aspect of advice and suggestion, the proper use of the strategies is necessary. Both speech acts occur in all languages but not all languages realize them in the same way (Barron, 2017). As such, taking a socio-pragmatic approach, this study intended to describe the strategies realized by Korean L2 learners while making suggestion and giving advice and investigated whether the two speech acts are realized in different pragmatic strategies and syntactic formulae between Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers. This study also aimed to find out to what extent the selection of strategies is different between making suggestion and giving advice. Since the everyday realization of speech acts is closely related with the concepts of politeness and appropriateness in a specific cultural context, this study also addressed the avoidance of face threatening in the strategy use as realized for the giving advice and making suggestion speech act.

2. Speech Acts of Suggestion and Advice

As evidenced by research in cross-cultural pragmatics, the way speakers perform speech acts through which do something with words is influenced by sociocultural norms and conventions of language use (Barron, 2017). That means cultures differ in the pragmatic rules governing the proper performance of a specific speech act and the pattern of speech act realization in a given situation (Allami, 2012; Babai and Shahrokhi, 2015). Therefore, the category of certain speech act realization can only be properly accepted in a given cultural context since politeness and appropriateness with which certain speech act is realized is totally based on culture specific norms (Babai and Shahrokhi, 2015). Within pragmatics, in this regard, speech act research has focused mostly cultural themes and made inter-language variation the center of systematic investigation in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (Barron, 2017).

In any speech community, the cooperation between interlocutors is the base of daily communication. Such cooperative manner and stance are well reflected in the speech acts of advice and suggestion (Hussein, 1984). In order to soften and mitigate the face-threatening aspect of advice and suggestion, the proper use of the strategies is necessary. As Hussein (1984) argued, both advice and suggestion are beneficent in nature since the acceptance of the offered in the form of advice or suggestion depends on the offeree. On the other hand, both advice and suggestion are directive since the purpose of speaker is to persuade the hearer to commit himself to the course of proposed action (Hancher, 1979). The speech acts of making suggestion and giving advice are performed to get the offeree to take some kind of proposed action. Such directive and commissive nature of advice and suggestion has an effect of cooperative illocutionary act (Barron, 2017). Concerning the politeness issue, both speech acts of advice and suggestion are regarded as face-threatening acts since they may be a treat to the offeree's negative face. Therefore, the social factors such as relation and status between interlocutors play a critical role in the use of strategies in giving advice and making suggestion.

However, advice and suggestion differ in the directness of the action offered. Only the proposed action in giving advice is directed to the offeree, while making suggestion can include the action of the speaker with the linguistic form of 'lets' or 'shall we?' Consequently, Making suggestion implies that the proposed action is performed either by the offeree alone or the offeree and the offerer together, whereas giving advice presupposes that the predicted action is only interest of the offeree, thus committed by the offeree alone (Darweesh and Al-Aadili, 2017; Lakoff and Ide, 2005; Martinez-Flor, 2003). Advice and suggestion also differ in the degree of face-threatening effect. Compared with advice, suggestion is less directive and forceful. Suggestion has not negative connotation, as Matsumura (2001) maintained, while advice may include strong negative connotation. Although both speech acts are offering something or future course of actions in common, they differ in degree of directness, assertiveness, connotation of utterance, and possible threat to the face of the offeree. Therefore, the linguistic expressions and the pragmatic strategies for the realization of each speech act should be different (Martinez-Flor, 2003; Thomson and Martinet, 2001).

A body of research on the speech acts in cross-cultural contexts paid attention to politeness issue (Allami, 2012; Barron, 2003, 2005, 2017). However, little research has been done focusing on the speech acts of advice and suggestion. Using the DCT tools, Babai and Shahrokh (2015) compared the use of strategies for offering advice speech act by Iranian learners of English and English native speakers, and demonstrated the convincing evidence for pragmatic transfer from L1 to L2. They reported that Iranian learners of English were not as balanced as native English speakers in the use of direct vs. indirect strategies for offering advice. Martinez-Flor (2003, 2005) investigated the use of strategies in the speech act of advice and suggestion by non-native speakers of English and whether the English proficiency influence the L2 learners' selection of strategies and perception of directness of the strategies. Based on the data from Iraqi L2 learners of English, Darweesh and Al-Aadili (2017) explored the pragmatic strategies used for suggestion and advice in English. They reported that Iraqi L2 learners of English prefer direct strategies rather than the indirect ones in their speech acts in English due to their preference for directness in Arabic language. In Korean L2 context, Min (2018) studied the offering advice speech acts in Korean L2 context by comparing the strategies used for the realization of offering advice by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers. She revealed that L2 learners' perception of directness increases as their level of proficiency develops. But the comparative analysis of advice and suggestion represents still not much studied area for the speech acts in general and for learner English in particular. When a certain

