

# Study on Contrastive Analysis of Korean ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ and Thai ‘cha’, and Pedagogical Implications for Thai Learners of Korean

**Kittichon Khoatkham**

*Korean Section, Faculty of Humanities, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok 10110, Thailand*

**(Corresponding author’s e-mail: kittichon@g.swu.ac.th)**

## Abstract

This paper examines differences between the Korean forms ‘-겠-’ (-get-), ‘-(으)ㄴ 것’ (-(eu)l geot) and Thai ‘ชา’ (cha)<sup>1</sup> through a contrastive analysis. It aims to anticipate difficulties Thai learners may face in acquiring and using ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’, and to propose concrete pedagogical implications for teaching these forms. The paper first describes the characteristics of Korean ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and Thai ‘cha’ and then compares them to identify key similarities and differences. The analysis suggests that Thai learners will struggle in using ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ appropriately because both ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ contain pragmatic meanings which are not systematically marked by ‘cha’ itself. Based on these findings, this paper proposes instructional guidelines that emphasize clear contextual explanations in the presentation stages, followed by situational practice exercises and post-task consciousness-raising activities to support learners’ understanding and accuracy.

**Keywords:** Contrastive analysis, Korean grammar, Thai learners of Korean language, Korean language education, Pragmatics

## Introduction

Korean language education at the secondary-school level in Thailand began in 2009 through cooperation between the Office of the Basic Education Commission (OBEC), Ministry of Education, and faculty members from the Korean language section in the Department of Eastern Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkhla University. In 2014, there were 70 public schools that offered Korean language courses with 18,745 students (Kaewchuay & Kobsirithiwara, 2017, p. 187). Then in 2024, the number of the schools offering Korean increased to

---

<sup>1</sup> Notation: Korean and Thai grammatical forms are referenced by romanized labels after first mention: ‘-겠-’ (-get-), ‘-(으)ㄴ 것’ (-(eu)l geot) and ‘ชา’ (cha). Korean and Thai example sentences are presented in the original script with romanization. To maximize readability, romanization of Korean language in this paper follows Revised Romanization of Korean (국어의 로마자 표기법) and for the romanization of Thai language, this paper follows Royal Thai General System of Transcription from the Royal Institute of Thailand.

209, and the number of students also surged to 47,844<sup>2</sup>. This indicates that, as the status of Korean language in Thailand has grown, there is an increasing need for a wider range of research focusing on Thai learners of Korean.

Thai language is classified as an isolating language. Thai's word order is Subject-Verb-Object (S-V-O) and there is no change in verb or adjective's forms. Temporal and modal meanings in Thai language are not expressed by inflections but separate words, markers or context (Ahn, 2009). In contrast, Korean language is categorized as an agglutinative language of which temporal meanings are frequently indicated by word endings (ㄷ). Therefore, because of such differences, Thai learners may find it challenging to map Thai tense or modal expressions onto Korean endings, especially when Korean has more than one form that can seem similar in translation.

One example that shows this problem is the Thai marker 'cha'. In Thai, the marker is used mainly to express futurity, including intention and prediction when formed with other markers. In Korean, however, such meanings can be expressed by both '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot'. Speakers usually choose between these two forms based on pragmatic factors. For example, volitional '-get-' is typically used when dealing with the listener who is higher in status while volitional '-(eu)l geot' does not contain such meaning. So, it can be anticipated that Thai learners may treat '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' as interchangeable equivalents of 'cha', even in contexts where native speakers would make a clearer distinction.

For the reason mentioned above, this paper will conduct a contrastive analysis of Korean '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' and Thai 'cha'. This is to clarify key differences among these forms and to predict likely errors Thai learners may make. Then, this paper will suggest pedagogical implications and exercises that will help learners to understand and use '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' more appropriately in context.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, it reviews previous literature mainly the studies of Korean-Thai contrastive analysis of tense and Korean tense acquisition in Thai learners. Second, the paper describes the characteristics of '-get-', '-(eu)l geot' and 'cha'. Third, it conducts a contrastive analysis between these forms to derive the main similarities and differences. Lastly, the paper proposes teaching guidelines for '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' for Thai learners.

## Literature Review

There are only a few studies that focus specifically on contrastive analyses of Korean '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' and Thai 'cha', or on Thai learners' acquisition of these Korean forms. Therefore, this section reviews related work on broader Korean – Thai contrasts in temporal expressions and Thai learners' acquisition of Korean tense-related morphology.

Firstly, Juthamad (2014) conducted a comparative study of tense expressions in Korean and Thai. Among the tense expressions compared in the study, it was indicated that Korean '-get-' can be compared to Thai 'cha', 'khong cha', and 'sa-maat ... dai'. This study can be considered as one of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Korean Education Center in Thailand

earliest studies regarding the comparison of Korean and Thai temporal expressions. However, such correspondences remain descriptive and do not fully specify the contextual constraints that govern form choices such as addressee-orientation or planned future, which are crucial for pedagogy.

Learner studies further indicate that Thai learners experience persistent difficulty with Korean tense/aspect related morphology. Kesmanee (2013) examined Thai learners' acquisition of Korean adnominal endings and found persistent difficulties across proficiency levels. The finding indicated that Thai learners particularly struggle with past-related forms such as '-(eu)n', '-deon', and '-at/eotdeon'. Although the focus is not on future markers, the results suggest that Korean tense/aspect-related morphology is a recurrent source of difficulty for Thai learners. Similarly, Patee (2014) reported that Thai learners experience difficulty with several tense meanings, including future events with a high degree of certainty. Along with Kesmanee (2013), these findings support the view that Thai learners' L1 can affect the acquisition of Korean tense – related meanings and morphology.

