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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to uncover the underlying philosophies and ideologies with reference to English language teaching and learning in Korean society—especially to examine how these ideologies unfold at the level of instructional language television programs. As an alternative to classroom learning, Korean television has produced a number of television shows to teach foreign languages, with English taking up the vast majority of these programs. However, relatively little work, if any, has centered on the concept of the native speaker in East Asia and how American English norms unfold in language teaching contexts. The data for this study consist of twenty episodes from the two most popular instructional English TV programs currently broadcast on the Korean national educational channel. Critical discourse analysis is used as the primary methodological framework to analyze the data in detail from both a micro-level and macro-level point of view. The use of the personal pronouns ‘we’ and ‘you’ has been examined as well as the use of ‘equivalency-signaling verbs’ and qualifiers and the participation structure used by the Korean and English-speaking (ES) hosts. Furthermore, the general use of discourse by Korean and ES hosts has been thoroughly investigated. The results show that American English norms are not only highly respected but also accepted as the only “correct” way of using English with American English norms being especially strongly valued.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The globalization of English

As a result of the rapid and widespread growth in the popularity of English around the world, English has become a lingua franca in many countries, to the point that educated people are assumed to be able to communicate fluently in English in addition to their first language. In fact, knowledge of and/or proficiency in English is an essential tool for success in East Asian countries such as China, Korea, Japan, and Taiwan, where it is taught as a fundamental foreign language. In these countries, English is much more than just a tool for communication; it is a veritable “Aladdin’s Lamp” (Kachru, 1986). In other words, the ability to speak English seems to be closely related to better socio-economic status, prestige, and education, and this ability commands respect by others in these countries (Pennycook, 1994a; 1998).

Recently, however, scholars have raised critical questions with respect to the spread and domination of English in ESL/EFL countries such as Korea. According to Pennycook (1994a), this rapid spread of English is neither a natural nor a neutral phenomenon; rather, it is closely related to cultural politics. As Phillipson (1992) also points out, it could be called a form of ‘linguistic imperialism’ in that English has come to strongly influence all areas of Korean society.
Undoubtedly, English has become not just a foreign language, but a survival tool that influences the everyday lives of many people. In Korea, for example, every major Korean newspaper includes a section for learning English, providing such items as “Today’s Expression” or “Today’s Idiom” for English learners. Moreover, English test scores are one of the most influential factors for promotion in Korean companies and for college admission. An increasing number of universities prefer to have instructors who can teach classes in English.

While the demands for English speakers are increasing, the opportunity to use English communicatively is still relatively limited, and contact with native speakers of English remains minimal. English teaching in the Korean educational system tends to center on the traditional teaching of grammatical rules and translation from English to Korean—especially in secondary schools (see Park, 1992). This emphasis on grammar and translation is due solely to the importance of the college entrance exam. In Korea, most of the items on this exam involve reading comprehension questions in English; students are expected to have a strong and solid background in grammar and a keen ability to translate in order to be able to accurately interpret a text. With such an emphasis on only grammar and translation, opportunities for actual practice communicating in English are still rather rare.
Because of the inherent difficulty in teaching English in a more communicative way in the educational system in Korea (Li, 1998), a considerable number of private institutes and television shows are striving to meet the needs of English learners who seek more communicative-based language learning. Korean parents tend to send their children to private English institutes where they can have more opportunities for exposure to native English speakers, even from an early age.

As a result, the Korean media have produced a number of television shows to teach foreign languages, not surprisingly, with English taking up the vast majority of these programs. By virtue of newer formats as compared to the traditional way of teaching English where the Korean hosts explain grammatical patterns, the program designers seem to have attempted to go beyond traditional grammar-based instruction, as is evidenced by the following observations. First, these shows generally include skits presenting more situated communication between English speakers, such as contextualized conversations in a store, bank, or restaurant. This approach appears to focus on the more functional aspects of language learning. Second, interaction frequently appears during these shows—sometimes between the Korean and English-speaking (ES) hosts, sometimes in a skit. In addition, the shows provide the audience with an opportunity to listen to the different voices of English speakers living in Korea (e.g.,
English teachers or businessmen) to develop their listening skills. Third, cultural factors are incorporated into the content of the teaching. For example, the Korean host often asks the native speakers about life in the United States and it is often the case that the hosts explicitly compare and contrast the two languages and cultures. Given the number and frequency of English language TV programs, it is necessary to closely analyze the quality of instruction and, in so doing, the underlying philosophies and ideologies that are initiated and reinforced through the language instruction in these programs.

1.2 Rethinking the notion of the native speaker

As English learners seek more communicatively-based instruction, these TV programs provide learners with the opportunity to watch and/or listen to native speakers interact on television. In other words, while there are few native speakers of English in the classroom, television provides another alternative for English learners. As Widdowson (1994) notes for classroom discourse, “English presented in the classroom should be authentic, naturally occurring language, not produced for instructional purposes…. What this means is language naturally occurring as communication in native-speaker contexts of use…” (p. 386). EFL learners wish to be exposed to the spoken discourse of native speakers and, thus, attempt to learn ‘native-like’ speech and
communicative strategies. In this sense, non-native speakers have a lower status than particular types of English speakers, since they cannot provide “real” or “authentic” language use (see Kramsch, 1997; 1998).

However, scholars have begun to question the simplified and idealized view of the native speaker (e.g., Belz, 2002a; 2002b; Cook, 1999; Firth & Wagner 1997; Kramsch, 1997, 1998; Rampton, 1990). Traditionally, the native language is defined as the first language (Bloomfield, 1933). As the word, ‘native’ implies, the native speaker is assumed undoubtedly to be a person with a mother tongue which was acquired from birth (Firth & Wagner, 1997). In other words, the definition of a native speaker is a person who speaks their first-learnt language. Therefore, a “later-learnt language” can never be a native language (Cook, 1999).

Another dominant assumption underlying the notion of the native speaker is that monolingualism is part of being an idealized native speaker (Chomsky, 1965). In other words, the native speaker perfectly speaks the language, which is his/her only language. From this point of view, the native speaker is a seemingly “omniscient figure” (Firth & Wagner, 1997) and “the uncrowned King, who can do no wrong” (Mey, 1981). This reductionist view of the idealized native speaker is, however, not realistic since it means that second or foreign language learners cannot reach the level of perfect communicators.
This means that they are stigmatized as endless learners of English rather than as users of English.

In contrast to the term “native speaker,” the term “non-native speaker” refers to those who speak or are learning second or foreign languages. As Hogg and Abrams (1990) suggest, “the social identity perspective holds that all knowledge is socially derived through social comparisons” (p. 22). This means that identity is developed and emphasized through comparison with others rather than fixed (Tang, 1997). Learner language is often called ‘inter-language’ and according to Selinker (1972), this coined term implies that the learners are somewhere on a continuum between their L1 and their L2. In other words, they are struggling to reach perfection in terms of their level of proficiency in their L2. In this sense, non-native speakers can never reach the level of proficiency that a NS has; even if they do, they are still destined to be called “near-native” or “pseudo-native” speakers (Medgyes, 1994).

However, Cook (1991) proposes using the more neutral term ‘multi-competence’ to describe the learner’s ability to speak two languages, also referring to non-native speakers as ‘multi-competent language users’ (Cook, 1999). In fact, viewing NNSs simply as deficient communicators ignores the advantages that they have at their disposal. For example, they have the potential to be more creative in their use of their L1 and their
L2 (e.g., Belz, 2002c).

This NS/NNS distinction is also deeply rooted in educational settings in Korea. English learners have a strong belief that a NS is a better role model as a teacher in every way, being able to provide more authentic input and thus they have a preference for native English-speaking teachers. Thus, NS teachers are given higher status than NNS teachers. As a result, NS and NNS teachers deal with different subjects, with NS teachers tending to focus on oral skills (e.g., English conversation, listening) and NNS teachers tending to focus on written skills and structure of the language (e.g., grammar, reading), since they are believed to have a lower oral proficiency compared with the NS teachers who have the “superior” proficiency.