cultural speech community favors some strategies in a given situation than the others, it is highly possible for the strategies might be less efficient in different cultural circumstances. This cultural aspect of language use is closely connected with the issues of politeness and appropriateness (Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015). This study, therefore, also referred politeness issue in the strategies as realized for giving advice and making suggestion speech acts.

Based on the foregoing objectives, this study aimed to answer the following two research questions.

1. What are the pragmatic strategies as realized in the speech acts of suggestion and advice by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers?
2. To what extent the selection of strategies is different between making suggestion and giving advice speech acts?

3. Methods

3.1 Participants

The current pragmatic research was conducted based on a descriptive layout. A total of 49 Korean L2 learners of English from two universities in Korea were selected for the study. They were all undergraduate students majoring in English education and aged between 20 and 25. The group of native English speakers included 17 Americans and 3 Australian who were aged between 27 and 32 and teaching English as full-time instructors in three universities in Korea. The participants were comprised to be as balanced in their gender as possible because of women's reported tendency toward more prescriptive and polite usage. The study used the sampling adapted to the study purpose to select the participants, so they were assumed to possess certain fundamental characteristics related to the study purpose (Dorney, 2007). English proficiency of Korean participants is assumed to be intermediate or high-intermediate based on their mean TOEIC score of 810 and the inference drawn from educational environment in which they gain a great deal of access to learning English. The period for their studying abroad in English speaking nations varied from 6 to 19 months. 9 students have no experience of studying abroad in any English speaking nations.

3.2 Instruments and Data

A Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire was used to gather the data in the present study. Although the naturalness of real speech situation may be under doubt (Rose and Ono, 1995), and consequently, such designed situations might not be familiar to the participants, the quality response needs socio-cultural familiarity not just situational familiarity (Lorenzo-Dus, 2001). On this ground, the DCT is still regarded as a dependable elicitation method in the research fields of interlanguage pragmatics and cross-cultural studies. For this study, the DCT questionnaire was slightly modified for both cultural familiarity and situational appropriateness and feasibility by two colleagues. The participants were instructed to give responses to each situation freely so that they can write adequate responses that they think most likely to produce in speaking context for each situation. There was no time constraint for providing answer in order not to give possible pressure that the participants may feel and consequently give unreliable responses. They were

also informed that their responses to each item could be more than one sentence, so space was provided enough to produce proper responses. After checking the answer sheets for invalid ones, the data was coded based on the categories according to the classification in Barron (2003) and Martinez-Flor (2003) which modified the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989).

3.3 Data Analysis

For the analysis of pragmatic strategies of the speech act realizations, the CCSARP has been widely used and accepted as a credible and solid instrument for data collection (Wouk, 2006). The data gathered through DCT questionnaire in the study was categorized and analyzed based on Martinez-Flor (2003) which employed and modified CCSARP. Besides the pragmatic strategies, each speech act is realized in the form of certain linguistic forms and expressions. Thomson and Martinet (2001) mentioned typical linguistic realizations of speech acts of advice and suggestion as demonstrated in

1. must/ought to/should
2. had better+bare infinitive.
3. If I were you I should
4. I advise you+ to infinitive
5. Why don't you+bare infinitive?
6. It is time you+past tense verb
7. You might/may as well+bare infinitive

Table 1. The Classification of Giving Advice Strategies

	Strategies	Sample Linguistic Realizations
Direct	Imperative	Stop smoking!
	Negative Imperative	Do not waste your time!
Indirect Conventionalized	Declarative	You should stop smoking
	Performative	I advise you to work harder
	Conditional	If I were you, I will try again
	Probability	It might be better for you to stop smoking
Indirect Non-Conventionalized	Interrogative	How about stop smoking?
	Declarative	You can work harder!
	Hints	You are damaging your mind and body as well

