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ABSTRACT

This study examined the attitudes of South Korean teachers of English in Jeollanamdo toward Konglish, particularly in relation to English education. The literature search shows that Konglish is a typical local variety, evolved from the borrowing and redefining of English words that became part of everyday South Korean speech. Konglish is not unique in this regard. Japlish in Japan and Chinglish in China developed for similar reasons and display the distinctive characteristics of those languages. However, Konglish is usually defined as poor and incorrect.

Teachers in the study expressed embarrassment, shyness, guilt, and anger about Konglish. On the other hand, they also valued it as something uniquely theirs. Teachers believed that students should not be taught that Konglish is bad English. However, students should be taught that it is poor or incorrect. With few exceptions, they correct Konglish in their classes.

Teachers exhibited considerable inner conflict. They defined Konglish as valid when used in Korea with Koreans. However, some preferred that their students not use it, even with their friends. This may cause students to judge Konglish as unacceptable or inferior.

The teachers believed that students should learn to distinguish between Konglish and “Standard English,” and that they should learn about the contexts in which each is appropriate or preferred. The conclusion, therefore, is that South Korean teachers see the value of teaching about varieties of English. The recommendations are that intelligibility, broader communication skills, and information about International English be included in the curriculum in South Korea.
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CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

This is a descriptive study of the attitudes of South Korean teachers of English toward Konglish, a part of everyday Korean speech. As an English teacher in South Korea, I observed what looked like embarrassment or self-consciousness about Konglish on the part of most of the teachers and students with whom I worked.

I examined two related issues. The main focus was the attitudes of South Korean teachers of English toward Konglish. In addition, I surveyed the teachers' references to Konglish in English language classrooms, what they taught their students about it, and whether they allowed or used it in their classes.

There are both academic and personal reasons for choosing this area of inquiry. A student notebook that I purchased in South Korea has these words on the cover: “In music each man find his soul revealed to him, and enabled to assume a cast of feeling in obedience to the changeful sound.” The notebook is part of a collection of Konglish sayings on products that I bought while I was working in South Korea as a native speaker teacher. It is a collection that I enjoy but which sometimes rests uneasily on my conscience. The Konglish sayings are delightful. They make me smile. Sometimes they make me laugh. But I am, and I believe I should be, embarrassed by some of my laughter.

In my Master of Education course work, I was fortunate to have taken a course in sociolinguistics. It explored language varieties and attitudes toward those varieties of English that are significantly different from the standard varieties of North American and British English. As I felt myself confronting a variety of English in South Korea that I sometimes could not understand, and tried to put my reactions to it in the context of my role as an English teacher, I had conflicting feelings. My sociolinguistics text was coming
to life in a personal way. The first chapter opens with the following quote: "So if you really want to hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity – I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself" (McGroarty, 1996, p. 3). If I laugh at a t-shirt that declares boldly "Behave in a giddy way," I am not just laughing at the language on the t-shirt. The South Koreans who produce and buy these products may justifiably feel that I am laughing at them.

My research, therefore, is the result of a nudged conscience and an intellectual inquisitiveness to understand what was happening in one small corner of the world where I was a well-meaning, enthusiastic, but largely unprepared, native speaker English teacher. I say unprepared because I did not know that I would encounter Konglish. I did not know what to make of it. Neither did I know whether, as a teacher, I should correct it, or as a student of linguistics, I should accept and enjoy it.

Konglish is an integral part of the everyday speech of South Koreans. However, when Konglish was referred to or spoken in my presence, there was often laughter and what appeared to be a sense of self-consciousness or embarrassment. I wanted to try to understand what this behaviour was about, to understand how the teachers with whom I worked felt about Konglish, and what they told their students.

Background to the Problem

Li (1998) notes that Korean students "usually have a small English vocabulary and a limited command of English structures" (p. 690). My students' ability to use English was generally very low. Some used a few words and short phrases or sentences memorized from the text in order to try to communicate in English. An even smaller
number attempted to create sentences or speak spontaneously, but other than saying
"Hello. How are you?" most students only spoke English when required to in the class. They seemed to know that they should not use Konglish, and if it was referred to, they laughed or joked about it.

Similarly, in the Teachers' Workshops that I ran, designed to develop better communication skills, teachers avoided Konglish variations. If Konglish was talked about, there was a lot of laughter, which seemed embarrassed or defensive. Professor Jeong-ryul Kim of Korea National University of Education states categorically "this proves the prescribed nature of Konglish being characterized as a bad English" (personal communication, September 14, 2004).

My question was whether this apparent avoidance of Konglish when with native speakers, and a tendency to joke about it, were behaviours that accompanied self-consciousness or embarrassment about Konglish. Norrish (1997) notes "recognition of Local Varieties comes mainly from local scholars in linguistic and literary fields, with public opinion lagging well behind" (section 2.2). Was the avoidance of Konglish in the classroom, a variety of English with which students are familiar, a detriment to the students? Were they thereby acquiring negative attitudes? Was the use of Konglish as a bridge to learning "Standard English" vocabulary being neglected because of negative beliefs about it? Was a fear of using Konglish hampering the efforts of students to speak English? South Korean students need encouragement to go beyond rote learning and speak spontaneously. Li's (1998) study finds both "a lack of motivation for communicative competence" and "a resistance to class participation" (pp. 690-691) in South Korean English language classrooms. By examining general attitudes toward
Konglish, it may be possible to determine if these attitudes contribute to the reluctance of both teachers and students to actually speak and use English extemporaneously for fear of using Konglish.

**Purpose of the Study**

My purpose was to try to understand the attitudes of South Korean English teachers toward Konglish. If negative attitudes are found, this could suggest a need for positive ways to talk about Konglish to students, possibly fostering a greater understanding of and respect for it. The results could also support the addition of information about varieties of English and World Englishes to the English language curriculum in South Korea. I also anticipate that this work might produce some secondary information that could be used to plan more effective orientation for native speakers who will be teaching English in South Korea.

**Questions to be Answered**

Two main questions were addressed. First, what is the attitude of South Korean teachers of English toward Konglish? Second, how is Konglish referred to and addressed in classrooms? If so, under what circumstances and how is it used?

**Theoretical Framework**

Sociolinguistic theory notes that languages evolve and change through use in speech communities. It sees all language varieties as equally valid. However, a lack of acceptance of varieties by both mother-tongue speakers and those who speak these varieties suggest an examination of attitudes could be valuable. Attitudes involve beliefs, emotions, and behavioural tendencies and these are the focus of this study.
Rationale for the Study

All students in South Korea are required to learn English. A perceived “Standard English” is the target language. A North American accent is preferred. However, the variety of English that South Korean students encounter in their day-to-day lives is Konglish, which is found extensively in English language newspapers, and in radio and television advertising and programming (Kent, 1999, section on Konglish).

Foreign native speakers of English are viewed as experts, even though many are not trained teachers, much less teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language. This seems to be a reflection of the assumption that people who grow up speaking English are experts in their language and, therefore, the best people to teach it, at least with regards to conversation and pronunciation. South Korean English teachers may have strong feelings of inadequacy (McKay, 2002, p. 113) and defer to the opinions of foreigners, discounting their own expertise as teachers.

According to McGroarty (1996, p. 4), attitudes can have a marked effect on students, affecting their success in learning English. Attitudes can be powerful, yet because they are often unconscious, may go unchallenged. I want, therefore, to identify what the attitudes of South Korean English teachers are toward Konglish. If they do experience embarrassment or self-consciousness, is there an impact on the students, as implied by McGroarty? How do the teachers refer to or use Konglish in their classes? If the references to Konglish are negative, this work may support the inclusion of information about Konglish in classrooms, and its use as a building block for learning standard classroom English.
Definition of Terms

Some of the terminology used in this research is explained here in order to clarify the content and intent of the study.

**Attitudes:** According to McGroarty (1996), “attitude has cognitive, affective, and conative components (i.e., it involves beliefs, emotional reactions, and behavioural tendencies related to the object of the attitude)” (p. 5). Attitudes can, therefore, influence choices and behaviours either consciously or unconsciously.

**World Englishes:** Brutt-Griffler (2002) defines World Englishes as varieties of English used by non-mother-tongue speakers who have made English their own. They are “stripped of any simplistic association with Anglo-American and Western culture” (pp. vii-viii) and are actually created by the users themselves. Using this definition, Konglish could be considered one of these varieties.

**Konglish:** Robertson (2002) defines Konglish as “Korean English spoken with Korean syntax.” It has, he claims, three main sources. The first is Black English spoken by Afro-American soldiers during the Korean War (1950-1953). The second is the Korean language itself, which “often has one word that would take the English a phrase to describe.” The third is “a combination of the two languages,” Korean and English (Introduction). According to Kent (1999), Konglish incorporates English as well as other European languages in five major ways: direct loan words, hybrid terms, truncated terminology, through substitution, and by the creation of pseudo loan words. A lengthier discussion of Konglish with examples is presented in the Review of the Literature.

**"Standard English"** : There is no consensus among linguists or language experts on what constitutes “Standard English” (Bex & Watts, 1999, p. 6). Bex and Watts conclude that it
is a concept that is ideological in nature (p. 13). Although “Standard English” has an assumed reality, a single entity that is English at its most correct, no one actually speaks it (Milroy, 1999, pp. 26-27). There is not even any consensus on how to represent the term in print, that is Standard English or standard English. Bex and Watts (1999) chose to retain the two upper case letters but include inverted commas to indicate that for many linguists

“‘Standard English’ is a social myth constructed for ideological purposes” (p. 89). The term will be represented as “Standard English” in this work for the same reason. A fuller discussion of “Standard English” is presented in the Review of the Literature. The term Standard American British English (SABE) is familiar to South Korean English teachers and is used here.

_Dialects and Varieties_: Dialects and varieties are “types of English that are identified with residents of particular places” (Kachru & Nelson, 1996, pp. 72-73). Differences in pronunciation, lexical choice or usage, and variations in grammar commonly identify dialects. The term dialect often carries connotations of substandardness. Because of this, sociolinguists prefer to use the more neutral term _variety_.

_Second Language Acquisition (SLA)_: Second Language Acquisition is the process by which learners acquire a second language. SLA research is a large field that focuses almost exclusively on individual learners. However, Brutt-Griffler (2002) extended SLA theory to a second type of language acquisition that looks at groups or speech communities. “This paradigmatic refocusing from the linguistic individual to the linguistic social allows for the examination of second language acquisition processes that
take place at the speech community level and that have ultimately produced new English varieties” (p. x).

**Code-switching**: According to Sridhar (1996), code-switching is a phenomenon whereby speakers in a community where two or more languages exist switch between those languages. Code-switching “is not random but functionally motivated” (p. 58). It is used for stylistic or situational reasons, such as accommodating the addition of a new person to a conversation.

**Code-mixing**: Code-mixing happens when speakers change languages within a single sentence. This is also not random. Sridhar (1996) states that it involves a “sophisticated linguistic competence” (p. 58). He also points out that it “presupposes the ability to integrate grammatical units from two different language systems into a more complex linguistic structure” (p. 58).

**Borrowing, borrowed words, or loan words**: Borrowing, borrowed words, and loan words are terms used for the assimilation of words from another language into the mother-tongue. Borrowing is distinguished from code-switching and code-mixing in that it requires no knowledge of the second language (Sridhar, 1996, p. 58). Kent identifies some categories of borrowed words or loan words in Konglish. Direct loans retain their original meaning. Hybrid terms combine both languages, for example *bang-ul* tomato, which in English is a cherry tomato and in Konglish means bell (for its shape) tomato. Pseudo loan words are “ideologically restructured terms possessing semantically modified meanings, such as hunting used to mean picking up men or women” (section on Konglish).
Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to South Korean teachers of English in the province of Jeollanamdo in South Korea, since this is the province in which I worked.

The linguistic competence of individual teachers varies widely and may have had a limiting effect on the study by discouraging some teachers from taking part in the study. This was particularly true of the interview portion of the study, in which participants were audiotaped.

Teachers who had attended one or more Teachers' Workshops, which I presented, were invited to take part. This allowed an opportunity to explain the nature of the research, the voluntary aspect of participation, and confidentiality. There is a disproportional representation of teachers working in Yeongam Gun (Yeongam County) since this is where I conducted weekly Teachers' Workshops. However, approximately 85% of the participants work in the remainder of the province and attended residential Intensive Teacher Training at the Education Training Centre in Damyang, Jeollanamdo, where I also taught. Another possible limiting factor, therefore, is the sample size: 67 teachers volunteered to complete the survey and 7 teachers participated in an interview.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature begins with a description and short discussion of Konglish. It then summarizes some of the research on how languages spread and change in order to understand how a variety such as Konglish might have developed. This is followed by a discussion of “Standard English,” what is considered standard as English changes, and some of the debate around what is considered error. It then looks at attitudes toward varieties of English, with an emphasis on Konglish. It discusses briefly English Language Teaching (ELT) pedagogy with particular attention to the challenges for Asian, and specifically South Korean, teachers and learners of English. Lastly, it presents evidence for the role of attitudes in language teaching.