More directly, Sanguansin (2018) investigated Thai learners' use of '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' and found that learners in all proficiency levels had difficulty distinguishing the two forms, often treating them as interchangeable in future contexts likely because both can be interpreted as Thai 'cha'. However, previous studies have offered limited discussion of the pragmatic factors that condition the choice between '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot', for example, subjective versus objective basis and addressee-orientation. Also, they provide relatively few detailed classroom procedures for teaching these distinctions effectively.

Accordingly, the present study addresses these limitations by moving beyond broad equivalence statements to specify the form–meaning–context relations that condition future-oriented choices in Korean and their points of divergence from Thai. In particular, it offers a contrastive analysis of Korean '-get-' and '-(eu)l geot' in relation to Thai 'cha' with attention to key pragmatic and semantic parameters (e.g., epistemic basis, speaker commitment, and addressee-orientation) that have been insufficiently developed in earlier work. On this basis, the study proposes pedagogical guidelines that translate these distinctions into teachable selection principles and classroom procedures, with the goal of supporting Thai learners' accurate and context-appropriate use of the two Korean forms.

## **Methodology**

The contrastive analysis in this paper is based on a theoretical comparison of Korean '-get-', '-(eu)l geot' and Thai 'cha'. The comparison uses three shared functional domains which are (1) future reference, (2) conjecture/inference, and (3) volition. Then, each form is evaluated according to two key linguistic criteria, epistemic basis and pragmatic orientation to the addressee. The language sources are drawn from previous studies regarding these forms that will be discussed in the next. On the basis of these sources, the paper first consolidates the major functions and usage constraints reported for each form, then compares them across three shared domains which are futurity, conjecture/inference, and volition/intention—The examples are taken from the cited works. The

resulting similarities and mismatches are used to predict likely problem areas for Thai learners and to motivate the pedagogical guidelines in the final section.

### Characteristics of ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’

#### ‘-get-’

Korean has various ways of expressing future time, and among them the prefinal ending ‘-get-’ as a representative form used to indicate the future tense (Ko & Koo, 2020, p. 425).

1. 잠시 후면 대통령 내외분이 입장하시겠습니다.

*Jamsi humyeon daetongnyeong naeoebuni ipjanghasigetsseumnida.*

“The president and First Lady will enter shortly.”

2. 한번 지원해 보겠습니다.

*Hanbeon jiwonhae bogetsseumnida.*

“I will go ahead and apply (and see how it goes).”

(Ko & Koo, 2020, p. 425)

In (1) and (2), ‘-get-’, attached to verb stems, expressed that the event time occurs after the speech time; thus ‘-get-’ is being used as a future tense marker. In addition, (2) shows that ‘-get-’ can also indicate the speaker’s intention or volition. However, Yu et al. (2023) argue that treating forms like ‘-get-’ as a pure future tense marker is problematic: unlike past and present, which form a mutually exclusive tense opposition, meanings such as volition and conjecture are compatible with any temporal reference. On this view, ‘-get-’ is more plausibly analyzed as a modal morpheme rather than a future tense marker.

Lim (2001) stated that ‘-get-’ not only marks simple future tense but also carries modal meaning, including conjecture. In general, conjecture expressed by ‘-get-’ is based on the current situation or on the speaker’s present knowledge. In some cases, the conjecture may also be based on a hypothetical situation. In addition, Ko & Koo (2020, p. 426) define ‘-get-’ as a subjective conjecture.

1. 행동거지로 볼 때 자기 형보다 낫겠네그려.

*Haengdonggeojiro bol ttae jagi hyeongboda natgetnegeuryeo.*

“Judging from his behavior, he must be better than his older brother.”

2. 그분은 첫눈에 보아도 좋은 사람이겠다.

*Geubuneun cheonnune boado joeun saramigetta.*

“Even at first glance, that person seems to be a good person.”

(Ko & Koo, 2020, p. 426)

Both (1) and (2) confirm that ‘-get-’ here is used to indicate the speaker’s conjecture about the situation at the time of utterance.

Furthermore, according to the National Institute of the Korean Language (2021), ‘-get-’ can also be attached to verbs in interrogative sentences to ask about the addressee’s intention as in the following example.

이것 좀 잡수시겠습니까? (National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 30)

*Igeot jom japsusigetssseumnikka?*

“Would you like to have some of this?” (honorific/polite)

It can also be attached to certain verbs to express the speaker’s thought that a situation or state is likely to occur, in a softened or indirect (euphemistic) way as in the following example.

잘 알겠습니다. (National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 31)

*Jal algetsseumnida.*

“I understand well.” (often used as a softened/indirect acknowledgment)

Overall, ‘-get-’ alone is not simply a future tense marker. Although it often yields a future-time reading, it also expresses modal meanings such as volition, conjecture, and polite intention. Therefore, it is better analyzed primarily as a modal morpheme whose future interpretations are context-dependent.

### ‘-(eu)l geot’

Next, ‘-(eu)l geot’ will be discussed. According to the National Institute of the Korean Language (2021), ‘-(eu)l geot’ consists of the adnominal suffix -(으)ㄴ (-(eu)l) plus the bound noun 것 (geot), and it expresses either conjecture or volition on the part of the speaker. Firstly, ‘-(eu)l geot’ can express a prospect or conjecture about a situation or fact, as in the following examples.

1. 정수기 물이니 틀림없이 깨끗할 것이다.

*Jeongsugi murini teullimeopsi kkaekkeutal geosida.*

“Since it’s water from a purifier, it will definitely be clean.”

2. 한 시니까 수업이 끝났을 거야.

*Han sinikka sueobi kkeunasseul geoya.*

“It’s one o’clock, so class will have ended (by now).”

3. 다음 경기에서도 금메달을 딸 선수는 우리나라 선수일 거예요.

*Daeum gyeonggiedo geummedareul ttal seonsuneun urinara seonsuil geoyeyo.*

“The athlete who will win the gold medal in the next match will probably be a Korean athlete.”

(1-3 from National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 772)

When ‘-(eu)l geot’ is attached to a verb, it can also express strong intention or willingness to perform an action in the future, or the speaker’s subjective conviction, as in the examples below.

