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This study compares the deictic demonstratives of Korean with those of Japanese and Finnish for development of teaching Korean as a foreign language (KFL).

The Deictic Demonstratives of Korean, Japanese and Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Finnish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>tämä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>ce</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>tuo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, Korean, Japanese and Finnish share typological similarities regarding the number of deictic contrasts expressed by the demonstratives, that is a three-way contrast between proximal, medial and distal. However, it is in question how pragmatically similar or different they are in the actual use, especially with regard to Korean and Finnish. Most recently, Lidén (2016) investigated the native and the learner use of spatial deictic demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish through discourse completion tasks and reported that the native use of spatial deictic demonstratives did not necessarily reflect the typological similarities or differences found in the languages and that their use was more influenced by language-specific social-interactional factors. She also reported that the learners’ use of spatial deictic demonstratives was more strongly influenced by the teaching materials and the linguistic environment in which the learners reside, rather than the typological similarities or differences mentioned above.

This study replicates the experiment of Lidén (2016), in order to collect data from one hundred native Korean speakers, in addition to her data collected from the same number of native Japanese and Finnish speakers respectively. The data from the three NL groups are analysed to compare the pragmatic usage of Korean and Japanese as well as Korean and Finnish deictic demonstratives. Based upon the results, it examines the similarities and differences of them, and also discusses further in detail the following issues: (1) whether the similarities/differences between Korean and Japanese deictic demonstratives are based on typological or social-interactional factors, and (2) whether the similarities/differences between Korean and Finnish deictic demonstratives are based on typological or social-interactional factors.

Taking into consideration the findings from examination of the experimental results, we endeavour to search how to develop the method of teaching the learners speaking NL with deictic demonstratives different from the target language, including not only the languages with a three-way deictic contrast (i.e. Japanese and Finnish), but also languages with a two-way deictic contrast such as English and Chinese.
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