Description of Konglish

Robertson (2002) describes Konglish as Korean English spoken with Korean syntax. “It can,” he says, “express complex Korean words, meanings or interactions in but a single English word, the meaning of which may not be readily apparent to a native English speaking person” (Introduction). Kent (1999) claims that many borrowed or loan words may be a “source of confusion for the native speaker of English because [the words] take on a form of their own, which may mask the original source code of the term” (section on Konglish). Robertson counters, conceding that while “Konglish words can cause misunderstanding and confusion,” they are usually “no more confusing than some British English is to American English” (section on Konglish). Robertson notes that little research exists on Konglish. “Koreans,” he states, “believe, wrongly, that Konglish is bad English and insitu western educators with little understanding of the subject agree that it is bad English” (section on Konglish).
Loan words are an important part of Konglish. Ahn (2003) says that Koreans use the term Konglish “to indicate the word ... is a Korean invention using English words” and that these words are not code-switching but are borrowed and listed in Korean dictionaries (section on Konglish and Code-Switching). Loan words may have been assimilated in a number of ways. In fact, over half of the loan words used by South Koreans are Chinese. English is the next most common language from which words are borrowed. A resto-hop (also written resto-hof), for example, is a bar that sells beer, alcohol, and full meals. Resto is a truncated use of the word restaurant.

Shortening, truncating, combining, and extending English terms are common in Konglish. For example, pon-ting is a blind date on the telephone, pon coming from phone and ting coming from meeting. A meeting in Konglish often refers to a blind date. Loan words are blended with other loan words to coin new terms or pseudo loan words (Kent, 1999, section on Konglish). For example, skinship uses ship the way it is used in friendship and skin is added as a direct loan word. Robertson (2002) defines skinship as “hugging, patting or bodily touching such as in family relationships” (section on Konglish).

Kent (1999) states that Konglish is used largely in the print media, radio, and in television advertisements and programming. Newspapers make regular use of Konglish terms in news stories, which according to Kent “ensure[s] its continued entrenchment and use within the culture and vernacular” (section on Konglish). Its use by the media, he says, reinforces “the supposed correctness of Konglish in the spoken vernacular” (section on Konglish). Kent’s use of the terms “supposed correctness” and “entrenchment” seems to reflect a negative bias toward Konglish, implying that it is in some way substandard. In fact, Robertson (2002) finds that Kent “shows clear lack of understanding pertaining to
Language Spread and Change

According to Brutt-Griffler (2002), two processes have led to English becoming a world language: language spread and language change. World English, she says, is a phase in the history of English. Her work "provides an historical and linguistic justification for first, second, and foreign language users of English to claim their rightful place in the creations of the multicultural identity of English" (p. ix). In other words, all users of English, whether as a first, second, or foreign language, have a justifiable impact on the language, creating changes both within and beyond the borders of their countries. It is Brutt-Griffler's belief that learners of English have a right not only to make the language their own but also to affect the way English is used internationally (p. ix).

McKay (2002) describes Kachru's picture of the spread of English using three concentric circles, based on the roles that English plays in those countries. The Inner Circle constitutes countries where English is spoken as the first or dominant language. These include the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. In Outer Circle countries, such as India and Singapore, English "has a long history of institutionalized functions and standing and has important roles in areas such as education and government" (pp. 7-8). Expanding Circle countries are those in which English is taught as a foreign language, such as Japan, South Korea, and China (McKay, 2002, pp. 6-8). "The circles model," according to Kachru, "is valid in the senses of earlier
historical and political contexts, the dynamic diachronic advance of English around the world, and the functions and standards to which its users relate" (pp. 7-8).

Speaker migration took English from the inner to the outer circle countries, where it became the language of the social elite. However, as the local people began to learn and use English in addition to their mother tongue, its spread was no longer a geographic process, but a linguistic one. Acquisition of English took place within whole speech communities as “individuals mutually influence[d] one another” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. 22). This process produced varieties of English that were influenced by the local mother tongues, such as Singlish in Singapore and Chinglish in China. These new varieties were significantly different from English as it was spoken in inner circle countries, giving rise to debates on standards, what defines good English, and what constitutes a valid variety.

The evidence that languages change is everywhere, particularly in the written word. Shakespeare is universally accepted and classified as great literature. Those who have studied Shakespeare, a standard part of the English literature curriculum throughout inner circle countries, encounter forms of words that have now become obsolete, such as an est ending on verbs to form thinkest, goest, and so forth. Mother-tongue speakers of English accept the eventual dropping of this est ending as natural. However, when changes are a result of use by those who have acquired English as a second or foreign language, they become much more controversial and have difficulty finding acceptance.

The traditional focus of linguistic research into Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has centered on individual learners. Theories of language change describe deviations from “Standard English” by learners in outer and expanding circle countries as either interference of the first language or imperfect learning, in other words, error.
Imperfect learning happens when a large number of learners acquire a language with little input from *Inner Circle* users. These learners develop and pass deviations on to each other. The resulting form of the language is then judged to be imperfect and therefore substandard. “The fundamental problem with this conception is that it denies language change. All change is deviation and can therefore be described as error” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. 129).

Deviations occur with *Inner Circle* speakers as well. Some are due to a lapse of time. Words and grammatical constructions fall into disuse, causing difficulties in comprehension for modern readers. Similarly, speaker migration causes a lack of geographical proximity to the country of origin, resulting in changes in terminology and accents. For example, accent and lexis in Canada, Australia, and the USA became, over time, significantly different from the British English of the emigrants to those countries. These changes often create communication difficulties between people from these areas.

What, then, is considered an acceptable change in the language and what is considered error? “Modern linguistics works from the assumption that change initiated by a native (or mother-tongue) speaker is not error. Theories of SLA, on the other hand, begin from the opposite premise, change introduced into the language by L2 learners constitutes error” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. 129). In other words, the changes introduced by mother-tongue speakers are considered to be natural and eventually become legitimate, accepted forms in the language. However, change that results from use of a language by non-mother-tongue speakers is usually considered to be substandard or wrong. Brutt-Griffler argues that errors should not be differentiated based on source. According to her theory, a change resulting from different usage over time in an *Inner Circle* country, and a
change due to geographical distance and lack of interaction from *Inner Circle* country speakers are both deviation. For example, we would no longer say, as Romeo does, "I am afeard, being in night, this is all but a dream," (Shakespeare, Act II, Scene II, p. 175). We would say, "I'm afraid I dreamt the whole thing." The present day form of the Shakespearean language is clearly acceptable. However, when a South Korean student notebook reads, "It reminds me a broad smile of you" for "It makes me smile," many would consider it substandard English if not error outright. Brutt-Griffler would argue that if deviation is error, then all deviation must be considered error, not just deviations produced by second language learners.

While learner error may apply to individuals acquiring second languages, Brutt-Griffler (2002) goes on to state:

Language is the linguistic expression of the speech community that speaks it. It is thereby contradictory to claim that a speech community can speak its own language in error.... They are not distinguished from some other norm-establishing group (a second speech community) as 'nonstandard'. (p. 129)

Thus, it would be valid to say that South Korean students learning a standard form of English are in error when they drop the plural "s" in English class. However, the same students speaking Konglish with their friends are using South Korean rules of grammar and pronunciation and the dropped "s" is not error in that context.

Mufwene (2001) defines language change as "language evolution" in the same sense that biology uses the term evolution to indicate change as opposed to advancement. "Evolution has no goal, certainly not to repair any putative deficiencies in a language" (p. 11). He sees linguistic change as inadvertent, a consequence of "imperfect replication in
the interactions of individual speakers as they adapt their communicative strategies to one another or to new needs” (p. 11). He is not referring to imperfect learning, but rather to imperfect replication, “the mutual accommodations that speakers make to each other.” Evolution of language takes place because “[speakers’] non-identical creative innovations set in motion constant competition-and-selection processes that bring about changes of all kinds.” (p. 12). These changes evolve both with native and nonnative speakers. Language becomes “restructured” by continual “deviations from an earlier stage” (p. 12).

Standards and Standard English

As English is used more and more by bilingual speakers, new words, grammatical structures, and pronunciation develop. The questions of what is standard, what is meant by standard, and who makes these decisions are critical (McKay, 2002, p. 49). Some linguists argue for the imposition and maintenance of a specific standard. Bex and Watts (1999) summarize this view as one in which “there are certain forms which are correct because they best express the meanings intended…Deviation from the ‘correct’ usage leads to imprecision” (p. 7).

Creating a history of standardization “makes it possible to think of the standard language as a legitimate off-spring of noble ancestors, and by implication non-standard vernaculars become illegitimate” (Bex & Watts, 1999, p. 28). Bex and Watts maintain, “the history of the English language contains the ideological biases of its compilers, one of which was that a Standard English has always existed” (pp. 13-14). Thus, while the history of the English language refers often to “Standard English,” there is in fact “no general consensus” as to what it is (p. 6). Milroy (1999) describes standard languages as idealizations rather than realities. Standardization, he says, inhibits language change and
variation. While standard languages are “promoted through written forms...no one actually speaks a standard language” (pp. 26-27).

Kachru and Nelson (1996) see the imposition of standards and the resistance to varieties as a losing battle. “One can defend to the death the notion of ‘one model and one standard’ (or two, perhaps three) for all would-be English users, but that will not stop the wide world from using English for conversing, bargaining, studying and trading” (p. 95). Nor does Kachru, in some of his other research, find that it is a battle that should be waged. McKay (2002), in summarizing Kachru’s stance, states that “allowing for a variety of norms would not lead to a lack of intelligibility among varieties of English; rather what would emerge from this situation would be an educated variety that would be intelligible across the others” (p. 51). For Kachru, native speakers of English “have lost the exclusive prerogative to control its standardization” (cited in McKay, 2002, p. 51). Norrish (1997), in discussing local varieties, finds it “entirely natural that English used in environments different from those in which it grew up, so to speak, should mutate to suit its new environments” (section 2.1).

**Attitudes toward Varieties of English**

Kachru and Nelson (1996) note that attitudes toward variation in language depend on who creates the variation. “Standard British and American users on the whole are expected to be rather tolerant of each others’ English but are likely to be intolerant of the usage of South Asians, Southwest Asians, West Africans, or East Africans” (p 81). Lick and Alsagoff (1998) note that “varieties used by people of lower class and status are tagged as *nonstandard*, sometimes derogatorily as *substandard*, synonymous with words
such as *bad, corrupt, and offensive*” (p. 282). They conclude, “such a standard-non-standard division is basically a reflection of social inequality” (p. 282).

McKay (2002) discusses Lick and Alsagoff’s work on Singlish. It points to some of the conflicting attitudes toward language varieties both from without and within the countries that speak them. They contend that Singlish is linguistically equal to any other variety of English. Speakers of Singlish conform to a grammar in that the words “in any other order would not be considered grammatical by speakers of Singlish” (pp. 54-55). Despite the opinion of linguists as to its validity, however, the use of Singlish on Singaporean television led to an outcry by Singaporeans. Opponents did not want their children to speak what they called “bad English” (p. 55).

This contradictory stance regarding Singlish is further exemplified inside and outside the classroom. McKay goes on to point out that despite the fear of children learning bad English, Singlish is used by all classes “to signal social identity and rapport” (p. 55). Classism only becomes an issue when the local variety is the only one available to certain groups. In the marketplace, Singlish can signal, “I belong here. I am one of you.” However, if the speaker does not have the option of switching to a more standard or international variety, Singlish can set the speaker apart as less educated or less successful. McKay points out the complexity of the issue. “For some the local variety represents a means for speakers to take ownership of the language and thus express their identity, for others the indigenized variety represents a corruption or sub-standard use” (p. 56).

One cannot draw a direct parallel between Singlish and Konglish. Singapore is an outer circle country where English is an official second language. South Korea, while mandating English for study, does not use it as an official language. English in South
Korea is a foreign language and is not used internally to run government affairs or conduct business. However, it is possible that this study will point to similarities in that Konglish operates, as Singlish does, to create a sense of identity and belonging for its speakers.