1. 나는 꼭 성공할 것이다.

*Naneun kkok seonggonghal geosida.*

“I will succeed no matter what.”

2. 오늘 점심에 뭐 먹을 거야?

*Oneul jeomsime mweo meogeul geoya?*

“What are you going to eat for lunch today?”

3. 이번 시합에서 꼭 이길 것이니 두고 보세요.

*Ibeon sihabeseo kkok igil geosini dugo boseyo.*

“I will definitely win this match, just wait and see.”

(1-3 from National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 772)

In sum, ‘-(eu)l geot’ expresses the speaker’s conjecture about a situation or fact and can also convey strong volition or firm commitment to a future action. Thus, it functions as a major device for expressing both prediction and intention in Korean.

### **Difference between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’**

‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ show a difference when they express conjecture or supposition. ‘-get-’ is mainly used when the conjecture is based on the speaker’s subjective judgment while ‘-(eu)l geot’ is mainly used when the conjecture is based on objective and general evidence<sup>3</sup>. Consider the following examples.

1. 오후에 비가 오겠다.

*Ohue biga ogetta.*

“Looks like it will rain this afternoon.”

---

<sup>3</sup> In terms of conjectural meaning, the difference between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ can be controversial. For instance, apart from the subjectivity versus objectivity, some scholars also view that ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used when the evidence of judgment is weaker while ‘-get-’ is used when the evidence of judgment is stronger (Ko & Koo, 2020, p. 439).

2. 오후에 비가 올 거야.

“It’s going to rain this afternoon.”

*Ohue biga ol geoya.*

(1-3 from National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 773)

In (1) where ‘-get-’ is used, the speaker makes a subjective inference that it will rain based on seeing dark clouds, whereas (2) where ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used, the conjecture is usually based on objective information such as a weather forecast. In other words, ‘-get-’ is used for subjective conjecture, while ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used for conjecture grounded in objective evidence.

In addition, according to Jo (2018), ‘-get-’ is used when the speaker expresses an opinion in response to the addressee while being mindful of the addressee’s thoughts, requests, or advice. In contrast, ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used when the speaker takes the initiative in expressing their own volition. That is, unlike ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used to express the speaker’s intention or plan regardless of the addressee.

To conclude, both ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ can be used to express futurity. However, both forms differ in terms of stance and contextual grounding. ‘-get-’ can mark simple future time, yet it is strongly associated with modal meanings such as the speaker’s subjective conjecture, and it also contains addressee-oriented sense when used in volitional use. In contrast, ‘-(eu)l geot’ likewise expresses conjecture and volition, but it is commonly used when the conjecture is based on more objective grounds. Also, when used to express plans or intention, ‘-(eu)l geot’ does not contain addressee-oriented meaning like ‘-get-’. Instead, it conveys strong intention or willingness to perform an action in the future. Therefore, when taught in a classroom, these two forms should be presented explicitly and should not be overgeneralized as futurity-related forms.

### Characteristics of ‘cha’

In current Thai linguistics, ‘cha’ has been actively discussed, and analyses vary across scholars. This section focuses on two broad perspectives: (1) Phraya Upakit Silapasan (1956) and Thonglor (2011), and (2) Panthumetha (2007) and Soithurum (2010).

First, according to Phraya Upakit Silapasan (1956), ‘cha’ (along with ‘chak’) is defined as an auxiliary verb, and it is one of the ways to express futurity in Thai. It appears before the main verb and functions to mark future time, as illustrated below.

## 1. เขาจะกิน

*Khao cha kin*

‘He will eat’

## 2. เขาจักสบาย

*Khao chak sabai*

‘He will be fine’

(1-2 from Phraya Upakit Silapasan, 1956, p. 117)

Similarly, Thonglor (2011) also classified ‘cha’ as an auxiliary verb used to indicate futurity. In this study, Thonglor also indicated that when combined with other elements, ‘cha’ can also appear in compound temporal reference (กาลซ้อน). For example:

1. เขากำลังจะได้ทำงานแล้ว  
*Khao kamlang **cha** dai tham ngan laeo*  
‘He is about to get a job now.’
2. เขาจะได้งานทำอยู่แล้ว  
*Khao **cha** dai ngan tham yu laeo*  
‘He will get a job anyway’  
(1-2 from Thonglor, 2011, p. 228)

In contrast, Panthumetha (2007) argued that ‘cha’ does not need to solely express futurity. Panthumetha (2007) stated that ‘cha’ can be used to mark events that are not yet realized. Therefore, it is often used with words that express opinion as follows:

1. เขาน่าจะไป  
*Khao na **cha** pai*  
‘He will probably go.’  
(*na* = probably, likely)
2. เขาเห็นจะชอบ  
*Khao hen **cha** chop*  
‘It seems he will like it.’  
(*hen* = apparently, it seems...)
3. เขาคงจะรู้  
*Khao khong **cha** ru*  
‘He probably knows’  
(*khong* = probably, must)
4. เขาคงจะมา  
*Khao khuan **cha** ma*  
‘He should come.’  
(*khuan* = should)  
(1-4 from Panthumetha, 2007, p. 67)

Likewise, Soithurum (2010) argues that it is not appropriate to treat ‘cha’ simply as a time-marking auxiliary and provides a more fine-grained analysis. Firstly, Soithurum (2010) argues that Thai is difficult to classify as either a tense-prominent language or aspect-prominent language because Thai can indicate temporal reference even without auxiliaries by relying on temporal adverbials and/or discourse context. This does not fit the criteria for tense and aspect prominent languages proposed by Bhat (1999)<sup>4</sup>. Because of this, Soithurum (2010) proposes that it is more appropriate to analyze ‘cha’ not as a tense or aspect auxiliary, but as an irrealis marker—a marker referring to events that have not yet become real at the time of utterance.