1.3. Norms and correctness

As demands for native speakers of English are increasing in Korea, the ultimate goal of English learners in Korea is to become as native-like in speaking as possible. However, to gain native-like competence seems to be both unattainable and unrealistic. In the teaching of English, native-like idiomatic expressions tend to be overemphasized with teachers encouraging students to memorize as many idioms as possible. The underlying assumption in this emphasis on idioms is that being able to use idiomatic expressions
makes speakers sound more like native speakers, which is often regarded as
“sophisticated” in Korea. However, it is not often questioned who, exactly, is a native speaker and how the concept can be defined, and also what types of native speakers are preferred. Although it is not explicitly stated which norms the learner should follow and imitate, there seems to be a strong value placed on an idealized norm.

However, this monolithic perspective that there is an idealized norm to follow may not fully relate to multilingual and multicultural societies in which varieties of norms intersect (see Blyth, 1995); in other words, this perspective of the native speaker cannot serve as a guideline to set a realistic and appropriate goal for L2 learners, who are beginning to stand between two languages and cultures. As Kramsch (1998) puts it, the learners’ goal is to be “intercultural speakers” in that they are no longer trying to emulate native speakers. Jenkins (1998) also points out that a native-like accent cannot be an ultimate goal for learners of English as an international language. If English is used in international contexts, it is not appropriate to follow or even imitate native speaker norms. For example, when a Korean businessman has a conversation with a Japanese customer, they may use English to communicate. In this case, they do not have to speak/write American English; since they are using English as an international language rather than English as an intranational language as it would be used in America. As Kramsch and
Sullivan (1996) suggest, the ‘authentic’ use of a language is not at all unproblematic. They proposed that which norm is ‘appropriate’ is more important than what is ‘real,’ since it is more relevant to the local needs of English learners. That is, the authentic discourse used in the United States may not be an appropriate model for English learners in Korea--or other parts of the world.

In spite of the inappropriateness of the idealized native norm as a model, the American English norms are widely promoted in Korea. It is common for private institutes to advertise learning ‘real’ English from American native speakers. This attitude towards learning English is based on the notion that “they are supposed to learn to speak the ‘right’ way” (Andreasson, 1994, p. 396). As Bartsch (1987) puts it, norms are the social reality of the correctness notion…Norms are the constellations in social reality that create, delimit, and secure the notions of correctness. These norms consist of relationships between people, in which it is determined what the models and standards which have to be followed are, who has to follow which model, who provides models, and who enforces, if necessary, adherence to the models (xii).

In other words, the majority of English learners follow these norms for the right or wrong ways of learning English. According to Kachru’s (1985) categories, the countries where English is spoken as a first language provide these norms, while countries where English is spoken as a foreign language depend on these norms. American English norms are especially highly emphasized in Korea because of its historical background, which will
be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. This idea of learning the correct language may not be unrelated to the Korean language policy; in Korea, the dialect used in Seoul, the capital of Korea, is officially known as Standard Korean. Therefore, English learners may also believe that “the ideal goal is to imitate the native speaker of the standard language as closely as possible” (Andreasson, 1994, p. 402).

1.4. Ideologies in the teaching of English

The purpose of my study is to uncover the underlying philosophies and ideologies with reference to English language teaching and learning in Korea—especially to examine how these ideologies unfold at the level of instructional language television shows. Because of the recent trend towards idealizing the native speaker of English in Korea, especially the native speaker of American-sounding English, I have committed myself to the study of current television programs broadcast in Korea which highlight English-speaking participants. This study focuses on the extent to which native speakers of English are valued in English teaching contexts in Korea.

While some research has recently been published on the notion of the native speaker in European contexts and concerning Indo-European languages (e.g., Belz,
2002a; Blyth, 1995; Kramsch, 1997, 1998; Rampton, 1990, 1995), relatively little work\(^1\), if any, has centered on the concept of the native speaker in East Asia and how idealized native norms unfold in language teaching contexts there.

In this paper, I analyze actual data to discuss how the idealized native speakers of English are portrayed in teaching contexts in Korea and how the idealized norms are initiated and reinforced through the media. Specifically, I examine a number of English-language instructional television shows currently being broadcast in Korea where both Korean and English-speaking hosts are responsible for the entire language teaching activity.

Discourse analysis is used as the primary methodological tool to critically analyze the data for this study from both a micro- and macro-level point of view. The theoretical framework of critical discourse analysis also helps to connect language use and the social problems related to language, power, and ideology occurring in English-teaching contexts in Korea. To this end, language use--both English and Korean--in the two most popular TV shows is thoroughly investigated in order to discover how the underlying ideologies of these programs unfold through language use.

What is striking is that idealized American English norms are highly emphasized

\(^1\) See Kubota (1998) for ideologies of English in Japan.
as the only appropriate and “correct” way of using English. This is evident in how the Korean hosts, who themselves speak like near native speakers of American English, consistently check with the English-speaking hosts who are considered representatives of the American language and culture and as such, should be able to answer any type of question, as if they were undisputed experts of both the English language and the American culture.
CHAPTER 2: THE SPREAD AND GROWTH OF ENGLISH

2.1. Introduction

In recent years, the growth and spread of English throughout the entire world has increased dramatically; thus, it has become a ‘global language’ (Crystal, 1997). This means that English is not spoken solely in English-speaking countries (e.g., USA, UK, and Australia) as an *intranational* language; but that it has also become a language of *international* communication (Kachru, 1985). Crystal (1997) demonstrates that English has served as a lingua franca in such areas as international relations, the media, international travel, international safety, education and communications. Modern technology has also made English one of the major contact languages between speakers of different languages. The Internet has played an important role in connecting the world as is evidenced by the fact that over 100 million hosts had been connected to the Internet by the year 2000 (Crystal, 2001). Furthermore, it is estimated that 670 million speakers of English have native or native-like competence and if we include speakers with ‘reasonable competence’ in English, the total number of people in the world using English increases to about 1.8 billion (Crystal, 1997).

However, the important issue concerning the spread of English is not just in its total number of speakers. As the demand for and importance of being able to
communicate in English has increased even in countries where English is spoken as a foreign language, English has come to serve as much more than a tool which enhances communication; it has also become an “Aladdin’s Lamp” (Kachru, 1986), or a gatekeeper for one’s future success. In other words, the ability to speak English is closely related to improved socio-economic status, prestige, and education, and this commands the respect of others in those countries where it is spoken. (Pennycook, 1994; 1998). Cooke (1988) also describes English as a “Trojan horse,” indicating that it is a language of imperialism and of particular class interests (cited in Pennycook, 1994). For these reasons, scholars, such as Pennycook (1994) and Phillipson (1992), have raised ethical concerns about the spread and domination of English as well as its relationship with cultural politics in the Third World.

2.2. Kachru’s Three Circles

The dissemination of English throughout the world has reached the point that numerous acronyms have been generated in relation to the roles and functions of English (e.g., English as a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as an International Language (EIL), etc.). Kachru (1985) categorizes this world into different circles based on the roles and
functions of English, thus representing how English is used rather than where it is used.

For example, Singapore, India, and Malaysia, which compose Kachru’s (1985) Outer Circle, do not belong to the same group as China, Japan, and Korea, which are categorized as part of the Expanding Circle even though these are all Asian countries (Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1. Adopted from Kachru’s three circles (Kachru, 1985)

1: Inner Circle
2: Outer Circle
3: Expanding Circle

Thus, Kachru (1985) provides three concentric circles of ‘English geography.’ In the ‘Inner Circle,’ English is spoken as a native language or a mother tongue such as in countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. In the second circle or the ‘Outer Circle,’ English is spoken as an institutionalized language and most of the countries in this circle were former colonies of countries where English was spoken as a
native language (e.g., India, Singapore, Egypt). Finally, the Expanding Circle includes the rest of the world where English is primarily a foreign language and used mostly for international communication (e.g., China, Japan, Korea, Germany). As the names of each circle imply, countries where English is spoken as a native language play the most ‘central’ role in the spread of English. Just as a stone thrown in a pond creates concentric circles that ripple from the center outwards, English has had an impact on the languages and cultures of countries in the outer periphery. However, these three circles are categorized based on nations, which may not always provide an appropriate explanation for this multi-lingual and multi-cultural society. This framework appears to be somewhat simplistic, because it does not fully capture the role of English in individual countries. In addition, it is simply assumed that English is only spoken as a foreign language in the Outer Circle; yet it could be used as the primary language in certain areas. For example, English is the medium of communication in certain classes and in formal meetings in some Korean companies.