A mother-tongue speaker of English who first encounters Konglish hears what seems to be an awkward use of English with random errors. However, as with Singlish, the mother-tongue listener is often hearing Korean grammar superimposed on English. Two examples of this, according to Ahn (2003), are in the use of articles and plurals. Dropping articles and interchanging singulants and plurals are “a result of applying Korean grammar rules” (Ahn, 2003, section 9). If the whole speech community consistently expresses itself in English by dropping articles or interchanging singulants and plurals according to Korean rules of grammar, Brutt-Griffler’s (2002) theory would say that it cannot be considered error. If a “language is the linguistic expression of the speech community that speaks it, it is thereby contradictory to claim that a speech community can speak its own language in error” (p. 129).

However, whether that variety is accepted, or what status it is given, both within South Korea and without, is a matter that cannot be settled by linguistic argument alone. The problem for speakers of local varieties is one of “sounding too local on the one hand, and too ex-patriate on the other” (Norrish, 1997, section 2.2). Norrish also notes that “English commonly co-occurs with indigenous languages” through code-mixing and code-switching but that this is “frequently viewed as ‘sub-standard’ language behaviour and teachers seldom feel at ease with this phenomenon in their classrooms” (section 1).

In conversations with South Korean English teachers, it was not unusual for Konglish expressions to be used in conversation and then be corrected or explained in
In conversations with South Korean English teachers, it was not unusual for Konglish expressions to be used in conversation and then be corrected or explained in some way. While this sometimes appeared to indicate self-consciousness on the part of the South Korean speaker, it may also have been indicating that the speaker was able to distinguish between and use either Konglish or "Standard English." This would be consistent with some of the work on Singlish cited earlier showing that the ability to switch varieties can be a marker of a more educated or successful person. The questionnaire looked at attitudes toward South Koreans who are able to speak a standard variety of English and may yield data that is parallel to the work on Singlish.

There are many references in the literature to negative attitudes toward varieties. Mufwene (2001) states that, "the naming practice of new Englishes has to do more with the racial identity of those who speak them than with how these varieties developed and the extent of their structural deviation" (p. 108). He continues, "the legitimate offspring are roughly those varieties spoken typically by descendents of Europeans around the world, whereas the illegitimate ones are those spoken primarily by populations that have not fully descended from Europeans." This would seem to reinforce Brutt-Griffler's (2002) notion that change introduced by mother-tongue speakers is not error while change introduced by non-mother-tongue speakers is frequently perceived to be error (p. 129).

If, in fact, inner circle mother-tongue speakers of English have negative attitudes about varieties, such as Konglish, and if even linguists cannot decide on what is error and what is legitimate variation, then it is not surprising that South Koreans would have conflicting attitudes toward their own local variety.
Attitudes toward Konglish

Bex and Watts (1999) make an interesting distinction between the general public and linguists in their attitudes toward language standards. While experts have felt some duty to "promote public tolerance of variation in language" and to point out that it is wrong to discriminate against individuals on linguistic grounds, the public can "have strong attitudes toward language use" (p. 19). The literature search resulted in little information about attitudes of South Koreans toward Konglish and it is hoped that this study will help to fill this gap. However, attitudes of foreigners in South Korea who are mother-tongue speakers of English can be traced through comments and public debates in Letters to the Editor of English language newspapers in South Korea and on the Internet. Rebuttals in these debates also sometimes provide insight into the feelings of speakers of varieties in the Far East. Five examples of the strong public debate on the use of Konglish are cited here in order to help readers understand some of the influences that could affect attitudes of South Koreans toward Konglish.

Example 1

David Cohen, in the Education section of the Guardian on April 27, 2001, refers to a commentary in the Korean Herald, an English language daily. The Herald, he says, describes Konglish as "the hybrid of jazzy Korean and messy English that, like heavy traffic, is an unpleasant but tolerable side of life" in South Korea. Cohen agrees with the definition but finds Konglish "not quite so tolerable." He goes on to describe the "bedazzling new multi-billion dollar airport in Seoul, where as many as 49 signs were subsequently discovered to have fallen prey to writers of Konglish." The objection to signage in an airport, which could arguably be a location where a more standard,
international variety of English would be useful, is a discussion for another paper.

However, Cohen's repetition of the term "messy English," his opinion that it is not tolerable, and his use of the phrase "fallen prey to writers of Konglish" lend a distinctly negative overtone about Konglish to his opinions.

Example 2

The following is cited verbatim as posted on emptybottle.org.

The forces of Konglish are strong, and they're winning...The entire last page of today's Korea Herald has a huge, colour advertisement from KT, Korea Telecom, one of the largest companies in the country. This is the ad copy, in its entirety:

'A new light of hope goes in search of you. Meet the glaring future lead by KT.

It's KT! It's future!'

The writer goes on to say that:

'I have no problem with people mangling the language, making mistakes. That's fine. Everyone who learns a new language does it. But how in the name of the dangling purple testicles of Lucifer does a full page ad in a nationally distributed newspaper (edit: it's an English language paper) with language like this get published? Does no one check these things? Ever?" (Posted by stavrosthewonderchicken on January 21, 2002, 09:46 PM)

Aside from the writer's objection to the way English is used in the advertisement, the manner in which the opinion is expressed is clearly negative in its attitude.
Example 3

A South Korean writer, Hyun (2002), responds to the emptybottle.org site, defending the Korea Telecom ad. She draws a parallel between Konglish and some American vernaculars. “Well ask yourself. ‘How do half of the lyric in any Kpop, Rap or Hip Hop song, get onto paper and into a recording studio?’” (Posted by Hyun, June 22, 2002, 09:50 PM). Her response reinforces the notion that nonstandard use of English language introduced by American mother-tongue speakers, such as in rap lyrics, are generally perceived as more acceptable and legitimized than nonstandard uses introduced by a South Korean advertising copy writer.

Example 4

A Letter to the Editor of the Korean Herald on June 21, 2001 was responding to an attack by a native speaker on the South Korean public during the World Cup Soccer matches in Seoul in 2001. The writer had objected to the slogan “Be the Reds,” claiming that this inept use of English undermined national soccer pride. (The Reds refers to the South Korean Soccer team, the Red Devils. South Koreans often refer to them simply as “The Reds.” The slogan “Be the Reds,” which appears on t-shirts and promotional items, while grammatically ambiguous to mother-tongue speakers of English, is clearly an enthusiastic appeal for support.) The response is of particular interest because the writer is from Singapore and has experienced similar conflicts over the use of English in his own country. He calls the letter a “scathing attack on the use of grammatically incorrect
English.” He then defends Konglish and draws parallels between it and Singlish, his own vernacular. An attempt by the government of Singapore to suppress Singlish was quashed when, “a more enlightened government [has] realized the cultural value of a language derivative that is homegrown and gives its people a sense of shared identity.” The writer compares “Be the Reds” to expressions he learned in the USA, such as “Yo, wassup?” and “That is way cool,” expressions that he says the writer would probably accept, despite their lack of grammatical correctness (Korean Herald, June 25, 2001).

These debates in letters to the editor reflect the first hand experience of non-mother-tongue speakers of English. They find that their innovations in English usage are often looked down on by native speakers and usually labeled as error. Conversely, innovations introduced by native speakers are generally tolerated and eventually accepted within their culture, sometimes becoming mainstream usage.

Example 5

An entire website, http://htmlplanet.com/konglish.htm, is devoted to lists of Konglish words compiled by a native speaker, and contributed to by at least two native speaker university professors. The author of the site states that the list was created “in order to elucidate the problems that some so-called ‘Konglish’ words might cause in ESL/EFL” (section called Legal Mumbo Jumbo). The site lists Konglish words under one of four perceived errors: “Verbicide” (words that “kill or change the meaning of a word”); “Phonicide” (words that are pronounced incorrectly); “Fabrication” (words that “do not exist in the English language”); and, “Abbreviation” (words that have been truncated or
shortened). Finally, the compilers included a list, entitled “O.K. Konglish.” Few Konglish words made this list and even these are described as only "partially correct."

The language used to describe the lists is intolerant of any use of English that does not directly reflect the narrow experience of the compilers. The “Verbicide List,” for example, has three columns headed “Real English Word,” “Verbicide Korean Definition,” and “Real English Definition.” To illustrate, “hit” appears under “Real English Word.” Under “Verbicide Korean Definition,” a hit is “a popular product.” Under “Real English Definition,” the only correct use of “hit” is as “a popular song.” In other words, according to this site it is correct, or “Standard English,” to refer to a song as a hit, but it is incorrect, or verbicide, to refer to a popular product as a hit. In contrast, The New Oxford Dictionary of English (1998) uses entertainment (“a hit comedy”) and people (“he was an immediate hit”), as well as music as examples of hits, a far broader range of definitions than the site uses. It is difficult to conceive why the author would find it incorrect, or “verbicide,” to refer to a product as a hit.

What is disturbing about a site such as this is an assumed authority on the part of the contributors about their use of English. The items in the lists reflect an astounding narrowness in understanding what could be considered correct or “Standard English” and an intolerance of the right of second language users of English to create their own expressions.

These examples point to a certain amount of arrogance on the part of native English speakers toward Konglish. They support the notion put forward by many linguists that variation introduced by a native speaker is usually accepted but variation introduced by non-native speakers is usually rejected.
The issue here is not whether the advertisements, signs, and slogans referred to in the above examples contain grammatical structures and word use that do not conform to what we think of as "Standard English." The issue here is the lack of awareness of these particular native speakers about what "Standard English" is and is not, and about the legitimacy of varieties.

Also at issue is the implied incompetence of the South Koreans who wrote the ads and invented the slogans. In fact, without inquiring of the writers, there is no way of knowing whether they know a more standard or international variety or whether they chose to write in a way that they know will attract their intended readers. Newspapers and advertising are directed to the general public. If, in fact, their goal is to write in a manner that reflects the speech of their readers, then how can they, as Brutt-Griffler (2002) states, "speak their own language in error" (p. 129)? Surely it is the prerogative of the editors of the newspapers and the producers of advertising copy to decide how they will use language.

In her work on multilingual discourse in advertising, Piller (2003) states that there is "evidence of strong and increasing influence of English in advertising in Korea" (p. 175). "English," she says, "has largely become a nonnational language and has been appropriated by advertisers in non-English-speaking countries to index a social stereotype." That is, the English used by advertisers is not seen as belonging to mother-tongue countries. Nor is there a need or a desire to adhere to any kind of inner circle standard. Advertisers, Piller says, "have created their own modes of and standards for using English" (pp. 175-176). In fact, this phenomenon is worldwide and is reflected in the use of many languages to create images that will attract buyers. English advertisers
use French, German, and Italian, for example, to enhance brands. *L’Eggs* hosiery uses the English word *egg* with the French article *le* to coin a new word that implies French quality. Piller appropriates Hills’ term “mock language” to describe these invented foreign words (p. 173). While “the forms used are often ludicrously incorrect to a speaker of these languages,” they serve to associate products with qualities, such as reliability, status, and confidence (pp. 172-173). Taken in the context of advertising discourse throughout the world, the Korea Telecom ad that incited the criticism of stavrosthewonderchicken can legitimately be seen as an example of English acting as, in Piller’s words, a “non-national language” in the advertising world.

**English Language Education in South Korea**

In examining the literature on Konglish, Kent’s (1999) research was the only work that addressed Konglish in English classrooms. In examining the literature on English Language Teaching (ELT), there were no references to Konglish. Konglish does, according to Kent, however, constitute a written vernacular (Kent, section on Konglish), and a significant amount of Konglish lexis is used in the Korean language. This section, therefore, tries to set the context into which the results of the questionnaire and the interviews will be placed by looking at three important areas: English education in present-day South Korea, ELT theory, and attitudes in the classroom.

The 6\textsuperscript{th} Curriculum of the South Korean Education System curriculum ran from 1992 to 2000 and was revised in 1995 to include English language education, which had been mandated for some time for Middle and High School students, at the Grade 3 elementary school level. The 7\textsuperscript{th} national curriculum was introduced in 2000. Its “stated
purpose is to employ Communicative Language Teaching methodology” (Ahn, 2003, section 3).

It is important to include information on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in this work in order to examine the expectations it places on teachers and whether these expectations could cause or contribute to negative attitudes toward the use of Konglish in English language classrooms.

Celce-Murcia (1991) outlines the major characteristics of a communicative approach. Its first goal is to teach learners to communicate in the target language. Students should work in pairs or groups to exchange information and negotiate meaning. Materials should be authentic. Content should be about real-life situations. The role of the teacher is to facilitate communication and “only secondarily to correct errors,” and for this reason, the teacher “should be able to use the target language fluently and appropriately” (p. 8).

There have been many difficulties introducing CLT to South Korean classrooms. According to Li (1998), the requirement to “engage the students in meaningful and authentic language use rather than in the merely mechanical practice of language patterns” (p. 679) is a challenge for South Korean teachers. Her study shows a significant lack of training in using CLT for teachers and few opportunities to retrain (p. 688). The following outlines some of the obstacles to successful implementation.