Soithurum (2010) further claims that ‘cha’ can express not only futurity but also a range of meanings depending on syntactic environment. The basic syntactic patterns are as follows:

1. NP + ‘cha’ + VP  
e.g. ฝนจะตกหนัก (*fon cha tok nak*)  
‘It will rain heavily.’
2. NP + (auxiliary) + ‘cha’ + (auxiliary) + VP  
e.g. น้องใกล้จะคลอด (*nong klai cha khlot*)  
‘My younger sibling is about to give birth.’
3. NP + V + ‘cha’ + V/VP  
e.g. ฝรั่งเข้ามาจะตั้งบริษัท (*farang khao-ma cha tang borisat*)  
‘Westerners are coming to establish a company.’  
(patterns 1-3 from Soithurum, 2010, p. 133)

Through these syntactic environments, ‘cha’ is argued to encode eleven meanings, including possibility, probability, intention, future, condition, habit, experience, inference, purpose, inception, and goal. Some examples presented in Soithurum (2010) are as follows:

1. เขาแทบจะทรงตัวไม่อยู่ (Soithurum, 2010, p. 138)  
*Khao thaep cha song tua mai yu*  
He can hardly keep his balance. (possibility)

---

<sup>4</sup> Bhat (1999) proposed criteria for classifying a language as either tense-prominent or aspect-prominent. First, elements that express tense should arise through grammaticalization. However, Soithurum notes that ‘cha’ does not behave like an obligatory tense marker. Second, expressing tense should obligatorily require a grammatical element; yet in Thai, the future can be indicated even without ‘cha’, through temporal adverbial phrases or through context. Third, grammatical elements expressing tense should form a systematic paradigm. Although Thai ‘cha’ is systematic to some extent, it is not obligatory when expressing the future, so Soithurum (2010) considers Thai not to meet this criterion. Fourth, the relevant element should apply broadly across parts of speech. For example, in Indo-Aryan languages, perfective and imperfective markers apply widely to finite verbs, adjectival verbs, adverbial principles, verb compounds and so on. In contrast, the distribution of Thai ‘cha’ is relatively limited. For these reasons, Soithurum (2010) argued that it may not be accurate to regard Thai as either a tense-prominent language or aspect-prominent language.

2. รถชนขนาดนี้คงจะมีคนตายไม่น้อย (Soithurum, 2010, p. 139)  
*Rot chon khanat-ni khong cha mi khon tai mai noi*  
With a crash this bad, there are probably quite a few deaths. (probability)
3. ผมตั้งใจจะประกอบอาชีพส่วนตัว (Soithurum, 2010, p. 139)  
*Phom tang chai cha prakop achip suan tua.*  
I intend to start my own business. (volition)
4. เขาจะไปทำงาน (Soithurum, 2010, p. 141)  
*Khao cha pai tham ngan*  
He is going to work. (future)
5. ถ้ามีเวลา เขาจะเที่ยวรอบโลก (Soithurum, 2010, p. 118)  
*Tha mi wela khao cha thiao rob lok*  
If he has time, he will travel all over the world. (conditionals)
6. เขามักจะไปโรงเรียนสาย (Soithurum, 2010, p. 142)  
*Khao mak cha pai rongrian sai*  
He often arrives at school late. (habit)
7. เขาเคยจะไปเมืองนอก (Soithurum, 2010, p. 143)  
*Khao khoei cha pai mueang nok*  
He almost went abroad. (experience)
8. มีชื่ออะไรบ้าง ฉันชักจะรู้สึกสนุกขึ้นมาแล้ว (Soithurum, 2010, p. 143)  
*Mi rueang arai bang? chan chak cha sanuk khuen ma laeo*  
What are the names? I'm starting to feel interested now. (deductive)
9. ฝรั่งเข้ามาจะตั้งบริษัท (Soithurum, 2010, p. 143)  
*Farang khao ma cha tang borisat*  
Westerners are coming to set up a company. (goal)
10. ประชาชนเริ่มจะยอมรับความจริง (Soithurum, 2010, p. 144)  
*Prachachon roem cha yomrap khwam ching*  
The people are beginning to accept the truth. (incentive)

11. คนยินดีจะช่วยเต็มที่ (Soithurum, 2010, p. 145)

*Ton yindi cha chuay tem thi*

I am glad to help as much as possible. (goal)

From these examples, it is clear that ‘cha’ does not merely mark future tense; rather, it occurs in diverse syntactic environments and yields a range of meanings. Importantly, future time reference in Thai does not always require ‘cha’, since it can be expressed through temporal markers and context. This makes it difficult to analyze ‘cha’ solely as a future auxiliary as in Phraya Upakit Silapasan (1956) and Thonglor (2011). Therefore, this paper follows Panthumetha (2007) and Soithurum (2010) and analyzes ‘cha’ as an irrealis marker referring to situations not yet realized at the time of utterance.

### A contrastive analysis of Korean ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ and Thai ‘cha’

First, in terms of similarities, ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and ‘cha’ share the ability to refer to future events. This can be confirmed by the examples presented in the previous sections.

1. 한번 지원해 보겠습니다. (Ko & Koo, 2020, p. 425)

*Hanbeon jiwonhae bogetsseumnida.*

“I will go ahead and apply (and see how it goes).”

2. 오늘 점심에 뭐 먹을 거야? (National Institute of the Korean Language, 2021, p. 772)

*Oneul jeomsime mweo meogeul geoya?*

“What are you going to eat for lunch today?”

3. เขาจะไปทำงาน (Soithurum, 2010, p. 141)

*Khao cha pai tham ngan*

‘He will go to work.’ (‘cha’ expressing futurity)

These examples show that, despite syntactic differences, all three forms can be used to denote events that occur after the speech time.

Next, the differences among ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and ‘cha’ are as follows. In the semantic domain of conjecture, as discussed before, ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ differ in terms of whether the inference is grounded in subjective or objective evidence.