2.3. The impact of English

As Kachru’s classification illustrates, the impact of English flows from the center

---

2 However, the validity for the creation of the category Outer Circle has been questioned (see Nayar, 1997; Tripathi, 1998), since the roles and functions of English are not clearly identical from country to country.
to the Outer Circle and further onwards to the Expanding Circle. As the diffusion of English continues further outwards, it leads to it having a linguistic and cultural impact on other countries—especially those in the Outer and Expanding Circles. This means that other indigenous languages have come under the influence of English as a result of contact with it, a process known as ‘Englishization’ (Kachru, 1994). In addition to this, the ways English is used in the Outer and Expanding Circles has changed in comparison to the ways it is used in the Inner Circle, a process known as ‘nativization.’ For example, linguistic changes have occurred in the Korean language due to its contact with English (Englishization) (Lee, 1989); while at the same time, the ways in which English is used in Korea has changed as a result of the impact of Korean (nativization) (Jung & Min, 1999). This impact is not only limited to language. It also extends to the cultural domain, since language is closely related to cultural reality (Kramsch, 1998).

This phenomenon may look accidental, however Pennycook (1994) argues that the spread of English is neither natural or neutral, nor beneficial; it is closely related to the “cultural, political, educational, social and economic life of a country” (p. 16). Pennycook points out that the post-colonial legacy and the political and economic forces of international capitalism have led to the special status of English in the world. The ripples in a pond do not occur by chance; rather, they are generated by a stone, or outside
force that is involved in this phenomenon. That is, the global spread of English is most likely to be motivated by sociopolitical agents. Pennycook (1998) observes that English Language Teaching (ELT) has not merely served as a service for education in the colonial age, but it has also added to the dichotomy between the ‘West’ and ‘primitive societies’ or between ‘Superiority’ and ‘Inferiority.’ Therefore it can be stated that ‘the West’ tends to be portrayed as representing ‘modernity’ and ‘civilization.’

Thus, the teaching of English does not occur in a vacuum. As Prodromou (1988) demonstrates, the teaching of English is a cultural action since native speakers of a language not only express their individual voices but they also express the established knowledge of their native community and society (Kramsch, 1993). Similarly, the teaching of English is also not just the teaching of a language; it is also the teaching of social and cultural meanings to learners. Hence, according to Prodromou (1988), native speaker teachers are often ‘reluctant or unwitting ambassadors’ of their culture and “because of their uncritical projection of Anglo-American culture,” they have “failed to take local sensitivities into account” (p. 76). In other words, native English-speaking American teachers tend to serve as representatives or supporters of their language and culture without fully understanding the language and culture of their learners. As a consequence, learning English can result in learning the cultures of English-speaking
countries, rather than learning to communicate in English within the learner’s own cultural framework. This may lead to a clash between the culture represented in English textbooks and the local cultures in countries where English is learned as a second or foreign language. Phillipson (1992) views this spread of English as ‘linguistic imperialism,’ meaning that the dominance of English is maintained by the structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages. Even in a homogeneous country such as Hong Kong where most people speak Cantonese, English is used as a language of social and economic prestige (Pennycook, 1994).

While researchers have studied the impact of the learning and teaching of English on other cultures, research has predominantly been focused on former colonies of English-speaking countries such as Singapore, India, and Hong Kong. Relatively less research can be found on Asian countries in the Expanding Circle which have never experienced colonialism by English-speaking countries and where English is spoken as a foreign language.

2.4. The Expanding Circle: English in East Asia

In East Asia (e.g., China, Japan, and Taiwan), English is spoken as a foreign language.

3 For discussions on China, see Cheng, 1992; Yong & Campbell, 1995; for discussions on Japan, see World Englishes Vol. 14, 1, 1995; and for discussions on Korea, see Baik, 1992; 1994; Shim, 1999.
language or used mainly for international communication. However, the demand for
English has been rapidly growing, although it still has not attained the institutionalized
status that it has in countries such as India and the Philippines (see Zhou & Feng, 1987).
The spread of English has continued into East Asia where it has achieved a prestigious
status over other languages.

2.4.1 English in China, Taiwan, and Japan

In recent years, the massive spread of English has extended into East Asian
countries such as China, Japan, and Taiwan. China has the largest number of teachers and
learners of English as a foreign language in the Expanding Circle (Crystal, 1985). As
Pride & Liu (1988) point out,

English is not used in administration or courts of law. It is learned primarily in a
school situation and very few people can reach a high standard. In spite of the
number of people involved in learning English, there is no English-speaking
community; nor does English serve as a lingua franca among the nation’s ethnic
groups (p. 49).

Although English is used primarily for international communication, English has had a
huge influence on China since the ‘open door’ policy was adopted in 1978. Chinese
people come into contact with English in their daily lives, ranging from street signs to
television programs (J. Kang, 1999).

Additionally, Huang (1999) observes that one of the reasons for the spread of
English in China is China’s integration into world markets as a result of its growing economic power. As demands for international communication in business are increasing, the importance of knowing business English has also increased. Before the 1980s, the model for the teaching of English was British English; however, in the last two decades American English has become more popular because of China’s closer ties with the USA (Wang, 1999).

Thus, English has now become one of the major subjects taught in middle schools and high schools in China. English also plays a key role in the college entrance examination that all students have to take to enter a national university, with over 2.5 million students taking it in 1995. Students may attend private schools offering English and/or learn it at home from English lessons broadcast on TV (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996).

Although the demands for people able to communicate in English have been increasing in China, English language classrooms there continue to be dominated by audio-lingual and teacher-centered grammar translation methods in reality (Campbell & Yong, 1993). Thus utilization of the methods of Communicative Language Teaching is currently a challenge because of long entrenched traditional ways of teaching (e.g., teacher- and textbook-centered classroom, form-focused teaching) (see Campbell & Yong, 1993; Wu, 2001; Yu, 2001).
In 1949, when Mainland China came under communist control, three million Chinese moved to Taiwan. Since this period, contact with English has become more widely spread in Taiwan than before for two reasons: “close economic, cultural and political ties between Taiwan and the U.S.A.”, and “compulsory education for people aged six to fifteen” (Hsu, 1994, p. 55). Hsu (1994) states that because of close ties with the U.S., American English has been accepted as the model to be followed in the teaching of English in Taiwan’s educational system.

Like China, Taiwan has also experienced a mismatch between classroom practices and learners’ needs (Wang, 2002). For example, the grammar-translation method is still prevalent, although the educational system has attempted to incorporate more communicative approaches in the teaching of English. Therefore, the non-academic domain for the teaching of English has become popular. Thousands of private language institutes offer English classes for adults and children as young as three. Over a dozen magazines are published concerning the teaching of English and there are currently three bilingual newspapers in circulation in Taiwan (Huang, 2001).

The spread of English reached Japan, which is geographically isolated, as well as racially homogeneous like China and Korea. More and more loanwords have been used since the Meiji Restoration in 1868, when Japan opened its doors to Western civilization.
Like other East Asian countries, English is taught as a core subject in middle schools and high schools in Japan. English started to be taught in 24,000 primary public schools beginning in the third grade in 2002 (see Honna, 2001). Besides this, thousands of English language schools are available for English learners outside the public educational system. As Koike and Tanaka (1995) point out, Japan’s rapid economic growth has also accelerated the demands for learning English, creating new social needs and educational expectations. In 1992, Japan’s GNP reached “a little over 4.3 trillion US dollars, the second largest in the world, next to the USA” (p. 14).

Exposure to English is not limited to formal education; English also occurs because of the media. Japan has four daily English newspapers and English learners can listen to and/or watch English instructional programs on the radio and TV (Tanaka, 1995). Some scholars view this diffusion of English as a non-neutral phenomenon (Kubota, 1998; Tsuda, 1994) representing the linguistic and cultural inequality between Japan and the West. That is, the diffusion of English also spreads Anglo-American cultural values and beliefs throughout the world (Phillipson, 1992). These studies reflect how English has had a considerable impact on Japanese society and people’s lives. American English is especially more popular than other varieties of English which is supported by the fact
that Chiba et al. (1995) found that Japanese university students show their preference for American English over other varieties of English.