Both Li (1998) and H. S. Kim (2003) cite the low proficiency of teachers as an important limitation in successfully implementing a CLT methodology. All 18 participants in Li’s study felt that, while they were proficient in grammar, reading, and writing, they were deficient in speaking English. As one participant said, “Since I can’t
speak English well, how can I teach it to my students?” (p. 686). Six of H. S. Kim’s (2003) ten participants also rated their proficiency in speaking too low to be able to assess their students’ communicative competence (Section 4.4.3).

Both Li (1998) and H. S. Kim (2003) also cite low proficiency in their students as a barrier to using CLT. Li’s study finds that Korean students tend to have a very small vocabulary, a limited number of English language structures, little motivation for learning to communicate in English, and resistance to class participation. These factors make the implementation of CLT difficult (pp. 690-691). Proficiency in speaking was so low in H. S. Kim’s study that teachers reported that they “announce[d] questions and tasks in advance for the students to prepare for answers” (Section 4.4.2). In other words, in order to succeed in communication tests, students were given the questions and correct answers to memorize, effectively undoing the goal of encouraging learners to be spontaneous.

Another issue related to low proficiency was students’ reluctance to participate in class. In traditional Korean classrooms, students “sit motionless, take notes while the teacher lectures, and speak only when they are spoken to” (Li, 1998, p. 691). This has traditionally been the role of students in the classroom. It is not surprising that with teachers and students both facing familiar roles which challenge the cultural norm, that the “grammar-centered, text-centered, teacher-centered method” (Kim, 2003, Section 1.1) is still common. H. S. Kim notes “teachers need to have assistance and encouragement in trying new ways of communicative assessment” (Section 5.2). Ahn (2003) also comments that rote memory still predominates in South Korean English classrooms, despite the stated criteria of Communicative Language Teaching (Section 3).
J.R. Kim (personal communication, September 14, 2004) paints a more optimistic picture of South Korean English teachers’ ability to use CLT, especially where it includes controlled and guided practices as a part of skill getting exercises. However, a lack of confidence regarding fluency and a fear of making errors in front of students were concerns expressed by many of the teachers with whom I worked.

The relevance of the literature on the difficulties surrounding CLT to this study is whether, in addition to the cultural factors cited above, attitudes also play a role. Rote memory allows for almost no leeway or discussion about alternative ways to express an idea. Success as a teacher or a learner is measured by tests and exams based on discrete points of grammar for which there is only one correct answer. While I observed students expressing a strong sense of pride about correctness, I did not see pride expressed about fluency or attempts to use language spontaneously. The reverse also tended to be true, that is, that those who did try to communicate made repeated comments about how poor their English was. Since correctness is very important, the reluctance to speak, and the sense of shame could be exaggerated by a fear of using Konglish. Therefore, I tried to determine feelings and beliefs of South Korean teachers of English about the use of Konglish, both in and outside classrooms, in order to understand whether these attitudes could be affecting students in any way.

Brutt-Griffler (2002) applies the term English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to countries "with an established national language where English is considered to play a role only in external communication" (p. 9). Using this definition, English language teaching in South Korea is EFL rather than English as a Second language (ESL). This is documented by Ahn (2003), who states that the subject of her study is unlikely to contact
English other than on the Internet and at the movies. In Korea, she says, “once the student leaves the classroom, the contact with the L2 ceases” (Section 2).

Confucian philosophy still influences South Korean classrooms. Confucian concepts of hierarchy mean that teachers are accorded “legitimated authority” and students “usually follow their teachers’ instructions without any criticism” (Lee, 2001, section on problems of paternalism and favoritism in Korean higher education). However, this traditionally accorded respect is eroded if the teacher is shown as incompetent in any way. In Li’s (1998) study, one teacher reports, “In Korea, when you can’t answer all of the students’ questions right away, you can’t be a teacher” (p. 687). Another says, “Some of the questions I could answer and some of them I could not. That made me very much embarrassed…In our culture, teachers are supposed to know everything and be always correct” (p. 687). Again, since this need to be correct is connected directly to a mastery of standard textbook English, do teachers then consider Konglish substandard, or do they feel the need to teach students that it is substandard. Teachers who do not feel confident in their own fluency with English may be more likely to play it safe and stick to the rules of the standard textbook English, contributing to a view that the standard is correct and that local Konglish variations are incorrect.

The Confucian value in saving face also contributes to the need to be correct and the tendency to believe in a single best or correct way to use English. Correct answers to questions are very important to both students and teachers. This often translates into the face-saving smile, which Ahn (2003) states “in Korea may be used to mask embarrassment or unwillingness to give a negative answer” (Section 10). Again, this need to be correct may lead to an unwillingness to risk incorrect answers in English language
classrooms, may extend itself to an unwillingness to use Konglish, and may contribute to a belief that Konglish is incorrect. The embarrassment that is being masked by the smile applies both to students who do not want to appear stupid and to teachers who do not want to lose respect. McGroarty (1996) states that "Teachers need to recognize a wide variety of language behaviours... and must realize that their own and their students' preexisting attitudes toward language skills and literacy abilities will affect students participation" (p. 33). However, if South Korean teachers of English have difficulty in accepting their own local variety or view it in some way substandard, they may be unconsciously inhibiting the participation of their students. They may be overlooking the potential for Konglish to be used as a bridge in learning a more standard or international variety of English. They may also be losing an opportunity to teach their students about the wide variations in the use of English and the growth of international varieties.

The Role of Attitudes in English Language Teaching

While there was scant information on attitudes toward Konglish variations in the literature, McKay (2002) discusses attitudes toward varieties of English exhibited in other parts of Asia. In South East Asia, for example, Filipinos felt that their local variations should be included in an Asian English dictionary, possibly indicating a sense of the legitimacy of their local variety. People from Thailand were more reluctant to legitimize their variations in this way. McKay concludes, "in general, the more English is used on a daily basis in a multilingual context, the more likely individuals in that country are to accept lexical innovation" (p. 62). South Korea is essentially monolingual and English is used infrequently. McKay's conclusion would then lead us to expect a low level of acceptance for Konglish lexis.
While the present study only examined attitudes of South Korean teachers, not native speakers, comments on hegemony and linguistic imperialism are included to give a fuller picture of the climate in expanding circle countries, particularly South Korea. South Korea does not stand alone as a country with a variety of English that is initially awkward for native speakers to comprehend, nor are Koreans alone in their apparent struggle to own their own variety and not be ridiculed for it. *Outer Circle and Expanding Circle* countries have all experienced pressures to conform to a perceived inner circle standard and have had their local varieties looked down on as substandard. The theory of linguistic imperialism, looks at “the ideology transmitted with, in, and through the English language” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 1). According to Phillipson, “English language hegemony can be understood as referring to the explicit and implicit values, purposes, and activities which characterize the ELT profession” (p. 73). Brutt-Griffler (2002) states that inner circle countries have attempted to “dictate the terms on which that world language [English] exists and spreads” (p. 183). Inner circle countries, she claims, have exerted some control both “in the way English is taught” and “in the teaching of a particular variety” (p. 183). If this is indeed true, it is possible that these attitudes, imposed by the inner circle, serve to intimidate speakers of other varieties, particularly teachers, who take pride in their profession.

While I did not ask the teachers about their experiences with the attitudes of native speakers, nor did I survey native speakers themselves, I anticipated that comments in the interviews might provide secondary evidence of their attitudes. Foreigners are hired because they are presumed to know their own language. They undoubtedly do. However, given the comments cited earlier from newspapers and Internet sites, some foreigners
appear unaware of World Englishes, the validity of different varieties of English, and the broad spectrum of opinion on what constitutes "Standard English." They seem to have accepted the assumptions of some people in their host countries that they are indeed experts on their own language and proceed to comment on areas beyond the scope of their expertise. Thus, with the best intentions, they may be inadvertently transferring some of the hegemonic attitudes and values to which Phillipson refers. Thus they may also be unwitting contributors to negative attitudes on the part of some South Korean teachers of English toward their own variety and toward their own ability to use English.

Sridhar (1996) makes some observations about second language teaching that are useful here. While written to apply to an ESL context, it seems valid to also apply these observations to native speakers teaching EFL overseas. Teachers, he says, must recognize that English is being added, not replacing a mother tongue. "It is both unnecessary and unrealistic to expect complete and nativelike competence" (pp. 63-64). In addition, he says that teachers need to recognize that code-mixing and switching are natural phenomena and fully acceptable. While the first impression for a native speaker may be that code-mixing and code-switching represent a poor and incomplete grasp of English, they in fact represent a sophisticated and complex ability to integrate two languages. A similar case can be made for respect for borrowed and loan words in that they help South Koreans to express ideas from their first language using English terminology. Thus, there is no need to apply derogatory terms such as verbicide and phonicide to Konglish lexis.

McGroarty (1996) asks the question "How can teachers carry out their charge while respecting the language varieties that students bring to school and using existing language skills to build new ones?" (p. 3). This question needs to be applied both to the
South Korean teachers of English and to the native English speakers who also work in South Korean classrooms.

Indeed, I would ask, "How can teachers and students feel free to bring their own variety to school when it is scorned by foreigners in the press and laughed at by native speakers?"
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This was a descriptive study using a questionnaire and audiotaped interviews to collect data. The interviews were designed to gain a deeper understanding of the attitudes and beliefs about Konglish studied in the questionnaire. The main research steps consisted of: (a) recruitment of participants, (b) administration of a questionnaire, (c) audiotaping of interviews, (d) data analysis of the results of the questionnaire, (e) data analysis of the interview transcripts, (f) a comparison of the two sets of data, (g) clarification of the limitations of the study preparatory to interpretation of the data, and (g) interpretation of the data.

Given that the literature indicates conflicting attitudes toward varieties of English that differ in marked ways from "Standard English," both within and beyond the borders of the country in which the variety originates, a strong trend for a particular attitude was not anticipated. That is, it was expected that there would be opposing views about, for example, whether Konglish is poor English, or whether it should be allowed or used in English language classrooms. The purpose was not to establish a uniformity of opinion, but rather to define the spectrum of thoughts, feelings, and beliefs of the participants, and to try to understand these in the context of teaching English in South Korea.

Recruitment of Participants

Once the Brock University Research Ethics Board had approved the research with human participants, recruitment of participants began (see Appendix A). They were recruited through weekly Teachers' Workshops and Residential Teacher Training run by the Jeollanamdo Language Program. While the weekly and residential workshops are considered mandatory, for a variety of reasons, many teachers do not attend. Attendance
was, therefore, considered an indicator of the motivation of individual teachers to develop and improve language skills, resulting in an ability to understand and accurately respond to a questionnaire in English that was adequate to yield reliable results.

Teachers were told about the study during a class in one of the two programs mentioned above. Using a recruitment information flyer so that teachers would be able to read as well as listen, the purpose of the study was explained, the number and type of questions were discussed, and teachers were given an opportunity to ask questions. After this presentation, teachers could fill out the bottom portion of the flyer indicating their willingness to take part in either the questionnaire alone or the questionnaire and the interview, consenting to be contacted once the questionnaire was ready.

The questionnaire had 25 statements (see Appendix B). The first 11 statements dealt specifically with attitudes toward Konglish. The remaining 12 statements sought information about if and how Konglish should be addressed in English language. Participants indicated agreement or disagreement with a statement through a choice of four answers: 1- agree very much; 2 - agree somewhat; 3 – disagree somewhat; 4 – disagree very much. Demographic information was also collected. Participants were asked to indicate their gender and their age range. However, because of the size of the study (67 participants), it was felt that this was not a large enough sample to produce statistically significant data and the information was not used.

**The Questionnaire**

All teachers indicating a willingness to complete the questionnaire during the recruitment phase were contacted. The questionnaire, along with an information letter and Informed Consent Form was presented to the teachers at their workshops. Both the letter
and Informed Consent Form were presented orally as well as in writing and teachers wishing to take part signed the form and stayed to complete the questionnaire. At all times in the presentation of information, teachers were assured that participation was voluntary, that they had nothing to gain or to lose by taking part, and that all data would be held in strictest confidence. They were also informed that they could decline to answer any part of the questionnaire and could ask for clarification if they wished. A total of 67 questionnaires were returned.

The Interviews

In all, nine teachers volunteered to be interviewed resulting in seven taped interviews. One potential interview was eliminated due to time and geographical constraints, and one tape was lost on the return trip to Canada. Interviews were scheduled at the schools at which the teachers work. The purpose of the interviews was reviewed at the beginning of the meeting with each participant. Each was then given a copy of the questions to look over before the taping commenced (see Appendix C). Interviews lasted from 50 to 75 minutes. I transcribed all tapes verbatim.