1. 제 생각에는 이게 좋겠어요. (National Institute of Korean Language)

*Je saengkakeneun ike jokesseoyo.*

‘I think this might be good.’ (‘-get-’; subjective conjecture)

2. 전에 먹어 봤는데 음식이 맛있을 거예요. (National Institute of Korean Language)

*Jeone meogeo bwanneunde eumsiki masisseul geoyeyo*

‘Since I had tried it before, it will probably be delicious.’ (‘-(eu)l geot’; conjecture based on objective grounds)

The contrast between (1) and (2) indicates that the choice of ‘-get-’ versus ‘-(eu)l geot’ reflects whether the speaker’s conjecture is based primarily on subjective inference or on more objective evidence. However, in Thai, ‘cha’ alone does not systematically distinguish whether a conjecture is based on an immediate subjective impression or on evidence-based reasoning in the way Korean differentiates ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’.

รถชนขนาดนี้คงจะมีคนตายไม่น้อย (Soithurum, 2010, p. 139)

*Rot chon khanat-ni khong **cha** mi khon tai mai noi*

‘With a crash this severe, there are probably quite a few fatalities.’

In the above example, the speaker’s degree of certainty may vary depending on the modal marker preceding ‘cha’, but ‘cha’ alone does not make it clear whether the inference is “subjective” or “objective” in the same way as the Korean contrast between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’.

With respect to ‘intention/volition’, as mentioned previously, ‘-get-’ is used when the speaker expresses a stance in response to the addressee while considering the addressee’s request, advice, or expectations. In contrast, ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used to express the speaker’s own intention or plan independently of the addressee as shown below in Jo (2018, p. 85-86).

선생님: 수진 씨, 지각하면 안 돼요. 내일은 일찍 오세요.

*Seonsaengnim: Sujin ssi, jikakhamyeon an dwaewyo. Naeireun iljjik oseyo.*

Teacher: ‘Sujin, you cannot be late. Please come earlier tomorrow.’

1. 수진: 네, 내일은 일찍 오겠습니다.

*Sujin: Ne, naeireun iljjik **ogetsseumnida**.*

Sujin: ‘Yes, I will come early tomorrow.’ (‘-get-’; polite/addressee-oriented response)

2. 수진: 네, 내일은 일찍 올 겁니다.

*Sujin: Ne, naeireun iljjik **olgeomnida**.*

Sujin: ‘Yes, I am going to come early tomorrow.’ (‘-(eu)l geot’; addressee-independent; pragmatically less appropriate)

By contrast, when we examine the ‘future’ and ‘purpose’ uses of ‘cha’, there is no clear case in which the marker encodes intention relative to addressee involvement. Rather, ‘cha’ combines with the syntactic environment to express the subject’s intention in a relatively straightforward way.

1. เขาจะไปทำงาน (Soithurum, 2010, p. 141)  
*Khao cha pai tham ngan*  
 ‘He will go to work.’ (‘cha’ expressing futurity)

2. ฝรั่งเศสจะมาตั้งบริษัท (Soithurum, 2010, p. 143)  
*farang khao-ma cha tang borisat*  
 ‘Westerners are coming to establish a company.’ (‘cha’ expressing purpose)

As shown in the above examples, ‘cha’ functions in combination with its syntactic environment to express subject’s intention, without encoding the addressee-oriented component found in Korean ‘-get-’.

In conclusion, the shared property of ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and ‘cha’ is that all can refer to events that will occur in the future. However, the subjective versus objective basis for conjecture and the addressee-oriented volitional meaning attested in Korean ‘-get-’ (in contrast with ‘-(eu)l geot’) are not systematically marked by ‘cha’ itself. This contrast suggests that Thai learners of Korean may initially acquire the basic future meaning relatively easily due to L1 transfer but may experience persistent confusion between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ in the domains of ‘conjecture’ and ‘volition/intention’, leading to learner errors. The result of the contrastive analysis of all these three forms can be illustrated as the next table.

**Table 1** Contrastive analysis of ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and ‘cha’.

Category	-get-	-(eu)l geot	cha
Future reference	yes	yes	yes
Conjecture	Yes (subjective)	Yes (objective)	No (without other markers)
Addressee-oriented volition	yes	no	no

**Pedagogical Implications of ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ for Thai Learners of Korean**

In this study, the characteristics of the Korean forms ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, as well as the Thai form ‘cha’, were examined. By conducting a contrastive analysis, the study identified differences among these forms and attempted to predict errors that Thai learners are likely to make. In order to prevent such errors, previous studies and related research have proposed instructional approaches, as follows.

First, Sanguansin (2018) argued that there is a need to teach the functions of ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ in a more specific and detailed way. Because learners are prone to confusion and show a strong tendency to use ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ interchangeably, the study maintained that instruction should go beyond simply teaching the meaning characteristics of each form and should explicitly teach their differences. Although this study is significant as the first to examine Thai learners’

acquisition patterns of ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, it did not present concrete instructional methods for how to effectively teach the distinction between the two forms.

In addition, Jo (2018) proposed two instructional approaches by dividing the forms into conjectural ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, and volitional ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’. For teaching conjectural ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, Jo (2018) argued that it is necessary to emphasize that ‘-get-’ is used to make an inference based on what one is currently observing, whereas ‘-(eu)l geot’ is used to make an inference based on one’s reasoning. In the case of volitional ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, Jo (2018) argued that instruction should compare ‘-get-’ which is used with consideration of the relationship with the addressee, and ‘-(eu)l geot’, which expresses the speaker’s intention regardless of the addressee. Jo (2018) further suggested that it is necessary to teach that, when the subject is third person, these forms cannot be used with a volitional meaning. Jo (2018) also suggested that to make the learners succeed in acquiring the differences between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, after teaching both ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ separately in the beginner level, these two should be taught again in the form of comparison in the intermediate level.