As for the pragmatic strategies for giving advice, Martinez-Flor (2003) schematized strategies used to realize advice speech act based on the directness; direct and indirect strategies, and the latter includes conventional and non-conventional. The directness of a particular strategy was measured only with regard to head act based on the scale of CCSARP. Direct strategies are divided into four realizations: imperatives as in 'Try', negative imperatives 'Do not try the dish,' declarative with modals 'should' or 'ought to' as in 'you should stop smoking', and performative as in 'I

am asking you to study hard' or 'My advice to you is to study harder.' Indirect conventionalized strategies include conditional as in 'If I were you, I would work hard', probability 'It might be better for you to stop smoking', certain interrogative formulae such as 'how about ...?' or 'why don't you...?' and declarative with 'can/could/might' as in 'You can stop smoking'. Indirect non-conventionalized strategies include giving hints either mild or strong in which utterances do not explicitly mention the speaker's intention but only partially refer to the subjects of the giving advice speech act. Table 1 is the classification of giving advice strategies with sample linguistic realizations.

Detailed linguistic realizations of the speech act of suggestion by Thomson and Martinet (2001) and Leech and Svartvik (1996) can be summarized as follows:

1. suggestions involving the speaker
 - How about?
 - What about?
 - Let's
 - I suggest/propose

2. suggestions denoted to the hearer
 - You can/could/might
 - Why don't you?

Table 2. The Classification of Making Suggestion Strategies

	Strategies	Sample Linguistic Realizations
Direct	Imperative	Try that again!
	Negative Imperative	Do not try too hard
	Performative verbs	I suggest that you try harder
Indirect Conventionalized	Noun of suggestion	My suggestion is that ...
	Interrogatives	Why don't you call him?
		How about calling him?
Indirect Non-Conventionalized	Possibility/Probability	You can stay longer.
		You may leave now.
	Conditional	If I were you, I would try that again.
Indirect Non-Conventionalized	Lets	Let's try again
	Impersonal	It would be nice to stay longer.
	Hints	I heard that he needs help.

Making suggestion also can be expressed through three categories of strategies (Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford, 2005): direct, indirect conventionalized, and indirect non-conventionalized. Direct strategies include use of performative verbs as in 'I suggest that you work hard', noun of suggestion 'My suggestion is to try again', imperative 'try that again' and negative imperative as in 'Do not try hard to do that'. However, the use of imperative and negative imperative forms are regarded as impolite or even aggressive due to their illocutionary force (Koester, 2002). The direct strategies with

performative verbs or nouns of suggestion, as Darweesh and Al-Aadili (2017) mentioned, are also not commonly used either since they sound quite directive. Indirect conventionalized strategies include the use of interrogatives such as ‘why don’t you call her later?’ expressions of probability or possibility like ‘you can call him later’, conditionals such as ‘If I were you, I would rather wait till tomorrow’, and lets. Indirect non-conventionalized strategies involve the use of impersonal expression as in ‘I would be nice if you can help him’ or ‘It might be better to wait till tomorrow’, and giving hints such as ‘I’ve heard that he needed help’. Unlike the conventionalized strategies which explicitly express the speakers’ intention, the speaker’s intents are not clearly indicated through the non-conventionalized strategies, therefore, the hearer’s inference is of importance. Table 2 is the classification of making suggestion strategies with sample linguistic realizations.

Giving advice and making suggestion were elicited in the context of 8 different situations each. To remove social factor of social distance and power relation, 8 situations were formed and controlled so that advice and suggestion in 4 situations out of 8 each were elicited to someone with higher social status and the other 4 situations were between intimate people in equal relations such as family members and classmates. Only the head acts of each advice and suggestion statements were analyzed. The frequency use and the percentage of overall strategies of advice and suggestion employed by Korean L2 learners and native English speakers were analyzed. The data were classified into main levels of directness; direct, indirect conventionalized, and indirect non-conventionalized.

4. Results

Table 3 displays and summarizes the descriptive statistics of the findings which clarifies giving advice employed by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers based on their responses in DCT. As Table 3 illustrates, both groups of participants tend to use indirect conventionalized strategy for giving advice.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Advice Expressions in Two Groups of Participants

	Advice	NS	KL2L
Direct	Imperative	15 (9.49)	67 (17.14)
	Negative Imperative	6 (3.8)	16 (4.09)
	Declarative	21 (13.29)	31 (7.93)
	Performative	6 (3.80)	
Indirect Conventionalized	Conditional	5 (3.16)	
	Probability	12 (7.59)	
	Interrogative	78 (49.37)	254 (64.96)
	Declarative	11 (6.96)	23 (5.83)
Indirect Non-Conventionalized	Hints	4 (2.53)	