Analysis of the Data

Simple percentages were calculated from the responses on the questionnaire. The questions were then grouped as follows:

Q 1-3 & 6 - Personal attitudes and feelings about Konglish;
Q 4-5 - Belief about Konglish as 'bad English';
Q 7-9 - Attitudes toward the use of Konglish in the media;
Q 10-11 - Attitudes about English;
Q 12-17 - Beliefs about what students should be taught about Konglish;
Q 18-20 - Beliefs about if and how Konglish should be discussed in classrooms;

Q 21-22 - Beliefs about how Konglish pronunciations should be handled in classrooms;

Q 23-25 - Beliefs about how Konglish lexis should be handled in classrooms.

Qualitative data collected through the seven audio taped interviews expanded on the information collected in the questionnaire. Only topics addressed in the questionnaire were included in the interview schedule (see Appendix C). However, if interview participants wanted to expand on these topics or bring up other issues that they felt were related, they were allowed to do so and all comments became part of the transcripts.

Since this was a descriptive study (i.e., it tried to describe the range of experiences of South Korean English teachers with respect to Konglish), statistical tools were not used. It was anticipated at the outset that there would be conflicting opinions, not only between individuals in the study, but possibly within individual study participants. Attitudes, feelings, and beliefs are individual. Reasons for holding them are equally individual. Therefore the study is meant to describe these as fully as possible. Percentages were used to give a sense of the weight of particular answers (i.e. whether a certain attitude seemed to be prevalent). However, it was the opportunity to describe these attitudes, to describe the experience of South Korean English teachers in relation to Konglish that was important.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

In this chapter, I present the results of the questionnaire and interviews. I started by analyzing the questionnaire data and then added data from the interviews to provide insight into the issues addressed in the questionnaire, that is, whether the interviews confirmed the results of the questionnaire and added any valuable information. I also looked for any contradictory or conflicting attitudes or opinions.

McGroarty (1996) identified three components of attitudes - beliefs, emotions, and behavioural tendencies (p. 5) - that provide analytic categories for the data analysis. I address teachers' beliefs about Konglish as a variety of English, their emotional reactions to Konglish, and their teaching practices related to Konglish.

Teachers' Definitions of Konglish

Teachers taking part in the interview portion of the research were asked how they would define Konglish. All respondents had to pause and think about it, indicating that they did not have a standard definition that they perceived to be universally accepted in South Korea. However, the general definition was consistent for all of them, in that they stated in some way that Konglish is a unique use of English by South Koreans that results in words that have different pronunciation and meanings from the original English. All definitions focused on the word level, rather than on grammar, one teacher stating explicitly that Konglish is "just the words, not the structure." Hand phone for cell phone, was a frequently used example of Konglish. It creates a new expression using two words that are not used together in the same way by native speakers. Konglish can also give new meaning to a common English word. For example, handle is used for steering wheel.
Truncating or shortening words is another characteristic of many Konglish words. An example was *apart-uh*, a shortening of *apartment*, to illustrate this phenomenon.

Pronunciation was mentioned by 5 of the 7 interviewees as a unique characteristic of Konglish. One focused on intonation and syllable stress as important parts of this distinct pronunciation. The example he used was *casino*. He pronounced it *kha-jzee-no* with no stressed syllable and used a *jz* sound for the *s*, a voiced palatal fricative *j*, according to J.R. Kim (personal communication, September 2004). A close equivalent of the sound is the *j* in French words such as *je*. Most native speakers stress the middle syllable whereas Korean pronunciation is generally unstressed. The lack of stress and the unique pronunciation of the *s*, caused comprehension problems for the interviewer and a typical negotiation for meaning took place to establish what the word was.

Another teacher addressed the extra vowel sound in Konglish pronunciation. She stated, "In our Korean language, we use a vowel accompanied by a consonant, so we use [an] extra vowel sound in the real world. So *network*, we pronounce *net-uh-work." The Korean system of writing is in blocks of syllables, each of which typically contains a vowel and a consonant. According to J.R. Kim (personal communication, September 2004), "CVC+V is resyllabified into CV-CV. Net+work [becomes] *ne-tuh-work* by inserting a least salient vowel in Korean." The result is that Koreans may experience difficulty in pronouncing consonants in English where there is no attached vowel, such as a *t* followed by a *w* in *network*.

Although opinions about the value of Konglish were not solicited at this point, all of the teachers added them as part of their definitions, giving the impression of wanting to defend Konglish and explain why it is useful. Five of them described it as easy or
meaningful for Koreans. “The purpose for a word is communication so language should be convenient and easy for conversation.” Three participants referred to the fact that native speakers of English can find Konglish confusing but defended it as useful for Koreans because “everybody understands what it means”. One teacher stated that sometimes there is “no exact Korean word, so we should use [Konglish]. It’s not English any more.” In other words, English words become incorporated into Korean lexis and the words now belong to the Korean language. There was a clear implication on the part of this teacher that, in this case, native speakers of English do not have a right to form judgments about how Konglish words are used. This opinion was also reflected by two of the other teachers, both of whom felt that native speakers should take some responsibility for understanding Konglish words.

Opinions of three teachers focused on what they perceived to be the incorrectness of Konglish, saying in effect that it is by definition incorrect English. For instance, they agreed that cell phone is correct and hand phone is incorrect, based solely on the fact that hand phone is a Korean invention. When asked how they decided if a word was correct or incorrect, all three said that it was correct if native speakers used it. As one teacher said, “I think if native speakers accept any words, then those words are acceptable for everyone.”

An unexpected occurrence in the interviews was the fact that six of the seven interviewees stated that they had problems distinguishing Konglish from “Standard English.” Even during the interview, two teachers were surprised that a word that they use routinely was unfamiliar to native speakers and did not appear in English dictionaries. One of these words was skinship, which describes an affectionate relationship, usually
between parent and child, that includes touching. Another was surprised to learn that native speakers do not use *apart-uh*, a truncation of the word *apartment* with a vowel sound added. The opposite also occurred. One teacher referred to *hand bag* as Konglish and was surprised to learn that North Americans also use *hand bag* for *purse*. She then became confused about whether it was Konglish and by definition incorrect, or whether it was, in fact, correct. Interviewees seemed to be embarrassed and laughed self-consciously while discussing their difficulty distinguishing between Konglish and “Standard English.” A typical comment was “sometimes, even though I am an English teacher, I don’t know which is Konglish and which is correct English.”

**Beliefs about Konglish as a Variety of English**

Questions 4 and 5 of the questionnaire attempted to find out if the teachers believed that Konglish variations are a poor, bad, or incorrect form of English. For brevity, only the word *bad* was used in the questionnaire. This was based on the report in McKay (2002) regarding Singaporeans’ fear that their children would learn “bad English” (p. 55) and on Robertson’s (2002) statement quoted in the Literature Review that “Koreans believe, wrongly, that Konglish is bad English” (section on Konglish). Since questions 14 to 17 also included their beliefs, that is, they asked what they believe students should be taught, these questions are tabulated here in order to give an overall picture of the teachers’ beliefs about Konglish. Responses to these six questions are tabulated in Table 1. The table shows that the majority of respondents did not think that Konglish was bad English. However, few thought that Konglish should be allowed in schools and most indicated that students should be taught that Konglish is incorrect.
Table 1

Percentage of Teachers Expressing Specific Beliefs about Konglish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konglish is bad English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konglish is not bad English. It is a local variety</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach that Konglish is incorrect</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konglish is bad English. Not allowed in school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konglish is not bad English. Not allowed in school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow in school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview participants were more evenly divided on the issue. Three saw Konglish as a valid variety. One teacher stated that “it is valid because language was and is developing” and Konglish allows Koreans to represent their thoughts by using English words in a new way. Another said that “Konglish is a new type of English.” She compared it with Singlish, saying that “people who make the new English do not know the proper and standard expression,” thus applying a limited repertoire to express themselves and creating a new and unique local usage. A third teacher stated that both Koreans and native speakers should accept Konglish. She felt that Konglish or Japlish (the Japanese variety) can actually influence and change “Standard English” and should be able to do so, that is, native speakers should accept these changes as valid.

Three other teachers, who stated strongly that Konglish is not a valid variety, expressed the opposite view. One called it a “poor form of language.” He went on to explain, saying that “Konglish comes from poor knowledge of English, so I think it is our responsibility to indicate that we are not using correct English.”

The final interview participant felt that Konglish was, in fact, not a variety of English but a variety of Korean. “We don’t really have a local version of English. It’s just English influence.” In other words, English has influenced Korean and the resulting Konglish lexis has been incorporated into the Korean language. “It’s Konglish when we say something in English but Korean way. It has developed from many people using it over a long time. But it is a variety of Korean, I think.”

Interestingly, no matter what they thought about the acceptability of Konglish as a valid variety of English, they all stated clearly and often that it is incorrect. On the one
hand, they defended the right for South Koreans to express themselves using English words, which they have changed in some way for their own use. However, they all stated that it is important to understand that Konglish is not correct and can therefore be incomprehensible on an international level. They emphasized that South Koreans who want to use English internationally need to know a correct or standard variety.

Beliefs about the Role of Konglish in the Media

Questions 7, 8, and 9 dealt with the attitudes of teachers toward the use of Konglish in the media and in print sources, such as advertising. A large majority (81%) agreed that Konglish should not be used in news broadcasting. This fell to just fewer than 70% for other kinds of radio and television programming. Participants appeared to feel most strongly about the use of Konglish when it appeared in print. The question gave a large range of print media, including newspapers, magazines, and advertising as examples. Eighty-seven percent of the questionnaire respondents felt that Konglish should be discouraged in print.

All of the teachers who were interviewed felt that, because news broadcasting can have a strong influence on people, it should use a standard variety of English. One stated, “when I hear Konglish in broadcasting, I feel anger...In the public broadcasting system, they should use the correct form.” They had similar attitudes toward newspapers. Again, the issue was the influence on people, and on setting and maintaining standards. As one teacher said, “If we use proper English, native speakers will get a good impression but if we use poor English, it can give them the wrong idea about Korea.” One teacher made allowance for the use of a Konglish word where no exact Korean word existed. If the only
word to adequately express an idea is a Konglish word, he felt that it should be used, stating the opinion that it would no longer be English but would be considered part of the Korean lexis. Another teacher felt that Konglish was acceptable in broadcasting and newspapers aimed at South Koreans. However, the English language newspapers in South Korea should not use Konglish because Koreans who read them often do so to practice or improve their English and want a paper that uses “Standard English” accurately.

Whereas the survey data only showed a drop of 11%, from 81% to 70% when distinguishing between news broadcasting versus all programs, teachers in the interview portion were able to speak to specific kinds of programming. All felt that Konglish in sitcoms was acceptable, although it can have a negative effect because children imitate it and are then confused. However, one teacher noted that this is where much new language develops and that children enjoy imitating it.

Interview participants indicated varying levels of tolerance for Konglish in print depending on the source. Of those who addressed the use of Konglish on clothing and products, there was a mixture of embarrassment and acceptance. For example, one teacher said, “we don’t read the Konglish on t-shirts and pencil cases. It’s just a kind of design. So I think it doesn’t matter.” However, later in the interview, thinking about the fact that native speakers see these products, he said, “Sometimes I feel ashamed. We should not use Konglish on t-shirts and products. Now we see many foreigners so manufacturers should be conscious of that.” This sense of inner conflict was a recurring theme in the interviews.
One teacher addressed the issue of Konglish in advertising by stating that “it is not the [advertisers’] job to use correct English, it is their job to sell products.” Another, however, said that Konglish in advertising made him angry because it is a form of public communication and should be correct.

Two participants based their opinion about the acceptability in these contexts on whether the purpose was communication. If language was being used for communication and the audience included native speakers, then correct or standard usage should be adhered to. If, however, communication was not the purpose, for example with consumer products, then Konglish was acceptable. Similarly, if the audience was South Korean, Konglish was also acceptable.

**Perceptions about Standard American British English**

In order to understand the attitudes of South Korean English teachers toward the ability to use English well, they were asked whether Koreans who speak grammatically correct Standard American British English (SABE) are more intelligent and whether they are more successful. Nearly 80% felt that Koreans who speak a standard variety of English well are more intelligent and nearly two thirds (64%) felt that they are also more successful. Interview participants had also completed the questionnaire and were not asked to expand on this. However, the ability to speak English well, particularly in an international context, and for their students to be able to do the same, were themes that permeated all of the discussions, and were clearly equated with success as teachers and with the potential success of their students.
Teachers' Emotional Reactions toward Konglish

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 6 of the questionnaire were designed to understand the personal feelings of South Korean English teachers about Konglish. In the first two questions, which distinguished between embarrassment in general versus embarrassment when speaking with native English speakers, percentages were nearly identical, with 65% reporting some level of embarrassment. There was an increase from 12% to 20% in the number who chose “agree very much,” indicating somewhat greater self-consciousness when with foreigners.