Han (2009) stated that example sentences should illustrate a grammar item’s meaning and discourse functions as clearly as possible. Otherwise, learners may not distinguish it from similar forms or use it appropriately. Han (2009) also noted that visual aids such as pictures or charts can help clarify meaning. Similarly, Park and Choi (2022, p. 258) emphasized that learners’ development requires both focused attention to the target form and meaningful practice that enables learners to use it in real-life situations. Accordingly, after providing clear example sentences, instruction should be followed by meaningful practice of the target forms. In addition, Ellis (2020) noted that consciousness-raising tasks can be used as post-task activities to help learners focus on recurring errors that emerged during the main task. In such activities, the instructor can present several learner responses containing the same error and ask students to identify and correct it, and to explain why the original form is inappropriate. Therefore, the instructional design in this paper combines (1) contextualized presentation of meanings and discourse functions, (2) meaningful practice, and (3) post-task consciousness-raising activities to help Thai learners make more accurate form-meaning choices between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’.

The pedagogical implications for Thai learners are as follows. This, as mentioned in Jo (2018), aims to boost the understanding of both forms in intermediate Thai learners who learned both forms already in the beginner level. First, learners should be provided with contexts that are easy to understand, because the difference between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ becomes most clearly visible in authentic, realistic discourse contexts. Next, grammar exercises and extensive activities can be provided to help internalize each form. The instructional guides are as follows:

### Instructional Guide for ‘-get-’ (Conjecture)

When teaching conjectural ‘-get-’, it is effective to present a short dialogue together with a situational prompt (e.g., a picture). For example:

#### *Situation 1 (Picture: Speaker B is looking at Speaker A’s injury)*

가: 어제 학교 앞에서 넘어졌어요.

*Ga: Eoje Hakkyo appeseo neomeojeosseoyo.*

A: “Yesterday, I fell down in front of the school.”

나: 아이고, 정말 아프겠어요.

*Na: Aigo, jeongmal apeugetsseoyo.*

B: “Oh no...then that must hurt.”

#### *Situation 2 (Picture: A and B are talking; A’s stomach is growling.)*

가: 오늘 너무 바빠서 아직 밥을 못 먹었어요.

*(Ga: Oneul neomu bappaseo ajik bapeul mot meogeosseoyo.)*

A: “I still haven’t eaten today because I was very busy.”

나: 그럼 배가 고프겠네요.

*(Na: Geureom baega gopeugetneyo.)*

B: “Then you must be hungry.”

At this point, the instructor can explain that conjectural ‘-get-’ is used when the speaker makes an inference based on their immediate, subjective judgment, even though it may appear similar to Thai “คงจะ” (khong cha) and “น่าจะ” (na cha) to boost the understanding of ‘-get-’s subjective conjecture. Here, the instructor might also emphasize that ‘-get-’ is not always translated to ‘cha’.

### Instructional Guide for ‘-(eu)l geot’ (Conjecture)

When teaching conjectural ‘-(eu)l geot’, dialogues and pictures can likewise be used.

#### *Situation 1 (Picture: A looks worried about Younghee; B reassures A.)*

가: 영희 씨가 아파서 입원했는데 괜찮을까요?

*(Ga: Yeonghui ssiga apaseo ibwonhaetneunde gwaenchanheulkkayo?)*

A: “Younghee is hospitalized because she’s sick. Will she be okay?”

나: 좋은 병원에 입원했으니까 괜찮을 거예요.

*(Na: Joeun byeongwone ibwonhaesseunikka gwaenchanheul geoyeyo.)*

B: “She’s in a good hospital, so she’ll probably be fine.”

**Situation 2** (Picture: A points to the word “audio” in a book; B suggests using a computer/website)

가: 이 책의 녹음 파일은 어디에서 다운받을 수 있어요?

(Ga: I chaegui nogeum pail-eun eodieseo daunbadeul su isseoyo?)

A: “Where can I download the audio files for this book?”

나: 웹사이트에 한번 들어가 보세요. 거기에서 다운받을 수 있을 거예요.

(Na: Websaiteue hanbeon deureoga boseyo. Geogieseo daunbadeul su isseul geoyeyo.)

B: “Try going to the website. You’ll probably be able to download them there.”

Here the instructor can clarify that ‘-(eu)l geot’ in the above examples is used for conjecture grounded in more objective evidence or reasoning (e.g. a generally reliable basis such as “it’s a good hospital”, “files are usually on the publisher’s website”). In addition, the instructor might also emphasize that ‘-(eu)l geot’ is not always translated to ‘cha’ but can be conjectural.

After explicitly explaining conjectural ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, the instructor can conclude again that the first one is based on the speaker’s perspective while the latter is grounded in more objective evidence.

### Instructional Guide for ‘-get-’ (Volition)

For volitional ‘-get-’, contexts should again be provided.

**Situation 1** (Picture: a teacher looks stern; a student apologizing)

가: 앞으로 수업에 늦지 마세요.

(Ga: Apeuro sueobe neujji maseyo.)

A: “Don’t be late again for class from now on.”

나: 죄송합니다, 선생님. 앞으로 늦지 않겠습니다.

(Na: Joesonghamnida, seonsaengnim. Apeuro neujji angetseumnida.)

B: “I’m sorry. I won’t be late again.”

**Situation 2** (Picture: a doctor and a patient; a “no smoking” sign.)

가: 건강을 위해서 담배를 끊으셔야 합니다.

(Ga: Geongangeul wihaeseo dambaereul kkeuneusyeoya hamnida.)

A: “You need to quit smoking for your health.”

나: 네, 알겠습니다. 담배를 끊겠습니다.

(Na: Ne, algetseumnida. Dambaereul kkeungetseumnida.)

B: “Yes, I understand. I will quit smoking.”

After presenting these, the instructor can explain that volitional ‘-get-’ can correspond to Thai ‘cha’ to some extent, but importantly, it is often used in contexts where the speaker’s commitment is expressed with attention to the addressee and the relationship/politeness context.