In the next sections, I discuss the impact of English on South Korea, which adopted Western civilization later than China and Japan.

2.4.2. English in Korea

South Korea (henceforth Korea), where English is used as the most important foreign language in various domains (Jung & Min, 1999), is not immune to the globalization of English. English is now taught more widely than any other foreign language whether in public schools, private language schools, or the Korean media. It has gained such a prestigious status that education and job markets place a large amount of emphasis on having proficiency in English (Shim, 1994). As Crystal (1997) points out, American English tends to be more popular and widely learned in Korea since the entrance of U.S. military and economic forces in the twentieth century. For example, a close look at Korean TV instructional language programs will enable us to realize the importance of learning English. On the Educational Broadcasting System (EBS), a national television and radio station, English is taught as the dominant foreign language (Table 2.1). In this table, the term ‘English’ tends to refer to ‘American English.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Number of foreign languages broadcast for adult learners on EBS in Korea
(Source: http://www.ebs.co.kr: March, 2003)

However, this phenomenon did not arise in a vacuum; rather it is interdependent
with historical background. In the next section, a historical review of contact with
English—especially American English—in Korea is presented.

2.4.2.1. The historical context of contact with English in Korea

The three languages that have had the greatest impact on Korean are Chinese,
Japanese, and English (Baik, 1992). Chinese was borrowed and used before the Korean
writing system, *Hangul*, was invented in 1446. Chinese loanwords have been used with
Korean pronunciations along with Korean words since then. The Japanese influence then
started with the Japanese colonial rule over Korea. During this Japanese imperialistic
period (1910-1945), foreign languages were first incorporated into the school system
(Park, 1992). In a later period, Japanese was the medium of instruction in Korean schools
as Japan attempted to “disseminate a Japanese identity among its colonial subjects through education and language” (Baik, 1992, p. 19).

K. Jung (1998) provides a historical account of the ‘contact and convergence’ of English in Korea based on three phases: The First Phase (1800s to 1945), The Second Phase (1945-1985), and The Third Phase (after 1986). Korea opened its door to Westerners for social and political reasons in 1882, when Korea signed its first foreign treaty with the United States. At that time, Western cultures had already infiltrated Korea’s neighbors such as China and Japan. Pae (1967) describes the period between 1885 and 1919 as the first period in which there was an influx of English into Korea and points out that “many scientific terms and words connected with home life” (p.3) were introduced to Korea during this time. As Western language and culture were introduced, education inevitably changed to meet this new demand and influx of Western culture.

Park (1992) summarizes the educational changes in this period:

At these government-run schools, they taught not only English but also geography, history and other content areas through the medium of English. Thus students were forced to either swim or sink in a sea of English for the duration of the school day, which was also taught along similar lines at a number of private schools founded by American Christian missionaries, notably at Payjay School for Boys and Ewha School for Girls (p. 150)

The newly established schools by American missionaries were the primary agents for the
spread of English in Korea (Jung, 1998).

However, this reform was interrupted by the forceful annexation of Korea by the Japanese in 1910. During this Japanese imperialistic period (1910-1945), often called the “dark period” in Korean history (Jung, 1998, p. 17), Japanese was the sole official medium of instruction and Korean was relegated to a language of the home. In this period, English was taught in secondary schools mostly to prepare students for college entrance examinations; therefore, students became passive recipients of Western culture—as well as Japanese—absorbed through textbooks. This was the period when the grammar-translation method was born in Korea (Park, 1992), a method which is still popular in Korean classrooms.

During the Second Phase (1945-1985), as soon as Korea was emancipated from Japan in 1945, the U.S. Liberation Army rushed into Korea and set up the American Military Government in 1945\(^4\). At that time, Americans and English-speaking Koreans who were appointed by Americans occupied all governmental positions to facilitate effective communication. In addition, the Korean War (1950-1953) contributed to increased contact with the United States and at the same time resulted in the increased practical and political value of English. In this way, “English became the language of

\(^4\) This government lasted until 1948.
power; it was the language of liberators” (Baik, 1995, p. 122).

In the post-war period of the 1940s and 1950s, a number of American military personnel and civilians came to Korea to teach English, which was the primary source for the ‘native-speaker resources,’ although limited and unprofessional, as Park (1992) points out. Park (*ibid*) also notes that a number of Korean teachers and professors received education and training in the United States, a situation which is still in effect. The situation for English education changed beginning in the 1960s, as the Korean government tried to establish a solid foundation for the teaching of English in the public educational system. In the 1960s and 1970s, U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers also added to the spread of English in Korea. They taught English throughout all levels of the Korean educational system (Jung, 1998). Also, during this period, English was taught as a required course in middle and high schools and during the first year of college (Baik, 1995).

Another powerful agent for the delivery of English was the American Forces Korea Network (AFKN), which was broadcast for U.S soldiers stationed in Korea. This TV channel not only provided a variety of programs, but also served as a medium for Koreans learning ‘real’ English (Shim, 1994).

Finally, the Third Phase emerged with international sports events such as the
Asian Games (in 1986) and Seoul Olympics (in 1988), events which served to accelerate the perceived importance of English as an international language. As Baik (1994) observes, during this period, “the Korean public…began to feel an urgent need to learn and speak English” and this atmosphere developed “into the desire to attain the identity of a ‘modern,’ ‘sophisticated,’ ‘assertive,’ and ‘educated’ person that came with the ability to speak English” (p. 156). It was during this period, as Baik (1992) notes, that many American-educated Koreans also returned home taking with them American English and culture, forming an elite group in Korea, which facilitated the spread and impact of English. From this time onwards, English throughout Korean society became more widely and rapidly spread. As part of President Kim’s plan of “Globalization” to meet the needs of the 21st century in 1994, an early start to English education was proposed (Jung, 1998). In order to make a concrete step towards this plan for globalization, the Korean Ministry of Education decided that English should be taught beginning in elementary school—preferably the third grade (Kim, 1998) so that the students can learn English at the earlier age. During this period, English has become a more prestigious language in Korea than any other language, as the Korean economy has expanded into international areas and the demand for being able to communicate in English has increased.
2.4.2.2. Previous studies on the impact of English in Korea

Like many other countries, English has had an impact on the Korean language at many different levels of discourse. However, Korea has not been a research focus in terms of looking at the globalization of English, in spite of the fact that English has played an increasing role in Korea and is considered the most important foreign language there. Recently the impact of English and the ‘localized’ use of English in Korea have been the focus of discussion among Korean researchers (Baik, 1992, 1994, 1995; Jung, 1998; Lee, 1989; Pae, 1967; Shim, 1994, 1999).

Lee (1989) discusses how English grammar has affected the everyday use of Korean, pointing out several features of the ‘Englishization’ process: overuse of the plural marker, and use of past perfective, present progressive and passive forms that didn’t previously exist. For example, Koreans have begun overusing the plural marker ‘-tul,’ which is not an equivalent to the English plural ending ‘-s.’ That is, unlike English, it is not required to use plural markers in Korean if plurality is indicated by other items and the marker can be suffixed to various elements such as adverbs, complementizers, etc (see Song, 1997). The phenomenon is illustrated in example (1) below.

(1)  
swu mahn-un kwancem-tul  
number many-ATTR viewpoint-PL  
‘A number of viewpoints’  
[Adopted from Baik, 1994, p. 158]
Here, the plural suffix is redundant, since the plurality ‘swu mahnun’ (a number of) is already expressed. This may have been ungrammatical decades ago, but is now widely accepted and used because of the influence of English. Another example of how English has influenced Korean is the use of double past tense markings (e.g. ‘-essess’). This form is used to indicate the perfective aspect, which previously did not exist in Korean. Baik (1994) argues:

[I]t wasn’t until 1957 that a leading Korean linguist Choe Hyun-pae wrote Wrimalpon [our grammar] in which he asserted that the Korean language was not clear enough in partitioning time, and thus he advocated the use of twelve tenses in Korean as it was done in English (p. 158)

Therefore, the present progressive was also added to the Korean tense/aspect system.