Table 3 shows that Interrogative of indirect conventionalized strategies was found to be the most frequently employed by both groups of participants to realize giving advice. The analysis of native speakers’ data showed that, out of total 158 giving advice strategies identified in the data, 78 giving advice (49.37%) were realized through the

Interrogative strategy. Korean L2 learners employed 391 strategies among which 254 (64.96%) were the Interrogative. The second most frequently used strategy was direct strategy for both groups of participants. The group of native English speakers selected Declarative as their second most favored strategy (13.29%). The ranking was followed by Imperative and Probability/Possibility strategies. On the contrary, Korean L2 learners selected Imperative of direct strategy as their second most favored strategy, registering 67 (17.14%) instances. Declarative was their third preference (7.93%) when they give advice. In native speakers data, one indirect strategy of Interrogative and two direct strategies of Declarative and Imperative amount to more than 70% of total occurrences of giving advice. On the other hand, Korean L2 learners data indicated that the three most favored strategies amount to about 90 % of total instances of giving advice.

The data showed that the group of native English speakers employed Probability/Possibility and Declarative of indirect conventionalized strategies as their fourth preference at roughly the same rate (7%) when they give advice. In responses of native English speakers, 23 (14.55%) instances out of total 158 giving advice identified were realized through Probability/Possibility and Declarative. The data indicated, on the other hand, that there were relatively few instances of indirect conventionalized Declarative among Korean L2 learners identified as shown in Table 3. Moreover, none of the Korean group used Probability/Possibility when they give advice. It is also notable that though Performative of direct strategies and Conditional of indirect conventionalized were not employed by the Korean L2 learners, the two strategies were chosen by the group of native speakers at roughly same rate.

It was also noticeable that there were few instances of indirect non-conventionalized Hints. The data showed that Hints was the least frequent strategy among the native speakers in giving advice and none of Korean L2 learners chose Hints strategy.

Over and above, an in-depth analysis of the expressions of giving advice revealed difference in the use of hedging devices such as downtoners (perhaps, probably) and committers (I think, in my opinion) between the two groups of participants. While the group of native speakers selected the direct strategies of Declarative and Imperative as their second and third preference, their use of direct strategies was mostly mitigated with a variety of hedging device. The use of hedging device played an important role in reducing the assertiveness of utterances and consequently increasing politeness by diminishing potential threatening force. On the other hand, Korean L2 learners rarely used mitigated expressions in giving advice in four situations in which advice was given to the person with the equal social status. Even in the other four situations where the act of giving advice was realized toward a person with a higher status, their use of mitigators were much less frequent than that of native speakers.

Table 4 displays and summarizes the descriptive statistics of the findings which clarifies the expressions of making suggestions by Korean L2 learners of English and native English speakers based on their responses in DCT. As Table 4 illustrates, both groups of participants tend to use indirect conventionalized strategy for suggestions.

Table 4 shows that Interrogative forms of indirect conventionalized strategies was found to be the most preferred by both groups of participants to make suggestions. The analysis of native speakers' data demonstrated that, out of total 158 making suggestion strategies identified in the data, 62 suggestions (39.24%) were realized through the Interrogative forms. The second favored strategy was Probability/Possibility (17.09%). This was followed by Performative verbs and Nouns of suggestion of direct strategies and Hints and Impersonal of indirect non-conventionalized strategies at roughly same rate (7% each). Out of total 391 strategy uses by Korean L2 learners, on the other hand, 227 (more than 50%) were

the Interrogative forms. The second most frequently used strategy when they make suggestions was Imperative of direct strategies, registering 59 (15.09%) occurrences. The ranking was followed by Possibility/Probability and Let's strategies at roughly same rate (9.46% and 8.44 % each).

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Suggestion Expressions in Two Groups of Participants

	Suggestion	NS	KL2L
Direct	Imperative	14 (8.86)	59 (15.09)
	Negative Imperative		
	Performative verbs	11 (6.96)	20 (5.13)
Indirect Conventionalized	Noun of suggestion	11 (6.96)	
	Interrogatives	62 (39.24)	227 (58.06)
	Possibility/Probability	27 (17.09)	37 (9.46)
Indirect Non-Conventionalized	Conditional	8 (5.06)	15 (3.84)
	Lets	5 (3.16)	33 (8.44)
	Impersonal	11 (6.96)	
	Hints	9 (5.7)	

Compared to the situation of giving advice in which the native English speakers' use of strategies was evenly distributed across direct and indirect strategies as shown in Table 3, their use of strategies for giving suggestion did not spread evenly but more centered on indirect strategies both conventionalized and non-conventionalized. In spite of the shared preference for indirect conventionalized strategies between the two groups of participants, one prominent difference in strategy use stands out. None of the Korean L2 learners chose indirect non-conventionalized strategies of Hints and Impersonal.