### Instructional Guide for ‘-(eu)l geot’ (Volition)

Volitional ‘-(eu)l geot’ can be introduced with examples such as:

**Situation 1** (Picture: Two people in a restaurant looking at a menu.)

가: 뭐 먹을 거예요?

(Ga: Mweo meogeul geoyeyo?)

A: “What are you going to eat?”

나: 김치찌개를 먹을 거예요.

(Na: Gimchijjigaereul meogeul geoyeyo.)

B: “I’m going to have Kimchi stew.”

**Situation 2** (Picture: A man saying he will quit smoking and start exercising. His friend reacts positively.)

가: 이제부터 담배를 끊고 운동을 시작할 거예요.

(Ga: Ijebuteo dambaereul kkeunko undongeul sijakhal geoyeyo.)

A: “From now on, I’m going to quit smoking and start exercising.”

나: 그게 좋은 생각이네요.

(Na: Geuge joeun saenggagineyo.)

B: “That’s a good idea.”

Here, the instructor can explain that volitional ‘-(eu)l geot’ can also correspond to ‘cha’ to a certain extent, but unlike volitional ‘-get-’, it typically does not inherently encode addressee-oriented politeness. Learners should also be told that in contexts where deference to the addressee is required, using ‘-(eu)l geot’ may be pragmatically less appropriate than ‘-get-’.

Next, after presenting the dialogues and contexts, it is advisable to provide meaningful exercises that allow learners to practice and differentiate these forms. As mentioned previously, since Thai learners are likely to struggle distinguishing ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ in terms of the contexts each form is used, one of the practices which can be useful is the situational practice<sup>5</sup>. Example activities are as follows.

### Exercise for conjectural ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’

‘-겠-’ 과 ‘-(으)ㄴ 것’ 중에서 골라서 문장을 적절하게 완성하십시오.

Choose between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ then complete the sentences in each situation appropriately.

<sup>5</sup> Situational practice is a type of meaningful grammar practice which requires learners to produce appropriate sentences in accordance with the situation presented by the instructor. After presenting a certain situation orally or through visual materials such as pictures, cartoons, photographs or videos, learners are asked to produce appropriate sentences using the target grammar (Han, 2009, p. 388). Through such practice, Thai learners may have a clearer picture of when to use ‘-get-’ or ‘-(eu)l geot’.

**Situation A**

유진: 이 식당이 맛있을까요? 새로 생겨서 잘 모르겠네요.

(Yujin: I sikdangi masisseulkkayo? Saero saenggyeoseo jal moreugetneyo.)

Yujin: “Do you think this restaurant will be good? It just opened so I’m not sure.”

진아: 주인이 유명한 셰프이기 때문에 당연히 \_\_\_\_\_.

(맛있다)

(Jina: Juin-i yumyeonghan syepu-igi ttaemune dangyeonhi \_\_\_\_\_.

(masitda))

Jina: “Since the owner is a famous chef, it definitely

\_\_\_\_\_. (to be delicious)

Answer Key: 맛있을 거예요. (-(으)ㄴ 것)

(Answer Key : Masisseul geoyeyo.)

**Situation B**

민수: 어젯밤에 두 시간밖에 못 잤어요.

(Minsu: Eoje bame du siganbakke mot jasseoyo.)

Minsu: “I only slept 2 hours last night.”

수현: 정말이에요? 그럼 많이 \_\_\_\_\_. (피곤하다)

(Suhyeon: Jeongmarieyo? Geureom mani \_\_\_\_\_.

(pigonhada))

Suhyeon: “Really? Then you \_\_\_\_\_.” (be tired)

Answer Key: 피곤하겠어요 / 피곤하겠네요. (-겠-)

(Answer Key : Pignonhagetseoyo / pignonhagetneyo.)

**Exercise for volitional ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’**

‘-겠-’ 과 ‘-(으)ㄴ 것’ 중에서 골라서 문장을 적절하게 완성하십시오.

Choose between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ then complete the sentences in each situation appropriately

**Situation A**

상사: 민수 씨, 숫자를 또 잘못 썼네요. 몇 번을 말해야 기억할 거예요?

(Sangsa: Minsu ssi, sutjareul tto jalmot sseotneyo. Myeot beoneul malhaeya gieokhal geoyeyo?)

Boss: “Minsoo, you’ve written the wrong number again. How many times do I have to tell you so that you will remember?”

민수: 죄송합니다. \_\_\_\_\_. (신경을 더 쓰다)

(Minsu: Joesonghamnida. \_\_\_\_\_ . (singyeong-eul deo sseuda))

Answer Key: 신경을 더 쓰겠습니다. (-겠-)

(Answer Key: Singyeong-eul deo sseugetseumnida.)

### Situation B

민수: 수업 끝나고 뭐 \_\_\_\_\_ ? (하다)

(Minsu: Sueop kkeutnago mwo \_\_\_\_\_ ? (hada))

Minsu: “After class, what \_\_\_\_\_ ?” (to do)

유진: \_\_\_\_\_ . (친구를 만나다)

(Yujin: \_\_\_\_\_ . (chingureul mannada))

Answer Key: 할 거예요?, 친구를 만날 거예요. (-(-으)ㄴ 것)

(Answer Key : Hal geoyeyo? Chingureul mannal geoyeyo.)

After the exercise, in case there are similar errors among the learners' answers, consciousness raising activity can be done as follows to boost accuracy. First, the instructor collects the answers from learners then extracts several representative errors (e.g., overuse of ‘-(eu)l geot’ in addressee-oriented situation or overuse of ‘-get-’ for fact-based prediction). Next, the instructor assigns an error-identification group task. Here, the instructor presents a mix of contextually appropriate and inappropriate sentences and asks learners to decide whether each sentence is appropriate. Learners then explain why the sentence is appropriate or inappropriate and suggest a correction when necessary. Finally, the instructor provides feedback on learners' explanations and summarizes the relevant form-meaning-context distinctions.