Question 3 was designed to provide a confirmation of the information by asking the same question in the negative, (i.e. “I am not at all embarrassed”). Four people declined to answer the question and 55 percent of respondents agreed with the statement. This is an increase of 20 percentage points from the first two statements where 35% stated that they were not embarrassed. However, the question itself may have caused problems. South Koreans answer negative questions differently than North Americans in that they say “yes” to agree with the negative, rather than “no” to emphasize the negative. For example, if plans were cancelled because of rain and someone asked, “aren’t we going to the game then?” most North Americans would say “no” to indicate that they are not going, but most Koreans would say “yes” as in “yes, we are not going to the game.” Perhaps it is telling that this question accounted for 30% of the missing responses for the entire survey. Since the first and second questions indicate some level of embarrassment, and since 6 of the 7 interview participants also indicated mild to marked embarrassment, the results of question 3 may be invalid and have been disregarded in the remainder of the analysis.
Question 6 was designed to compare personal feelings of embarrassment or self-consciousness, and feelings about how Konglish reflects on Koreans in general. Whereas two thirds of the respondents felt personally embarrassed, almost the same number (62%) disagreed that Konglish reflects badly on Koreans. The evidence from the interviews indicates that their perception of their role as English teachers affects their attitudes. In other words, while they accept the use of Konglish by Koreans in general, as English teachers, they felt that they should not use it themselves to the same extent.

Six of the seven teachers interviewed stated some level of uneasiness about Konglish. They used words such as uncomfortable, shy, embarrassed, ashamed, and guilty to express their feelings. One teacher said he was “always uncomfortable” and another “embarrassed a lot.” Five of the seven stated explicitly that this was exaggerated in the presence of native speakers. One also added, “the embarrassment goes once the native speaker understands what Konglish is.” Two teachers stated that if they use Konglish with a native speaker, they “feel guilty.” Another said that when she uses it with Koreans, the words “have been borrowed and Koreanized” and belong to Koreans. “That’s why we don’t feel guilty.” In other words, once the word was no longer seen as the property of native speakers and had been accepted in Korean lexis, there was no longer any need to be apologetic about it.

The interview participants were then asked to expand on their attitudes by talking about the contexts in which Konglish is acceptable or desirable. Five of the seven found it completely acceptable to use it with Koreans, calling it convenient and understandable. Three of them, however, felt that as English teachers, they should use it less than other Koreans. Sometimes a sense of conflict was evident. Two teachers stated “even I” use it,
laughing but also uncomfortable because they thought they should know better. One of them talked about how his friends tease him when he uses it because he is an English teacher. Even though he admitted that this was good-natured teasing, the fact that it happened left him confused as to what standard he should hold himself. Another teacher felt that if he did not use Konglish, he would be separating himself from his friends or trying to be better than them.

Two of the interviewees stated explicitly that they should not use Konglish, even with Koreans, and four more felt that they should not use it in the presence of foreigners. All felt that they should use what they described as “correct” or “exact” English when speaking with native speakers, usually expressing embarrassment if the native speaker could not understand them. Two, however, felt that some of the onus for understanding what is being said should be on the native speaker.

**Teaching Practices Related to Konglish**

A number of teaching practices relating to Konglish were looked at. Teachers were asked what they teach about Konglish in terms of its correctness and relation to “Standard English.” They were asked about their perceptions of the importance of teaching about distinguishing between Konglish and SABE. They were asked their opinions about Konglish lexis with regards to pronunciation, meaning, and use. Finally, they were asked if and how they used Konglish as a teaching tool to help their students learn “Standard English.”
What is Taught About Konglish

Questions 12 through 17 asked teachers to give their opinion on teaching English and what should be said about Konglish in the English classroom. Question 12, asking if only SABE should be taught, was a benchmark question included to establish the basic aim of the English language classroom. It was assumed that there would be high agreement with this statement and indeed 57 of the 67 teachers agreed, 34 of these strongly. The remaining questions then looked at whether Konglish should be allowed in the classroom, and, if so, under what circumstances.

Question 13 asked if students should be discouraged from using Konglish variations. Three-quarters of the teachers agreed with this statement. However, this is a drop from the number who stated that only SABE should be taught. It is apparent, then, that while the target is SABE, 25% of the teachers allow or tolerate the use of some Konglish variations.

Questions 14 to 17 look more closely at how the attitudes are reflected in classrooms, specifically, what teachers say to their students. A large number (82%) teach their students that Konglish variations are incorrect, more than half of these agreeing strongly with the statement. Teachers were then asked three progressive questions to see where they fell on a continuum of tolerance for Konglish in the classroom. The most extreme statement was that students should be taught that Konglish is bad English and it should not be allowed in schools. Opinions were evenly split on this with a slight preference to disagree. When the statement was changed to read that Konglish is not bad English but its use should not be allowed in schools, over two thirds agreed with this
statement. The final question in this group stated that Konglish is not bad English and should be accepted in school. Only one third agreed with this statement. It would appear from this that, while teachers do not teach that Konglish is bad English, neither do they believe that it should be accepted in the classroom.

The interviews confirmed this. All teachers interviewed agreed that they did not believe that Konglish is bad and did not teach their students that it is bad. All, however, replaced the word bad with poor or incorrect and said that they did teach their students that Konglish is a poor form of English. Although at other points in the interview the teachers used bad and poor apparently interchangeably, when it came to this question, they made it clear that the terms are not really the same and that they preferred the use of poor or incorrect. They had a difficult time being articulate about the difference between the terms, but the comment, “bad is bad...poor is not bad, just lacking in knowledge,” suggests that bad carries a sense of judgment that poor does not. Another stated, “As to Konglish, I don’t like to think of it as good or bad, just poor or proper.” The use of poor did not mean that it was unacceptable. It simply meant that it was not “Standard English.” Even though all participants described Konglish as poor or incorrect, this seemed largely to be in relation to SABE as the target. Konglish clearly had a rightful place in Korea for them. As one teacher summed it up, “English is a universal language, right? So universal languages should be adaptable or should be changed suitable to the case of people who use them.”
Distinguishing between Konglish and Standard American British English

Questions 18 through 20 asked teachers to give opinions on whether students should be taught about the use of different varieties of English in different contexts. Question 18 asked if students should be taught to distinguish between Konglish and SABE (i.e., if it is important that they can recognize the difference). There were two missing answers for this question, but otherwise opinions were almost unanimous (97%) that students should be taught to distinguish between the two varieties. Three quarters of these agreed very much with the statement.

All seven interview participants agreed that teaching students to distinguish between Konglish and SABE would be valuable. However, the issue of the teachers themselves being able to distinguish between Konglish and SABE resurfaced here. Many said that they depend on dictionaries to help them to distinguish. One teacher said, for example, that when he started teaching, he used the term eye-shopping (Konglish for window-shopping). “At first I didn’t know [if] eye-shopping is correct or incorrect. After a long time, I know.” In other words, even though all teachers stated an intention to correct most or all Konglish used in the classroom, they were unaware that some words that they commonly use are not used by native speakers and do not appear in English dictionaries.

At least three teachers seemed to have a conflict about dealing with the two standards. As English teachers they want to teach students perfect English. As Koreans, they want to honour or make room for their own variety. One teacher described himself as a moderate. Rather than requiring that no Konglish be used, he said that “I usually
recommend to my students” an internationally recognized term as opposed to a Konglish term when communicating with native speakers. While he describes himself as very strict with himself in terms of correct usage, he goes on to say that “Konglish is a variety of English expression and we respect those words. In that point, I am moderate.” After a pause, he added, “But I have a double standard” and laughed. In other words, he wanted to give his students an opportunity to respect their own variety while teaching them an internationally acceptable and useful standard. However, his requirement for himself was much more rigidly “Standard English.”

Questions 19 and 20 asked if students should be taught when each variety is acceptable or preferred. Responses to these were also in very high agreement, with 84% saying that students should be taught when or where Konglish is acceptable or preferred and 91% agreeing that students should be taught when or where Standard English is acceptable or preferred.

All of the interview participants also agreed that students should be taught in which contexts each variety is acceptable or desirable. One stated that she “explain[s] why they should distinguish between Konglish and English. I hope they will use real English in the case of international world, but I also want them to accept Konglish as another way of communication, a Korean way.” One teacher, who corrects all Konglish use in her classroom, notes that “the purpose of learning English is communication with Westerners, not Koreans. We have Korean!” Therefore, correct or standard usage is important because students who eventually use it will be using it with Westerners. Two
others clearly build education about varieties and international standards into their teaching. One says:

I usually emphasize Konglish is another type of English…but I emphasize that around the world there are a lot of expressions. I want students to accept Konglish as one kind of expression but the student should know the correct terms which are used abroad.

The second feels that it is important that students learn to understand different accents.

I think there are three main standards in English. Koreans are used to North American English but we have to expose students to British and Australian English. If we make some effort to listen to the accent, it will give us no problem.

Four of the teachers, while agreeing that teaching their students that the different varieties are acceptable or useful in different contexts, still wanted their students to use “Standard English” rather than Konglish expressions, even with their friends. One teacher in particular expressed a significant amount of conflict about the issue. On the one hand, he stated that it was acceptable for his students to use Konglish with their friends, or to be understood in the supermarket. On the other hand, in a conversation about the use of the terms cell phone and hand phone, he said that while hand phone is generally used in South Korea, that it is incorrect and his students should not use it. “Even in Korea, they have to use, they have to say cell phone.” It may be significant that this is one of the teachers who felt most strongly about giving foreigners a bad impression. In other words, the line between appreciating Konglish lexis and gaining the respect of the foreign community was a difficult one to straddle.
Another teacher, who had a significant understanding of the development of varieties of English and was very accepting of the use of Konglish within South Korea, corrects all uses of Konglish in his classroom and recommends that his students use "Standard English" in all contexts. Two other teachers also preferred that their students use "Standard English" in place of Konglish, even when talking with their friends. One says, "Even outside the classroom, they should use the right English words or at least know that they are not right." One teacher, who stated that he feels guilty and embarrassed if he uses Konglish, especially with native speakers, wants his students to experience the same feelings so that they will aim high, so that they will be motivated to speak the best English possible.

This sense of conflict between valuing and enjoying Konglish as their own unique expression, and wanting their students to use what they called correct or exact English remained unresolved. They wanted both for their students. They wanted them to be both proud of their culture, and to excel in their English studies and be able to communicate among foreigners.

**Teaching About Konglish Lexis**

Pronunciation is one characteristic that distinguishes a loan word as Konglish. Since the preference in South Korea is for a North American accent, teachers were asked if students should be taught that a North American accent is correct. Over half of the teachers disagreed. However, when asked about the pronunciation of a specific word, *coffee*, over 80% said that pronouncing it *copi*, the Konglish pronunciation, is incorrect and should always be corrected. In other words, while they were reluctant to define a
North American accent as correct, even though it is preferred, they were clear that a Konglish pronunciation is incorrect. More than one third of the participants chose agree very much, indicating that they felt strongly about this. Therefore, while less than half of the teachers would describe a North American accent as correct, more than four fifths of them would describe a Konglish pronunciation as incorrect.

Questions 23 to 25 dealt with loan words whose meaning changes when used as part of Konglish. The example chosen for the questionnaire was the Korean use of the word *meeting* to mean blind date, as opposed to the North American use, which is largely in a business or somewhat formal context. Three quarters of the respondents said that the Konglish use of *meeting* is incorrect. However, 85% of them agreed that the Konglish use of *meeting* was acceptable when talking with Koreans. Therefore, a significant majority feels that it is fine to use Konglish in conversations with Koreans and, more significant, that it is fine to teach students that it is acceptable. This would seem to indicate an important acceptance of Konglish for use when talking with Koreans. However, it differs significantly from the four out of seven of the interview participants who preferred that their students not use Konglish with their friends. It may be that the interview participants had more time to explain their viewpoint. All interview participants began by saying that Konglish is fine to use with Koreans. However, during discussion about the issue, they made exceptions for themselves or their students. They also said that even if Konglish with Koreans was acceptable, “Standard English” expressions were better. The impression was that this was related to their success as teachers, and their students’ potential academic success. It may also have been a class issue. Having the facility to use more than one variety and demonstrating this may have given teachers and students more
status. This was only a general impression of the overall content of the interviews, however, and is not a conclusion that can be reached with the evidence from this study.