It was also notable that there were few instances of indirect conventionalized Let's among native English speakers. Conditional and Performative verbs were the least frequent strategies in making suggestions among Korean L2 learners.

The difference in use of more direct vs. indirect expressions of advice and suggestion lies in the cultural differences (Babaie and Shahrokhi, 2015). Compared with the cases of many Eastern cultures (Darweesh and Al-Aadili, 2017), languages of Western cultures are said to prefer more indirect linguistic forms and pragmatic strategies (.Al-Darraj et al., 2013). Therefore, the tendency of overusing certain strategies among the Korean L2 learners and their reliance on direct strategies without hedging devices contrast with native speakers' strategy use both direct and indirect in the speech acts of advice and suggestion. The difference is also clear in use of indirect non-conventionalized strategies for advice and suggestion. In contrast to the native speakers, the Korean L2 learners obviated the use of Hints and Impersonal. The avoidance of the two strategies is assumed due to the lack of sign of the intended force in Hints and Impersonal when giving advice and making suggestion as well as their grammatical complexity (Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study investigated the pragmatic strategies in making suggestions and giving advice as used by Korean L2

learners and native English speakers. While both acts of giving advice and making suggestions are a way of having balanced interpersonal relations in any culture, people are not allowed to intrude themselves into personal territory (Hofstede, 1991). The degree of directness in relation with politeness is closely linked with cultural values such as collectivism or individual autonomy. As such, socio-cultural context plays a significant role in the production and perception of making suggestions and giving advice. The degree of politeness and face-saving is the primary concern also in the two speech acts. Therefore, when language users in L2 context violate typical strategy realization used by native speakers, they might be considered to violate politeness norms of target culture and target language. As L2 learners become more aware of context and culture sensitive nature of speech act realization, as Spada and Lightbown (1999) maintained, some difficulties and misjudgement they face may be reduced.

In this respect, the comparative analysis of the expressions of suggestion and advice in the present study shed light on inter-language pragmatics in relations with theory of speech act realization. As the findings reveal, the Korean L2 learners tended to overuse certain strategies and relied on more direct strategies unmitigated when they made suggestions and gave advice. This contrasted with more balanced use of both direct and indirect strategies mostly mitigated or hedged in the speech acts of advice and suggestion among native English speakers. The difference is also evident in use of indirect non-conventionalized strategies. In contrast to the native speakers, the Korean L2 learners avoided indirect non-conventionalized strategies. The responses from Korean L2 learners might be the influence of their cultural background and politeness norms or the developmental nature of inter-language.

A detailed comparative analysis of suggestions and advice also revealed the difference in the realizations of the two speech acts. Native English speakers tended to show even distribution in the selection of strategies for both suggestion and advice. This contrasts with the case of Korean groups. While Korean L2 learners frequently used three direct strategies except Performative for giving advice, their preference in strategy use for making suggestion was indirect conventionalized strategies. Though both advice and suggestion belong to directives, only advice is regarded as an act which is directed to the hearer alone. Consequently, advice speech act might have more negative implication and more possibility to threaten the negative face of the hearer than in case of suggestion. Therefore, Korean L2 learners may experience the risk of unintentionally violating conversational norms and be regarded more assertive and less polite in their speech act of advice in English by employing high level of directness. Overall, the results confirm the findings of L2 learners' speech acts in different cultural contexts (Allami, 2012; Babaie and Shahrokhi, 2015; Darweesh and Al-Aadili, 2017; Min, 2018).

Making suggestions and offering advice are regarded as having face-threatening effects, thus need to be softened with a variety of devices (Brown and Levinson, 1987), consequently require a high level of pragmatic competence. L2 learners are required to improve their awareness of socio-pragmatic competence and produce contextually proper speech acts in their cross-cultural interaction. Therefore, L2 pedagogy have to integrate socio-cultural and pragmatic components and help learners have positive experience and increase their motivation (Kasper and Rose, 2002). Inevitably, it is indispensable to guide L2 learners to being perceived not as deficient but as more appropriate in their performance of speech acts in English. Though the results of this study should not be generalized and further research is required to determine the specific situational contexts which prefer certain strategies in daily interactions, this study contributes to the research on inter-language pragmatics focusing on the speech acts of advice and suggestion on the part of L2 learners of English in Korean context.