Thus Koreans have grammaticalized ‘-oko issta’ (to be coming) to indicate “continuing some action from the past to the present” (Lee, 1989, p. 35).

The influence of English on Korean is not limited to the above-mentioned instances. Baik (1994) notes additional syntactic features of Korean that have changed as a result of the influence of English: pronouns and possessive determiners; causative constructions; multiple modifying clauses; word order, and more.

Shim (1994) also notes that use of English-mixed utterances in discourse has been increasing and “the trend is moving toward using English labeling” (p. 234) in the advertisements and English titles in movies and other popular media. In their study on the
nativization of the use of English in Korea, Jung and Min (1999) found that the frequency of the use of modal verbs of English being used in Korea is different from other varieties of English (American, British, and Australian English). They continued to compare the use of space as indicated by the prepositions ‘at’ and ‘in.’ Interestingly, these two prepositions were not used differently as they are in ‘Inner Circle’ English because of the interference of Korean, since the Korean locative post-positional ‘-ey’ can be used in all locations regardless of dimension-type, size and semantic differences based on the categories of Quirk et al (1985). In her study of the impact of English on the educational context, Shim (1999) examined English textbooks used in Korea. She provided some examples to show how ‘codified Korean English’ is different from American English at the level of lexico-semantic, morpho-syntactic, and pragmatic differences. For example, ‘day by day’ is used as a synonym for ‘daily’ or ‘everyday,’ which is not the case in American English (e.g., the weather is getting warmer day by day ≠ the weather is getting warmer daily/everyday). At the level of pragmatics, it is not uncommon to use a simple arithmetic formulation to make a comparison. Example (2), which is found in middle school English, is a prototypical example of this:

(2) [Shim, 1999, p. 255]

*What are you? = What do you do for a living?*
The implications of Shim’s study are significant in that most English teachers seem to believe that the standards for English education in Korea have been provided by American English as Choe (1996, p. 4) observes:

The formal policy of the Ministry of Education was and still is ‘the teacher is free to choose any variety of English; if she is good at British English, she may choose it to teach, and if she is good at American English, she may teach it.’ Over a half century of American presence in Korea has resulted in more than 99% of the Koreans teaching and speaking American English. [sic] (Cited in Shim, 1999, p. 247)

Although they believe that they are teaching American English, they are actually not since Korean English contains forms that don’t exist in American English.

Shim (1999) continues to argue that Korean students may experience a conflict between what is learned in school and what is tested (e.g., TOEFL), since what is ‘correct’ in school is not always accepted in English-speaking countries (i.e., norm-providing countries according to Kachru [1985]).

2.4.2.3. English education in Korea

Considering the historical background of English in Korea, it may be understandable for the society to place a strong emphasis on the teaching of English. While the need for competence in English is increasing in Korea, the opportunity to use English communicatively is limited, and contact with native speakers of English seems to
be minimal, since English education takes place in a non-English-speaking environment (Ellis, 1996). The teaching of English in Korean formal language classrooms, however, has long centered on the rather limited approaches of grammar translation and reading comprehension—especially in secondary schools (Kim, 1998), even though English is the most important foreign language taught in Korean schools. According to the 7th School Curriculum put together by the Ministry of Education (1997), students begin learning English in the third grade of elementary school (Table 2.2). In Table 2.2 below, the minimum number of total annual instructional hours by subject and grade level during the 34 school weeks in a year is indicated. In principle, one instructional hour equals 40 minutes for elementary schools, 45 minutes for middle schools, and 50 minutes for high schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Instruct. Hours/acc. Year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. The National Common Basic Curriculum (Foreign Languages: English) (Source: The 7th School Curriculum, Ministry of Education, 1997)

When students enter the 11th grade, they start to learn one of a number of foreign
languages as an elective, as well as English. The figures in parentheses in Table 2.3 are the numbers of units to be completed, and one unit means the amount of school learning undertaken within a 50 minute period of instruction per week over the course of one semester (equivalent to 17 weeks).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>National Common Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Elective Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>-English (8)</td>
<td>-English I (8 hrs/week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English Conversation (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English Reading Comprehension (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-German I (6 hrs/week)</td>
<td>-German II (6 hrs/week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-French I (  &quot;  )</td>
<td>-French II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Spanish I (  &quot;  )</td>
<td>-Spanish II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Chinese I (  &quot;  )</td>
<td>-Chinese II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Russian I (  &quot;  )</td>
<td>-Russian II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Arabic I (  &quot;  )</td>
<td>-Arabic II (  &quot;  )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. Elective Foreign Language Courses

As in Tables 2.2 and 2.3, EFL education in Korea has been controlled by the government (Roh, 2001). English is the only foreign language taught until the 10th grade. Other foreign languages begin to be taught in the second year of high school (i.e., 11th
grade) and students can learn one of the foreign languages listed above in addition to the required English courses.

Formal English education in Korea, like other East Asian countries mentioned in section 2.4.1, mainly focuses on grammar and reading comprehension. One of the reasons is the need for students to prepare for the college entrance examination. This exam, which in English could appropriately be termed the ‘College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT),’ comprises four core subjects (a Korean language section, a math section, a social and natural sciences section and a foreign language section) as well as one elective section for a second foreign language. More than 650,000 students took this exam during the 2003 academic year (Korea Herald, Nov 7, 2002). Interestingly, the ‘Foreign Language’ section actually only tests English proficiency, while the second foreign language section is optional. The English exam is mainly designed in such a way as to assess students’ abilities to decode texts on multiple-choice tests, focusing on grammar, reading comprehension, and translation items (Li, 1998). That is, most of the items on this exam involve reading comprehension questions in English; students are expected to have a strong, solid background in grammar and a keen ability to translate in order to be able to accurately interpret a text.

As Richards and Rogers (2001) summarize, this grammar translation emphasizes
a “detailed analysis of …grammar rules followed by application of this knowledge to the
task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language” (p. 5). On the
other hand, communicative competence includes pragmatic competence as well as
grammatical competence (Savignon, 2001). For Communicative Language Teaching
(CLT), it is important to incorporate authentic resources which are used in realistic
situations; however, it is not always feasible in EFL countries like Korea where students
have limited access to authentic materials and native speakers of English. Another issue is
that CLT also faces a conflict caused by different cultural values in Korea with regard to
teaching and learning contexts, since CLT originates from the “British language teaching
tradition dating from the late 1960s” (Richards & Rogers, 2001, p. 153).

While it is difficult to teach in a communicative way in the educational system in
Korea as well as China and Japan (e.g., Campbell & Yong, 1993; Li, 1998; Sano et al,
1984), a considerable number of private institutes and television programs have been
mushrooming to reach out to students who seek more communication-based language
learning. That is, students think they learn grammar and reading at school, but learn how
to speak English in an institute (Kim, 2000). Communicative instruction is impossible
given the current status of education in Korean secondary schools. According to the
Korea Herald (Oct. 15, 2001), a leading English newspaper in Korea, most English
teachers in Korea do not have enough proficiency to teach English classes in English.

“Less than 8 percent of Korean teachers of English in Seoul speak the language fluently⁵.” After evaluating 9,678 elementary and secondary school teachers, the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education stated that only 7.9 percent of teachers are able to run their classes completely in English.

Since the English educational system has been criticized for not preparing students to communicate in English, in 1997 the Korean public school system approved the introduction of instruction in English beginning in the third grade of elementary school as a way to participate in the ‘globalization age⁶.’ Kim (1998) argues against this decision claiming that it is mainly based on “the early start fallacy” (Phillipson 1992) and “Critical Period Hypothesis” (see Lenneberg, 1967; Johnson & Newport, 1989). In other words, it is assumed that the earlier the children learn English, the better, since language acquisition becomes more difficult after puberty. Kim points out that it is not appropriate to simply follow “success stories in foreign countries” since they have different linguistic environments in terms of English; ESL versus EFL (p. 244).