There was 97% agreement that students should be taught the difference between the Konglish and “Standard English” use of the word *meeting* and when each is acceptable or preferred. This corresponds well with the comments of the interview participants who all felt that teaching about contexts in which different varieties are acceptable or preferred was important.

*Using Konglish as a Teaching Tool*

It was assumed that the willingness to talk about differences between the varieties would indicate willingness on the part of Korean English teachers to bring Konglish more intentionally into the classroom. Three teachers did say that they use Konglish to help students begin to learn English. In the beginning, says one, “fluency is more important than exactness.” She does not correct Konglish at this stage. However, she says, “later I will explain the difference between Konglish and English.” Another teacher said that he uses Konglish for educational purposes to compare the Konglish and the English equivalent. He said that this makes memorizing easier for his students. Other than these two examples, however, there was no evidence that teachers perceive Konglish as relevant or useful in teaching “Standard English.”

It would seem, therefore, that the Korean English teachers, despite expressing embarrassment about Konglish, owned it as their own variety of English. They were more than willing to teach their students about varieties of English and the contexts in which different varieties are used. Given the evidence, it can be projected that introduction into
the curriculum of appropriate materials that draw on students’ experience with Konglish might receive wide acceptance from teachers.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

My main focus was the attitudes of South Korean teachers of English toward Konglish. In addition, I looked at the teachers’ perception of the place of Konglish, if any, in English language classrooms. The motivation for this line of inquiry was the apparent embarrassment of South Korean English teachers about Konglish and a strong tendency for both teachers and students to laugh about it. I hoped that the research might show how these attitudes impact on the way English is taught, whether these attitudes affect the students, and what the implications might be for English education in South Korea. While the study did not examine the attitudes of native speakers teaching in South Korea, it was recognized that the data, particularly the interviews, might provide information that would suggest further study.

To provide a background for this line of inquiry, the literature search looked at what Konglish is, and the characteristics of language spread and change that produce local varieties, such as Konglish. It also looked briefly at issues surrounding standards and “Standard English.” It explored the attitudes toward varieties, both of local people and of native speakers of English. Lastly, it provided a short description of English language education in South Korea, and expectations for teachers and students.

The literature search showed that Konglish is a typical local variety, evolved from the borrowing and redefining of English words that then became part of the everyday speech of South Koreans, some words being codified in South Korean dictionaries. These words are pronounced according to Korean rules of pronunciation. Many of these words developed because most South Koreans do not speak with native speakers of English, resulting in lexis that reflects their own language and culture. Konglish is not unique in
this regard. Varieties, such as Japlish in Japan and Chinglish in China have developed for similar reasons and display the distinctive characteristics of those languages and cultures. However, a strong belief that there is a “Standard English” that is correct pervades English teaching in South Korea, and Konglish is usually defined as poor and incorrect.

The results show that the teachers did indeed express embarrassment, shyness, guilt, and anger about Konglish. On the other hand, they also enjoyed it and valued it as something uniquely theirs. Much of the embarrassment seemed to be attached to their role as teachers of English. They also expressed concern that the eyes of the world were on them and they did not want to be denigrated for the way they use English. As for the role of Konglish in English language classrooms, the teachers were almost unanimous that, other than the occasional reference to Konglish as a bridge to new vocabulary in English, it was not useful or acceptable in the classroom and should usually be corrected.

Conclusions about Descriptions of Konglish as Reported by South Korean Teachers of English

The amount of time interview participants took to articulate a definition of Konglish indicates that no formal, generally agreed upon definition of Konglish exists. Despite this, descriptions were remarkably similar, concentrating on the word level. Teachers who were interviewed all added to their definitions, a defense of Konglish, an explanation of why it is useful, or both. This would appear to indicate both a need to defend Konglish and a desire to present it in a positive light. Some of the teachers also added that foreigners had told them that Konglish is incorrect, and that they sometimes feel judged by foreigners.
Some of the teachers' definitions included the opinion that Konglish can be confusing to foreigners. However, those expressing this view all stated that the confusion was easily explained and short lived. None of the interview participants felt that confusion was a significant or ongoing problem. Two teachers put the onus on native speakers to try to understand, stating that native speakers also have their own pronunciation and lexical variations. Overall, there was a strong ownership of Konglish despite the self-consciousness and embarrassment that were also expressed.

The other issue that surfaced both while defining Konglish, and at other points in the interviews, was the periodic difficulty distinguishing between “Standard English” and Konglish. Brutt-Griffler’s (2002) discussion of language change as a social process is valuable in understanding this. Some of the teachers described how English is used to create new expressions, defending them as justifiable because they have become part of the South Korean lexis and are legitimately their own words, despite their English origins. This would appear to be the macroacquisition Brutt-Griffler talks about, whereby a speech community brings about language change (pp. 22-23) by using a language in a unique way. The definition of a word as English or Konglish would then be a gradual process during which the speech community defines its use, pronunciation, and acceptability, over a period of time before it eventually claims it as part of its own lexis. During this process, it is inevitable that there will be a variety of opinions on its correctness or incorrectness, and on the language to which it belongs. McKay’s (2002) comments regarding Outer Circle countries help here. When “innovations get conventionally established by regular use, some argue they should be considered as standard for that context” (p. 52). One factor used to determine standardness is
codification and indeed, some English words used by South Koreans with distinct pronunciation and for specific meanings are ultimately found in South Korean dictionaries. Thus, what I may have been observing was the process of macroacquisition. It may be inevitable that South Koreans, particularly those who teach English, will have varying opinions about what is and is not acceptable, and about what should and should not be considered standard. They cannot know now what will become generally acceptable and included in South Korean dictionaries in 5, 10, or 20 years time. Therefore, they are required to adjust to and judge, on behalf of their students, as well as for themselves, innovations produced by South Korean culture. Opinions and attitudes will necessarily vary. There is no way to know, mid-process, what will eventually be considered standard.

If it is, therefore, valid to conclude that the difficulty the teachers experienced in distinguishing between English and Konglish can be considered a natural part of the process of the developing Konglish lexis, and need not be a source of stress or embarrassment.

Conclusions about Attitudes of South Korean English Teachers toward Konglish

McGroarty’s (1996) definition of attitudes states that they involve beliefs, emotional reactions, and behavioural tendencies (p. 5). The responses made by the teachers did in fact reflect all three components. There was a strong belief that Konglish is incorrect and should be corrected. There was a range of emotional reactions, including shyness, embarrassment, guilt, and anger. The resulting behaviour when teachers found themselves using it was to laugh in order to cover the embarrassment, to explain it, or to
make a joke about it. It would appear then, that all components of McGroarty’s definition were displayed.

Over two thirds of the participants in the research reported embarrassment about Konglish, a feeling that increased to varying degrees in the presence of native speakers of English. Given that only half of the teachers felt that Konglish reflects badly on South Korean people in general, comments from the interview participants were analyzed to determine if their roles as English teachers contributed to the embarrassment, and in fact this proved to be true. The research also showed that most teachers view Konglish as incorrect, and that correctness was an important goal in their classrooms. Han (2003) describes the influence of Confucian thought on the function of education in South Korea as reinforcing “the distinction between right and wrong” (section on Impact of Confucianism on roles between a teacher and student). This may be at least part of the reason that the burden of being correct seemed to weigh on most of the teachers. Therefore, it may have contributed to their view of Konglish as incorrect rather than simply a local usage.

In contrast, there were also many positive comments about Konglish made by all of the interview participants. They referred to the fact that Konglish words are descriptive of the way South Koreans think and are easily understood by South Koreans. Hand phone, the term used for cell phone, was a common example. One teacher explained that the visual image created by some Konglish words is helpful. For instance, when you say hand phone “you can easily see it, so I think it [hand phone] is correct...very useful and meaningful.”
One participant did not see Konglish as either good or bad. “To define Konglish as good or bad form is difficult for me.” He went on to define correct or good in relation to the context. He defined correct as “the expression that people can understand.” Thus, Konglish is correct in South Korea, but when speaking with foreigners or going abroad, South Koreans should use terms that people in those contexts can understand. He made the case more than once in the course of the interview that Konglish is meaningful to South Koreans, expresses their thoughts, and should be respected.

Konglish was experienced as enjoyable by all of the participants, one stating explicitly that Konglish is a lot of fun. It was clearly important to them on some level. One teacher, who had some understanding of language spread and change, stated specifically that varieties, such as Konglish and Japlish, can actually change English and should be given the right to do so by mother-tongue speakers. She stated that English is a universal language and should be adaptable. This clearly echoes Brutt-Griffler’s (2002) contention that theories of SLA should not define change that is introduced by L2 learners as error (p. 129). It is reasonable to conclude that the participants who say that Konglish should be respected, and who defend its right to have an impact on the English language, are reinforcing McKay’s (2002) thesis that “a language cannot be linked to any one country or culture; rather it must belong to those who use it” (p. 1).

The most striking outcome of the question into attitudes was the presence of conflicting feelings in all of the teachers. These conflicting opinions were not between different people with opposing opinions, but were internal: most participants expressed some conflict with themselves about Konglish. While some inconsistency was predictable, there was more than anticipated. This would seem to reflect the views of Lick
and Alsagoff as reported by McKay (2002), on the use of local varieties in Outer Circle countries where English has an official status. McKay reports “a dual attitude” toward varieties by their users. For some, it is “a means for speakers to take ownership of the language and thus express their own identity, for others the indigenized variety represents a corruption or substandard use” (pp. 55-56). However, in this case, the research indicates that the teachers hold both opinions at different times and in different contexts, and these opposing views can cause internal conflict about the use of Konglish. While McKay’s work refers to research carried out in Outer Circle countries, further research may find the same dual attitudes are present in the Expanding Circle (i.e., countries where English is learned as a foreign language and is not used in an official capacity).

Conclusions about the Impact of Attitudes on the Classroom

It would appear from this study that one impact of the pride and ownership many of the teachers feel about Konglish, is that a number of them tell their students that Konglish is not bad English and try to pass on the message that it should be respected.

However, the conflicting views also carried over into classrooms. A number of teachers expressed concern that foreigners look down on Konglish. As English teachers, they want to demonstrate to foreigners a good command of the English language, and they want their students to be able to do the same. Thus, while respecting Konglish, and wanting it to be respected, they also want to excel at what they perceive to be “Standard English.” The overall message given by most teachers is that Konglish is fine when speaking with Koreans in Korea. However, and understandably, the target language of the classroom is SABE, and in this context, standard terminology recognizable outside South Korea, is what is considered correct.
The result is that a third “unspoken message” may be being transmitted. Konglish is fine. It is our own language and we have a right to it. But do not use it. Thus, while not intentionally passing on negative attitudes toward Konglish, these attitudes could be inferred by some students whose teachers want them to speak beautiful English and not use Konglish, even with their friends. The same interview participant who said, “For me, Konglish is acceptable with Koreans, in Korea, anytime” was the most adamant that her students not use Konglish with each other socially. She also said that she sometimes corrects friends and family members. This tendency to both stand up for Konglish as valid in some way and yet to not accept its use on a personal level or by students was commonly demonstrated.

How are we to understand this apparent contradiction? Does it say that Konglish is acceptable in some circumstances but that “Standard English” is better and, therefore, has more prestige? Does it categorize students who do use “Standard English” lexis outside the classroom as better, more successful students? How do students reconcile this contradiction? These are questions for another study.

The questions about attitudes toward competence in English showed that the teachers believed that the ability to speak good English indicated higher intelligence, and was an indicator of a more successful person. This may indicate that South Korean English teachers do see English as a prestige language that accords status to those who master it. It is understandable, then, that teachers would want to correct their own and their students’ Konglish. As one interview participant said, “I want to speak beautiful, standard, correct English.”
Findings about the Current Use of Konglish as a Teaching Tool

There were a few references by teachers to using Konglish in the classroom but this generally focused on using it as a bridge to new vocabulary. Yamaguchi (2002) points out some phonological and semantic issues with Japlish that are also true for Konglish. South Koreans, like Japanese, have a relatively unstressed language so English loan words have been learned without stress. That is, there is very little to no stress on syllables in words in these languages, and this is often carried over into English. In addition, many words have taken on a fixed meaning that is different from the original English. These two characteristics can and do cause a lot of confusion and, Yamaguchi claims, make learning English more difficult. However, students already know a lot of English words even though they are unaware of it. According to Yamaguchi, it is the teacher’s role to minimize this confusion and to promote a “consciousness of language difference” (section on English in Japan). It seems valid to apply Yamaguchi’s ideas to the South Korean context, given that the two varieties have similar characteristics.