### Conclusion

This paper aimed to anticipate difficulties Thai learners of Korean may face in learning and using ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ and provide concrete teaching guidelines to address such problems. To do so, it conducted a contrastive analysis of these Korean forms and Thai ‘cha’. The result shows that ‘-get-’, ‘-(eu)l geot’ and ‘cha’ can all refer to future events, which may help Thai learners acquire the basic future meaning relatively easily through L1 transfer. However, Thai ‘cha’ does not explicitly mark the same differences found between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’, especially the difference between subjective vs. objective conjecture and the addressee orientation in volitional use of ‘-get-’. As a result, Thai learners may treat ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ as interchangeable and produce sentences that are pragmatically less natural.

The comparison also points to a broader issue: in Korean, future-related expressions are closely tied to stance and interactional context, not just time reference. Thai ‘cha’, in contrast, is more general and its precise meaning often depends on other markers or syntactical environments as stated

in Soithurum (2010). This helps explain why learners may understand the basic future meaning but still struggle with choosing between ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ in conjecture and volition context.

Based on the contrastive analysis, this paper proposed instructional guidelines for ‘-get-’ and ‘-(eu)l geot’ that focus on clear contextual explanation, situational practice, and post-task consciousness-raising activities. While this study provides both a contrastive description and concrete instructional suggestions, the effectiveness of these methods have not yet been tested. Future research should apply them in real classroom and evaluate their impact through classroom-based and experimental studies.

## References

- Ahn, J. Y. (2009). *태국어에서 시제와 상의 표현: 현재 시제를 중심으로* [Expression of tense and aspect in Thai: Focusing on the present tense] (pp. 65-71). In Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of Korea. Seoul, South Korea.  
<https://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE02272940>
- Boonchoo, J. (2014). *A Comparative study of tense expressions in Korean and Thai* (Doctoral dissertations). Daejeon, South Korea: Chungnam University.  
<https://m.riss.kr/link?id=T13566721>
- Ellis, R. (2020). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Han, S. K. (2009). Teaching grammar in Korean language education. *Grammar Education, 10*, 369–395. [https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/landing/article.kci?arti\\_id=ART001356086](https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/landing/article.kci?arti_id=ART001356086)
- Jo, M. K. (2018). A study on teaching modal expressions “-겠-” and “-(으)ㄹ 것이다” in teaching Korean. *The Education of Korean Language and Culture, 12*(1), 78–99.  
<https://db.koreascholar.com/Article/Detail/352160>
- Kaewchuay, S., & Kobsirithiwara, P. (2017). *The situation in Korean language teaching in Thai secondary schools: Problems and solutions*. In Proceedings of the Academic Seminar on Guidelines for Developing Korean Language Teaching at Secondary and Higher Education Levels 2017 (pp. 185–200). Chon Buri, Thailand: Burapha University.
- Kesmanee, C. (2013). *Aspects of use of Korean past-tense adnominal endings by Thai learners based on the proficiency* (Master’s thesis). Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University.  
<https://m.riss.kr/link?id=T13080148>
- Ko, Y. K., & Koo, B. K. (2020). *개정판 우리말 문법론* [Revised edition: Korean grammar]. Jipmoondang.
- Korean Education Center in Thailand. (n.d.). *태국 한국어 교육 현황* [Current status of Korean language education in Thailand]. Retrieved from <https://kecthai.kr/sub/korea-edu/1-1.php>
- Lim, D. H. (2001). The diachronic perspective on the meanings of Korean prefinal ending “-gess-”. *Journal of Korean Linguistics, 37*, 115–147.  
<https://kiss.kstudy.com/Detail/Ar?key=1746392>

- National Institute of Korean Language. (2021). *Korean grammar for foreigners 2: Usage*. Seoul, South Korea: CommunicationBooks.
- National Institute of Korean Language. (n.d.). -ㄹ. Retrieved from <https://kcenter.korean.go.kr/kcenter/search/dgrammar/view.do?id=741>
- Panthumetha, N. (2007). *Thai grammar*. Bangkok, Thailand: Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University.
- Park, S. J., & Choi, B. S. (2022). Instructional design of Korean grammar education centered on FonF and TBLT. *Korean Journal of General Education*, 16(1), 255–268. <https://m.riss.kr/link?id=A108059380>
- Patee, I. (2014). *A study of the acquisition of Korean tense morphemes of Thai learners* (Master's thesis). Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University. <https://m.riss.kr/link?id=T13522324>
- Phraya Upakit Silapasan. (1956). *Thai grammar: Wachiwiphak*. Bangkok, Thailand: Thai Watana Panich.
- Sanguansin, S. (2018). *A study on the acquisition of '-gess-' and '-(eu)l geosi' of Thai learners of Korean* (Master's thesis). Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University. [https://www.riss.kr/search/detail/DetailView.do?p\\_mat\\_type=be54d9b8bc7cdb09&control\\_no=87a03ebef4ec280effe0bdc3ef48d419&keyword=sanguansin](https://www.riss.kr/search/detail/DetailView.do?p_mat_type=be54d9b8bc7cdb09&control_no=87a03ebef4ec280effe0bdc3ef48d419&keyword=sanguansin)
- Soithurum, A. (2010). *The polyfunctionality of ca? in Thai* (Doctoral dissertations). Bangkok, Thailand: Chulalongkorn University.
- Thonglor, K. (2011). *The Grammar of Thai Language*. Bangkok, Thailand: Ruamsarn.
- Yu, H. K., Han, J.Y., Kim, H. B., Lee, J. T., Kim, S. K., Kang, H. H., Koo, B. K., Lee, B. G., Hwang, H. S., Lee, J. H. (2023). *한국어 표준 문법* [Standard Korean Grammar]. Seoul, South Korea: Jipmoondang.