⁵ This study is based on questionnaires distributed to elementary and secondary schools. Elementary school teachers were rated the best with a competence rate of 11.7 percent. Junior high schools teachers and high school teachers were rated with a competence rate of 3.9 percent and 2.9 percent respectively.

2.4.2.4. English teaching through the media

As an alternative to classroom learning, the media have produced a number of television programs to teach foreign languages, including English. English makes up the largest number of language programs broadcast in Korea as can be seen in Table 2.1. This table is reintroduced for convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Number of foreign languages broadcast for adult learners on EBS in Korea

Park (1992) observes this trend as follows:

The mass media are playing an increasingly important role in Korean foreign-language education today. Foreign-language teaching by broadcast, especially by television, began in earnest [sic] in Korea in the late 70s and early 80s with sizable programming not just for English but for Japanese, Chinese, German, French, and Spanish. Since 1989, Russian has joined the ranks of TV-taught foreign languages in Korea. Conducted by eminent professors in tandem with native speakers of the languages in question, these programs provide viewers-learners with first-rate instruction in and exposure to those languages. For this reason, these programs are popular especially with a high-brow viewership comprising college students and college graduates with a keen desire to improve their foreign-language proficiency (p. 153).
These TV programs can provide learners with the opportunity to watch and/or listen to native speakers interact on television. In other words, while there are few native speakers of English in the classroom, television provides an alternative way of learning English in a different setting from the traditional classroom, using multi-media. In fact, program designers have attempted to go far beyond grammar-based instruction apparently. First, these programs generally include skits presenting more situated communication between native speakers, such as conversations in a store, bank, or college cafeteria. This approach appears to try to focus on more functional aspects of language learning, that is, how to communicate appropriately in a particular context and to achieve a particular end (Savignon, 1997). The programs also tend to select a theme (e.g., communication in a hotel) and try to provide consistent information about that theme throughout a certain period. Second, interaction frequently appears in the show--sometimes between the Korean and English-speaking hosts, sometimes in a skit and the programs also provide the audience with the opportunity to listen to the different voices of English speakers living in Korea (e.g., EFL teachers, Korean language students, and businessmen) to develop their listening skills. Third, cultural factors are incorporated in the content of the teaching. For example, the Korean host often asks the English-speaking hosts about life
in the United States. It is also the case that the two cultures (e.g., between Korea and the United States) are compared and contrasted.

In short, television programs can provide a variety of authentic resources for the teaching of English, using vivid images, sounds, cultural events, and a wide range of linguistic structures spanning multiple registers, although there are limitations for communication-based teaching in the classroom setting.

Grammar-based English education in Korea has limitations in preparing learners to communicate meaningfully in real situations. As a result, the notion of communicative competence (Hymes, 1971) has achieved ascendancy in the goals of second and foreign language pedagogy, and attention to interaction with English speakers has increased in Korea. Thus, a growing number of television programs in Korea have included interactions with native speakers (e.g., in the skits). In addition, an irrational level of respect for English and its native speakers is prevalent in Korea. As Kim (1998) points out:

Korean people tend to blindly think that native speakers of English are more helpful and better than Korean teachers. Many private institutes have more foreigners than Korean teachers to teach English since parents want their children to be taught by foreigners with the vague expectation that they will learn more about English from foreign teachers than from Korean teachers (p. 250).

English now has become a great commodity to be possessed even from early childhood.
Korean parents’ concern for making their children competent English speakers is not limited to just formal education within Korea. The following two news articles released by the *Los Angeles Times* indicate the strong eagerness that exists to learn English in Korea. Some ‘blind’ parents bring their children to a plastic surgeon to have a tongue operation, since they believe it will help their children pronounce all the difficult tongue-teasers for Asians. (*Los Angeles Times*, Mar. 31, 2002). In the article, one of the hosts of a popular English language show on Educational Broadcasting System (EBS) remarked, “learning English is almost the national religion” in Korea. More active parents fly to the United States to give birth to their babies in order to obtain U.S. citizenship (*Los Angeles Times*, May 25, 2002). Their motivations are to have their children be well-educated and members of the upper-class in the United States. This craze for English and education in the United States does not occur by chance; rather, it is closely intertwined with cultural, social, and political motivation, as Pennycook (1994) argues. English is not just a neutral language learned for the purpose of communication, but it is a commodity that Korean people are eager to possess in order to be more successful.

2.5. Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the spread of English and its impact throughout
various areas in East Asian countries (e.g., business, education, and media). The direction of the spread of English seems to be obvious: from the Inner Circle to the Outer Circle, and finally to the Expanding Circle. However, the role of English may not fully be presented simply based on three circles. Although it is spoken and taught in school as one of the foreign languages in Korea just like China, Taiwan, and Japan, English has the most prestigious status and serves as an important commodity for success. Therefore, learning English is a necessity not only for international communication such as business and travel, but also for admission to college and promotion in the company within Korean society. As long as English maintains power and dominance, people will strive to be able to use it with the belief that the closer they are to being able to speak like a native speaker, the more rewards they will reap.
CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Description of the Data

Given the number and frequency of English language instructional television programs broadcast in Korea, two of the most popular instructional English TV programs were randomly selected for this study: ‘Survival English’ and ‘TV English Conversation’. In these programs, the Korean host and the native English speaking co-hosts lead the programs using a variety of segments to motivate their English-learning TV viewers. To provide a fuller picture of these programs, it may be necessary to present the structure of each of the television shows under investigation.

3.1.1 Survival English

Survival English is primarily designed to provide the oral communication skills that learners of basic English need. From the time the show first aired until January, 2003, Survival English was broadcast 20 min/day twice a week. Since February, 2003, it has been airing every day, Monday through Friday.

Figure 3.1 presents an overview of this show, in which the Korean host (male), who is leading the overall program, and a native speaker (female), who is supporting him, 

---

7 This show is also called ‘Yenge Swiweyo’ ‘English is easy.’
8 The Korean host holds a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from a U.S. university.
interact with each other. The program begins with a brief introduction to the day’s theme and moves to an enactment of the day’s skit which consists of two or three parts. After watching each part of the skit, the Korean host (K) points out some useful expressions (e.g., “all set,” and “pull over”) and provides Korean translations for them, followed by the English-speaking (ES) host’s brief summary of what is happening in the segment.

While K explains the expressions or situations, he frequently has a short conversation in English with the ES host in this session. After that, the full skit is presented again--this time with English subtitles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>K starts with introduction (Korean).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief summary of today’s skit</td>
<td>ES briefly explains the context of the day’s skit (English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Full skit without English subtitles (English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skit is divided into two segments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After first or second part of skit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief summary</td>
<td>ES briefly explains what is going on (English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>1. K points out useful expressions and translates into Korean (Korean).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. There is a short conversation with K and ES (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full skit with English subtitles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s phrase</td>
<td>ES presents today’s’ phrase ‘I wonder if~’, explaining the meaning through examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three short skits containing today’s phrase--without subtitles first and then with subtitles later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((Go-for-it)) –Role play by Korean entertainer, ES, and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>K points out students’ errors and suggests ‘model’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expressions. A short conversation with ES is frequently added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model conversation between ESs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing comment</td>
<td>K closes the show (short conversation with ES could be added).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1. Sample sequence of *Survival English*[^9]

After the full skit, ES introduces “Today’s phrase” (e.g., “I wonder if…” or “I am going to…”[^10]) and explains its meaning by using it in example sentences. Three short skits containing different situations are shown again, first without English subtitles and then with subtitles.

“Go-for-it”[^10] is a kind of spontaneous, unscripted role-play session in which Korean students act as “challengers” who help a foreigner to do something related to the day’s theme. Here, the “challengers” are asked to serve as translators between a Korean actor and an English speaker. After this role-play, K, the Korean host, points out the challenger’s grammatical problems and misused expressions and suggests more appropriate ones. Again, K has a short conversation with ES, if necessary, to confirm the appropriateness of his intuitions and proposed corrections. Built on the spontaneous errors made by the Korean challengers, a model conversation between English speakers

[^9]: This particular show in which the theme of the day was ‘Going to the post office’ was broadcast on 5/10/99.
[^10]: This type of role play has some variations, such as ‘Survival Cam’ and ‘I Can Do it’, but they basically share the same format and philosophy.
is then enacted. The show ends with K’s closing comment. It is important to remember that the segments are not fixed, so the program tends to be revised and expanded as time goes on.