The results of the interview data do indicate that some teachers use Konglish for the kind of bridging to which Yamaguchi refers. One of the interview participants says that she accepts Konglish from beginner and low intermediate students. For her, at the beginning, “fluency is more important than correctness, so if they speak Konglish I don’t correct them. Later, I will explain the difference between Konglish and English.” It must be noted, however, that in the context of this study, that was the most tolerant or permissive view expressed. Konglish is almost always corrected and students are advised not to use it.
context. This may also indicate an understanding of and appreciation for the concept of English as an international language where multiple standards exist and the speaker chooses lexis depending on context. Comments of the interview participants further reinforce this. It would appear then that South Korean English teachers want to have more than passing or incidental discussions in class about language change, varieties of English, and Konglish in particular.

**Recommendations**

Two key recommendations have been made as a result of this study. The first is a recommendation that there be a shift in emphasis in oral English toward intelligibility and a broader range of communication skills. The second is that students be taught about International English, again shifting the emphasis from a North American standard to a globally intelligible one.

**Recommendation One: Teach and Test for Intelligibility and Communication Skills**

I would recommend a shift toward intelligibility in oral English teaching, rather than native like competence. Yamaguchi (2002) in her work on Japlish, finds that focusing on a prestige standard such as British or American English “from the educational and sociocultural point of view is not always realistic” (section on Common Standard). As in Japan, South Korean students are subject largely to non-native input and simply do not have access to the amount of exposure to native input required to achieve competence in an Inner Circle standard. She concludes that “it is not educationally and linguistically realistic to drive learners to conform to a native variety beyond their needs” (section on Common Standard). In addition, the evidence that speakers of varieties tie their language to their identity could make a case for including materials that use varieties, such as Japlish
and Konglish. Yamaguchi’s (2002) thesis is that the needs of the students should drive the curriculum and that intelligibility rather than a rigid adherence to a perceived correct standard (section on Common Core) should be the goal. The comments of one interview participant, which echo the feelings of a number of them, indicate that in fact some South Korean teachers of English are already teaching students about specific varieties for specific contexts. He had been talking about the importance of correct English, but then adds:

Participant S6: I use the term correct, but it is really complicated to explain.
Correct is complicated. Correct has to mean the expression that people can accept and understand.
Interviewer: It sounds like you’re looking at it from the point of view of the person that you are speaking to, so that you are adjusting to what they know and what is acceptable to them.
Participant S6: That’s right. To define Konglish as a good or bad form is very difficult for me. Konglish is the expression Koreans use, so it has meaning, we understand it. In Kenya, Kenyans use their style, so we have to respect it.
In fact, many of the interview participants did refer to contexts, some indicating that, while they think they themselves should use correct English, if they did so all of the time, they would not be understood. The experience, then, of needing to use different varieties for intelligibility is one that most of them seem to have. For some, their use of Konglish conflicts with their belief that a perceived correct standard would be more desirable. Others simply enjoy their own variety and find that they can express themselves more easily using it. Most teachers commented that they told their students that it was
acceptable to use Konglish with friends (though a few preferred that they not do this), but that, if they were speaking to foreigners, they should use the correct terms. Thus, it would appear that many South Korean students are already being taught about varieties of English, and about switching varieties to accommodate the person with whom they are communicating. However, this is not part of the curriculum so any information students are getting is because a particular teacher is interested in the subject.

There is little room in the evaluation process for communication skills or intelligibility. This puts teachers in a difficult position. Students are competing for positions at university and need high marks. If teachers take away from the teaching time that prepares them for these examinations in order to focus on other issues, the students may become more competent users of the language but may not be adequately prepared for the examinations that will determine their futures.

A change of this kind could more closely address the real needs of the students by removing the pressure for correctness and emphasizing the ability to communicate. Therefore, it is recommended that teaching about and testing for intelligibility and a range of practical communication skills be included in the English language curriculum.

**Recommendation Two: Teach about International English**

Teaching about language changes, the development of varieties of English, and how they are used internationally would help students to understand the emergence of Konglish as part of a normal process. It would also help them to understand why working on intelligibility, as opposed to correctness, is valuable for them. One of the interview participants exposes his students to a variety of English accents, including North American, British, and Australian. He believes that they should understand that there are
many standards throughout the world, and that it is both achievable and valuable for his students to learn to recognize different accents.

Including this in the curriculum would help students to be more flexible in their use of English. They currently adhere to memorized phrases and sentences and have little experience in practicing saying things in a variety of ways or negotiating for meaning, both of which are important for users of a second language.

I, therefore, recommend that students learn about and be exposed to more than one standard. I would also suggest that they be encouraged to think of English as an International Language, resulting in the use of many varieties depending on the speakers involved.

**Implications**

This study has implications for further research. I did not look at classrooms directly. I also did not look at the attitudes of students toward Konglish. If the goal of education is to meet students’ needs, then valuable information could be collected on what students want and need from their English language education, particularly with regard to Konglish.

In addition, the study did not examine the attitudes of native speaker teachers in South Korea. Since it is difficult to talk about English language education in South Korea without referring to native speakers, it would be valuable to examine both the attitudes and the knowledge that they bring with them about language varieties, such as Konglish. This could result in valuable information on the kinds of orientation and training foreigners would benefit from in order to work successfully in South Korea.
Finally, this study did not investigate the actual uses of Standard English and Konglish in South Korean society. It did not provide a detailed analysis of the use of Konglish and English in global and local spheres, including the role and value of these symbolic resources in South Koreans' daily lives.

**A Final Comment: Teachers' Remarks on Attitudes of Native Speakers toward Konglish**

While information on attitudes toward native speakers was not collected in the questionnaire, both positive and negative comments about them did emerge in the interviews. It is important to report these because they define one of the sources of the embarrassment expressed by the teachers. The comments may therefore have implications for further research.

As noted in Chapter Two, while little evidence was found in the literature about attitudes of English speaking foreigners in South Korea, a sampling of remarks in the media and on the Internet were cited that show significant negative attitudes toward Konglish. All of the teachers interviewed felt some pressure to speak correct "Standard English" with native speakers. While some explicitly said that they appreciated being corrected, others indicated feeling judged or self-conscious. One said that he feels shy and ashamed if he uses Konglish when speaking with native speakers. He felt that native speakers should take some responsibility by asking the meaning of a Konglish expression. Another one said that he felt guilty if he inadvertently used a Konglish word when a native speaker was present. Both said that trying to speak "perfect English" all of the time was very tiring.
Konglish sayings on t-shirts and other products also caused some anger or embarrassment related to what native speakers might think. One comment sums up the general opinions well. "Because of the number of foreigners in Korea now, we should be careful not to use Konglish [on products]. It gives a bad impression." Certainly, the interview participants gave the impression that they feel more relaxed about the use of Konglish, both in conversation and on products, when not in the presence of native speakers.

There is some evidence in the interview transcripts that native speakers' attitudes can cause embarrassment. The teachers' self-consciousness with native speakers seems, to some extent, to be the desire to conform to and gain the respect of foreigners. However, some opinions of native speakers have had a negative impact on these teachers. For example, they have been told that a particular word, in one case hand phone, was Konglish, was incorrect, and should not be used. One of the interviews was particularly poignant.

Participant S5: Sometimes a few native speakers judge Konglish and Standard English.

Interviewer: Judge them how?

Participant S5: They say you must not use Konglish.

Interviewer: They've judged the word as...

Participant S5: ...as bad English. Yes.

Interviewer: And a native speaker has told you that?

Participant S5: (very quietly with head down). Yes.

Interviewer: How did you feel about that?
Participant S5: I was very embarrassed. In that case, many Koreans have fear to speak English.

Interviewer: So sometimes when Koreans are reluctant to speak, it’s because of the judgment?

Participant S5: Yes, yes. I think so.

A study carried out by Han (2003) found that some native speaker teachers lacked compassion and were not concerned about the difficulties experienced by their students. They were reported by students to be impolite. “They think they are the best...they ignore our culture” (section on South Korean adult learners perceptions of native English-speaking teachers).

The evidence suggests, therefore, that research with native speaker EFL teachers may be valuable. Some areas of study that would be valuable include attitudes of native speaker teachers toward Konglish, and a survey of their opinions of the content and effectiveness of the orientation they received as teachers in South Korea. The negative attitudes reported in the review of the literature and the unsolicited comments of the interview participants alone are enough to recommend orientation for prospective EFL teachers with regard to Konglish. This orientation should include information on the nature of language change, the development and validity of local and international varieties of English, the characteristics of Konglish, and its right to its own status. I believe that this kind of orientation could go a long way in helping native speakers to understand and respect Konglish. It could also prevent comments and judgements being made which,
while often made in ignorance, are embarrassing for South Korean English teachers and ultimately disrespectful.
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## Appendix B

### Questionnaire

**Demographic Information**

- **Male?** 
- **Female?** 
- **Age Range:** 20-30  |  30-40  |  40-50  |  50-60

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement. *Circle your answer.*

1. agree very much  
2. agree somewhat  
3. disagree somewhat  
4. disagree strongly

For example, question 1 asks if you are embarrassed or self-conscious about Konglish. If you are often embarrassed or self-conscious, circle 1. If you are a little embarrassed or self-conscious, circle 2. If you usually aren’t embarrassed or self-conscious, circle 3. If you are never embarrassed or self-conscious, circle 4.

### Part ONE: Attitudes Toward Konglish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree 1</th>
<th>Agree 2</th>
<th>Agree 3</th>
<th>Disagree 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am often self-conscious or embarrassed about Konglish in Korea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am only self-conscious or embarrassed about Konglish when I am with native English speakers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am not at all embarrassed or self-conscious about Konglish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Konglish is <em>bad English</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Konglish is <em>not</em> <em>bad English</em>. It is the local (Korean) variety of English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Konglish reflects badly on the Korean people and its use should be discouraged.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The use of Konglish expressions should be discouraged in radio and TV news Broadcasting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The use of Konglish expressions should be discouraged in all radio and TV Programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The use of Konglish expressions should be discouraged in print (newspapers, magazines, books, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advertising, magazines, etc.). 4

10. Koreans who speak grammatically correct SABE (Standard American British English) in place of Konglish expressions are generally more intelligent. 1 2 3 4

11. Koreans who speak grammatically correct SABE (Standard American British English in place of Konglish expressions are generally more successful. 1 2 3 4

**Part TWO: English Language Education in Korea**

12. Students should be taught only SABE (Standard American British English). 1 2 3 4

13. Students should be discouraged from using Konglish variations. 1 2 3 4

14. Students should be taught that Konglish variations are incorrect. 1 2 3 4

15. Students should be taught that Konglish is ‘bad English’. It’s use should *not be* allowed in schools. 1 2 3 4

16. Students should be taught that Konglish is *not ‘bad English’*. It is a local Korean variety of English *but its use should not be allowed in schools*. 1 2 3 4

17. Students should be taught that Konglish is *not ‘bad English’* and its use should be accepted in schools. 1 2 3 4

18. Students should be taught to distinguish between Konglish and SABE. 1 2 3 4

19. Students should be taught *when* the use of Konglish is acceptable or preferred. 1 2 3 4

20. Students should be taught about *when* the use of SABE is preferred. 1 2 3 4

21. Students should be taught that North American pronunciation is correct. 1 2 3 4

22. Pronunciation of Konglish words such as ‘copi’ for “coffee” is incorrect and should always be corrected. 1 2 3 4

---

23. *Konglish* includes some English words that have a different meaning and use. An example is “meeting,” which represents a kind of party-style group blind date for Koreans. In English, a meeting is a group of people who get together for business purposes. 1 2 3
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be taught that the Konglish use of “meeting” is incorrect or bad English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> Students should be taught that the Konglish use of ‘meeting’ is acceptable when talking with Koreans or for informal occasions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong> Students should be taught the difference between the English and Konglish use of ‘meeting’, and when the use of each is acceptable or preferred.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview Questions

1. How would you define Konglish?

2. Do you use Konglish expressions? If you do, is this acceptable to you, or do you feel that you are using a poor form of English? In what contexts do you feel it is more acceptable to use Konglish expressions?

3. Should Konglish be accepted as a valid variety of English? Please say why you think this.

4. How do you feel about Konglish? Think about contexts in which you might encounter it such as advertising, in print media such as newspapers, radio and television, or on articles of clothing or other consumer products. Does Konglish bother you in any of these contexts? Is it more acceptable in some than in others? Are any of your feelings changed if you are in the presence of native speakers?

5. Should students be taught that Konglish is bad English? How would you like your students to view Konglish? How would you like them to feel about it?

6. Do you think students should be taught to distinguish between Konglish and Standard SABE expressions? If so, would it be useful to your students to understand in which contexts each of the varieties (Konglish and SABE English) can be used?

7. Should students be taught to change Konglish expressions to SABE? Should all Konglish be corrected in the classroom or only some aspects of it? Consider word choice, grammatical constructions, and pronunciation.