References

- Al-Darraj, H., T. Foo, S. Ismail, and W. Abdulah. 2013. Cultural Values Underlying Speech Act of Inviting: The Case of Iraqi EFL Speakers. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 4.8, 1051-1057.
- Allami, H. 2012. A Sociopragmatic Study of the Offer Speech Act in Persian. *RALS*, 3.1, 110-129.
- Babaie, S., and M. Shahrokhi. 2015. A Cross-Cultural Study of Offering Advice Speech Acts by Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers: Pragmatic Transfer in Focus. *English Language Teaching*, 8.6, 133-140.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. and B. Hartford. 2005. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Exploring Institutional Talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Barron, A. 2003. *Acquisition in Intrerlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Thing with Words in a Study Abroad Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Barron, A. 2005. Offering in Ireland and England. In A. Barron. & K. Schneider (eds.). *The Pragmatics of Irish English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 141-176.
- Barron, A. 2017. The speech Act of 'Offers' in Irish English. *World Englishes*, 224-238. doi:10.1111/weng.12255.
- Blum-Kulka, S., J. House, and G. Kasper. 1989. Investigating Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: An Introductory Overview. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Albex, 1-34.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheng, S. 2005. An Exploratory Cross-Sectional Study of Inter-Language Pragmatic Development of Expressions of Gratitude by Chinese Learner of English. A Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Darweesh, A. and N. Al-Aadili. 2017. Investigating Iraqi EFL Learners' Performance in Utilizing the Speech Acts of Advice and Suggestion. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7.4, 179-190.
- Dornyei, Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hancher, M. 1979. The Classification of Cooperative Illocutionary Acts. *Journal of Language in Society*, 9, 1-14.
- Hofstede, G. 1991. *Culture and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hussein, A. 1984. The Realization of Request in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Baghdad, Iraq.
- Kasper, G. 1992. Pragmatic Transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8, 203-231.
- Kasper, G. and K. Rose. 2002. *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Koester, A. 2002. The Performance of Speech Acts in Workplace Conversations and the Teaching of Communicative Functions. *System*, 30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00003-9)
- Lakoff, R. and S. Ide. 2005. *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Leech, G. and J. Svartvik. 1996. *A Communicative Grammar of English*. New York.: Longman Publishing.
- Lorenzo-Dus, N. 2001. Complement Responses among British and Spanish University Students: A Contrastive Study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33.1, 107-127.
- Martinez-FLor, A. 2003. *Non-Native Speakers' Production of Advice Acts: The Effects of Proficiency*. Castellon: University Jaume I.
- Martinez-FLor, A. 2005. Theoretical Review of the Speech Act of Suggesting: Towards a Taxonomy for Its Use in FLT. *Revista Alicantina De Studios Ingleses*, No. 18. Castellon: University Jaume I. 167-187.
- Matsumura, S. 2001. Learning the Rules for Offering Advice: A Quantitative Approach to Second Language Socialization.

Language Learning, 51.4, 635-679.

- Min, S. 2018. The Speech Act of Offering Advice in Learner English in Korean Context. *Journal of Language Science*, 25.4, 201-219.
- Olshtain, E. and A. Cohen. 1991. Teaching Speech Act Behavior to Nonnative Speakers. In M. Celce-Murica (ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 156-165.
- Rose, K. and R. Ono. 1995. Eliciting Speech Act Data in Japanese: The Effect of Questionnaire Type. *Language Learning*, 45.2, 191-223.
- Spada, N. and P. Lightbown. 1999. Instruction, First Language Influence, and Developmental Readiness in Second Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83.1, 1-22.
- Tomson, A. and A. Martinet. 2001. *A Practical English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- White, R. 1993. Saying Please: Pragmalinguistic Failure in English Interaction. *ELT Journal*, 47.3., 193-202.
- Wouk, F. 2006. The Language of Apologizing in Lombok, Indonesia. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 1456-1486.

Sujung Min, Professor

56 Kongjudaehakro, Gonjusi, Chungnam, Republic of Korea, 32588

Department of English Education, Kongju National University

E-mail: sujmin@kongju.ac.kr