3.1.2 *TV English Conversation* (‘*TV Yenge hoyhwa*’)

The other program under investigation is ‘*TV Yenge hoyhwa*’ (henceforth, *TV English Conversation*), which is designed for learners with more advanced proficiency than *Survival English*. It is broadcast twice a week for twenty minutes.

In this program, a Korean host leads the show with two other English-speaking co-hosts (both female and male). Figure 3.2 illustrates the organization of the segments of this program based on a broadcast from November 2, 2000. The theme for that particular day’s lesson was “Meeting someone’s parents.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>K starts with introduction and ES opens the day’s theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English in Cinema: Presentation of the movie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clip entitled ‘There’s something about Mary’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 The Korean host, who has ‘native-like’ competence, holds a Master’s degree from the Graduate School of Simultaneous Translation in Korea and is now pursuing a Ph.D. in English Education at a large Korean university.
Explanation | K and ESs have a short conversation about the movie clip in English and then K gives a short explanation about the conversation. K goes on to ask ESs about American life.

Movie clip is divided into two segments

The first segment is played twice: first without subtitles and then with subtitles.

Explanation | ES gives a general idea about the scene in English and K explains what ES says in Korean.

The second segment is played twice: first without subtitles and then with subtitles.

Explanation | ES gives a general idea about the scene in English and K explains what ES says in Korean.

The whole clip is played again with English subtitles.

Today's dialogue

Key expressions | Before acting out a skit, ESs present key expressions with explanations in English and K explains in Korean.

Presentation of today’s dialogue—a whole skit is acted out.

Explanation | ES gives background in English and ES does in Korean.

The skit is divided into two segments.

Presentation of first/second segments: first without subtitles and then with subtitles

ES explains what is presented in the clip.

Closing comments | K and ES have a short conversation related to the theme and close the program

Q & A | ES and K select a question from a viewer and ES provides an answer to the question about the English expression (e.g. difference between ‘account for’ and ‘explain’ or idiomatic expressions).

Figure 3.2. Sample sequence of TV English Conversation

In TV English Conversation, a movie clip called “English in Cinema” is used to incorporate a cultural component related to the day’s theme (i.e., ‘Meeting someone’s
parents’). Every time the clip is presented, the ES hosts explain the background of the clip and the Korean host explains in Korean what the ES hosts have said, focusing on useful expressions and grammatical structures.

Following this clip, a skit is presented where English speakers interact in a certain situation. For example, in this particular skit, a daughter introduces her boyfriend to her parents. After the skit, the ES host again provides a general background of what the participants are talking about in the skit and then the Korean host translates and explains it in Korean. Finally, a ‘Q&A’ section is designed to provide an appropriate answer to a question selected by a viewer. Typically, the questions consist of anything from, ‘How do you say A in English?’ to, ‘What’s the difference between A and B?’

Although every year the sequence and content of the above programs changes to provide more variety, the basic format and the interactions between the Korean host and the English-speaking co-hosts have remained the same.

In this section I have described the data for my study and have explained the structure of the two TV programs. In terms of the methodological framework that was employed for this study, discourse analysis (DA) is the primary tool used for analyzing the data. I will also discuss how the idea of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (an extended area of DA) is a relevant tool for my study.
3.2. Discourse analysis (DA) as a methodological tool

Discourse Analysis (DA), which serves as the primary methodological framework for analyzing the data in my study, can help to uncover a wealth of information concerning how language—both English and Korean—is used in a particular context (i.e., English TV instructional programs). Closer observation of the TV data through DA may help us to identify recurring patterns of language use beyond the sentence level.

3.2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse is not simply a collection of isolated sentences, but a set of inherently contextualized units of language use. In other words, natural language always occurs in a context and thus is context-specific. It would not be possible to provide a full account of language use in isolated sentences since an analysis of discourse cannot be limited to a description of surface linguistic forms separate from the purposes and functions that the forms are designed to serve.

Discourse Analysis (DA) can deal with a wide range of problems and phenomena in a systematic way, since this method helps to identify recurring patterns of language use beyond the sentence level (see Brown & Yule, 1983; Schiffrin, 1994; van Dijk, 1985).
That is, DA is a useful tool for analyzing the functions and forms of language from a functional perspective using actual data and large stretches of discourse (e.g., Chafe, 1994; Coulthard, 1994; McCarthy, 1998; Ochs, Scheglof & Thomson, 1996; Strauss, 2002). In short, DA is a useful data-driven methodology meant to help discover patterns of language use.

It is also not possible to analyze data separately from their context, since the way language is used is inherently related to certain social contexts (Gee, 1999; Halliday, 1978; Hatch, 1992; Stubbs, 1983). For example, the participants in the TV shows of the present study are not only individuals, but also members of a certain culture and society. Therefore, this type of analysis can reveal invisible aspects (e.g., assumptions, cultural values, etc.) of the participants through visible items, i.e., observable language use.

As I pointed out earlier, DA possesses a number of strengths for examining a wide range of data taken from many different types of communicative events, e.g., any type of spoken text such as conversations, TV shows, interviews, narratives, teaching and learning interactions, and even any type of written text (e.g., Coulthard, 1994). In sum, DA is a methodology that can be used to answer many kinds of questions by examining aspects of the structure and functions of language in use (Johnstone, 2002).

Although discourse analysis does not, in and of itself, consist of a single type of
methodological framework, its overall usefulness makes it crucial to this study. In addition to DA, I also use transcription conventions from Conversational Analysis (CA) to explicate interaction and language use in my data. These are exceptionally useful in capturing prosodic features, such as intonation and pauses. For a micro-level analysis, it is necessary to transcribe in such a way that this type of rich information is captured.

3.2.2 Toward Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

‘Critical discourse analysis’ is primarily concerned with more ‘critical’ approaches to language use that take into account social problems such as power, dominance, and inequality (see Fairclough, 1989, 1995a; Pennycook, 2001; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; van Dijk, 1993, 2001). When we call an approach ‘critical,’ it is “a recognition that our social practice in general and our language use in particular are bound up with causes and effects” in spite of our unawareness “under normal conditions” (Bourdieu, 1977, cited in Fairclough, 1995b, p. 54). For example, it is not always clear to TV viewers what the underlying values and beliefs of the television participants are. A close examination of their language use enables us to discern their ideologies and philosophies, which may not be discovered simply by watching the TV program.

Fairclough (1995a) distinguishes ‘critical’ from ‘descriptive’ goals in discourse
analysis studies by pointing out that the main goal of descriptive DA is to describe the status quo first, and then later to apply academic findings to practical problems (Johnstone, 2002). However, this description-based analysis tends to provide a rather ‘limited’ explanation of the world. Therefore, it may not provide a full explanation of the relationship between language use and society.

Critical discourse analysis, on the other hand, “rejects ‘value free’ science” arguing that science is “inherently influenced by social structure and produced in social interaction.” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). Thus, the major concern of CDA is not with the immediate situation that descriptive discourse analysis pursues, but rather with the “social institution and social formation” (Fairclough, 1995a, p. 43). In other words, CDA seeks to disclose underlying ideologies by analyzing uses of language, whether visible or hidden, which may be closely indicative of the broader social relationships of dominance and inequality. In short, as Fairclough (1995a, p. 36) notes ‘critique’ is “essentially making visible the interconnectedness of things.”

For CDA, the primary goal is to bridge the gap between micro-level and macro-level analysis (Fairclough, 1995a; van Dijk, 1990; 2001). This means that a greater level of ideology can be made visible by performing micro-level or linguistic analyses. Pennycook (2001) suggests that one of the important challenges critical applied
linguistics faces is to find ways to link micro- and macro-level relations. In everyday life, ideological values are ‘naturalized,’ since ideology is represented “from the perspective of a particular interest so that the relationship between proposition and fact is not transparent” (Fairclough, 1995a, p. 44). That is, at the surface level language tends to be used in ways which are taken-for-granted; however, it can also be used to maintain dominant values for the sake of dominant groups. Therefore, according to Fairclough (ibid), it is necessary to uncover the invisible ideologies of the dominant class through the process of ‘denaturalization’. Ideologies in discourse cannot be simply read directly from the text unless we carefully consider “patterns and variations in the social distribution, consumption, and interpretation of the text” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 28).

3.2.3 Why critical discourse analysis?

In CDA, ‘discourse’ is generally used to refer in the common linguistic sense to language use and ‘ideology’ is generally used to refer to a particular framework of knowledge that is closely tied to social power as it may manifest itself in language; therefore, the goal of CDA is to examine language use for indications of ideology (Pennycook, 2001). That is, if we look at the recurrent patterns represented in discourse, ideologies become more visible. As Oktar (2001) defines it, ‘the basic sense of ideology
is the system of ideas, beliefs, values, attitudes and categories by reference to which a person, a group, or a society perceives, comprehends, and interprets the world’ (pp. 313-314). Ideology is also a “systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view” (Hodge & Kress, 1993, p. 6) thus illustrating the relationship between linguistic structures and ideological manifestations. In sum, underlying ideologies can be associated with language use and thus language clearly plays a significant role in the reproduction of ideologies, since it is used by different social groups.

Language use, text, talk and communication...are needed and used by group members to learn, acquire, change, confirm, articulate, as well as to persuasively convey ideologies to other ingroup members, to inculcate them in novices, defend them against (or conceal them from) outgroup members or to propagate them among those who are (as yet) the infidels. In sum, if we want to know what ideologies actually look like, how they work, and how they are created, changed and reproduced, we need to look closely at their discursive manifestations [emphasis original] (van Dijk, 1998, p. 6).

Thus, ideologies are the shared knowledge or assumptions of social groups, which are mostly taken for granted in the name of common sense. However, we can discern these underlying ideologies through recurrent linguistic features or patterns.

For example, Baik (1995) calls attention to the fact that events which are described as “disturbances,” “insurrections,” or “riots” could be regarded as “democratic
movements” or “struggles for freedom and democracy” from different points of view. He continues to provide examples to demonstrate how language can reflect underlying political power structures. For example, the Korean government portrayed the event that occurred in Kwangju in 1980 as the ‘Kwangju Riot’ and the citizens who participated were called ‘rioters’; however, the event is now accepted as the ‘Kwangju Democratization Movement.’

Another example of how power structures can be expressed through language use is how Japanese history textbooks officially have depicted its invasion and colonization of other Asian countries before the end of World War II (Baik, 1995). The word used in Japanese official knowledge are “advances” for “a ‘New Order’ in East Asia” and for the creation of “the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere” (Peattie, 1984, p.123). Several governments of Asian countries (e.g., China, Malaysia, North Korea, South Korea) have, for the past several decades, expressed their concern in such “distortions” of history and have demanded a correction to the Japanese official knowledge (Baik, 1995, p. 85).

For CDA it is important to incorporate linguistic analysis as CDA also depends on linguistic categories such as turn takings, speech acts, topic choice, repairs, lexical style, etc. (Meyer, 2001) to provide explanatory foundations for macro-level social problems.

For instance, one linguistic feature is how pronouns are used in political discourse. A speaker can use ‘we’ to refer to multiple “ingroups,” such as ‘we, in the Western World,’

---

12 Fairclough calls it ‘form and texture’ at the textual level and Wodak calls it forms of linguistic realization (Meyer, 2001).
or ‘we Dutch people,’ or ‘we White Dutch people,’ etc (van Dijk, 2000, p. 95). In addition to the use of pronouns, CDA researchers also examine different types of linguistics patterns such as nominalizations, the use of voices (passive vs. active), modality and so forth (see Fairclough, 1989; Meyer, 2001; van Dijk, 2000).

3.2.4 TV programs as media discourse

This study examines English instructional programs broadcast on Korean television. Hosted by a Korean and one or two native speaker(s) of English, these television shows are designed mainly for adult language learners who wish to learn and practice their oral communication skills. However, these television programs are ‘deficient’ in such a way that the TV participants can provide no direct communication between the hosts and the TV viewers (Fairclough, 1995b, p. 37)13. This means that the TV viewers cannot directly contribute to the TV program. Fairclough (1995b) also notes that the media have tried to ‘mediate between the public and private domains’ (p. 37). In other words, the Korean learners watching these programs at home receive what is taught and presented. Knowledge and information are transmitted from the English-speaking (ES) and Korean hosts into the cognitive domains of the viewers—through the television.

---

13 Thompson (1990) also called this feature of media discourse “mediated quasi-interaction.”
Unlike in face-to-face situations, this type of English instruction cannot provide the learners with opportunities to negotiate meaning; therefore, learners simply absorb the input as recipients—especially in the case of native speaker input. Since the audience is unknown in the media, the program designers produce the TV shows based on what is expected by English learners in Korea.

…producers postulate and construct ‘ideal’ audiences partly on the basis of guesses about audience response drawn from experience and various types of indirect evidence (such as programme ratings or market research). There is much debate in this connection about questions of manipulation, cultural domination and imperialism (especially where the cultural gap between producer and audience is wide), and ideology (Fairclough, 1995b p. 40).

Therefore, the media reflect the expectations of the TV viewers; at the same time, the program designers teach the TV viewers what they guess is important. Thus, these programs are not unrelated to the ideologies and assumptions of the viewers vis-à-vis the English teaching/learning ideologies that are common to the Korean society. In the English instructional programs under investigation, the ES and Korean hosts lead the program together, although the roles of the two hosts seem to be different. The ES hosts speak only English, while the Korean hosts speak Korean to the audience—except when they have a conversation with the ES hosts. The presence of a native speaker on TV does not occur by chance. It is a reflection of the desires of the Korean learners, in a sense.
This means that Korean learners of English strongly wish to receive input from a native speaker, since they tend to believe that native speakers are the only legitimate authentic users of English.

Although interactions with the native speaker manifests themselves at the surface level in the form of casual conversation, the underlying goal for the Korean host is to receive a confirmation check from the native speaker, who is known as the only person to have legitimate and ‘authentic’ access to the language. This interaction may sound straightforward and transparent like a mundane conversation between two parties. However, we cannot fully understand the way language is being used in this interaction without considering the asymmetric relationship between the native speaker (who has the power to provide a commodity named ‘English’) and the non-native speaker (who does not). Analysis of recurrent linguistic patterns enables us to more deeply examine the underlying ideologies and assumptions that consistently appear in these TV programs.

3.3 Data and Methodology

The data for this study consist of twenty episodes from the two most popular English instructional television programs currently broadcast on the Korean national educational channel (i.e., ten from each show): Survival English and TV English
Conversation. In these shows, the program designers select a theme for that month or day.

The themes of the show are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survival English</th>
<th>TV English Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Apartment hunting</td>
<td>-Christmas gift giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Buying computers</td>
<td>-Divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Deposits and withdrawals in the bank</td>
<td>-English education in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dining in the restaurant</td>
<td>-Interests and personal preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dorm life</td>
<td>-Just around the corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Health</td>
<td>-Living in apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Housewarming party</td>
<td>-Meeting boy/girlfriend’s parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Going to the beauty salon</td>
<td>-TV commercials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Going to the post office</td>
<td>-University life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Renting a car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3. Themes of the two TV shows: Survival English and TV English Conversation

As can be seen in the figure above, Survival English tends to focus on issues directly related to the prototypical life in English-speaking countries, while TV English Conversation tends to deal with the more abstract concepts of culture, which may also be related to the level of proficiency of the target audiences.

In these TV shows, a variety of participants are involved: male and female Korean hosts, and male and female native English-speaking hosts. These shows also contain different genres of discourse including face-to-face interactions in the skit or in the studio, instructional talks, and movie clips. They tend to focus on English oral communication
skills for adult language learners residing in Korea, rather than emphasizing traditional
grammar-oriented instruction. All data for this study were randomly selected from
broadcasts between 1999 and 2002 and are romanized according to the Yale System and
transcribed in accordance with the transcription conventions of Conversation Analysis
(see Atkinson & Heritage, 1984 for a more detailed description). These transcription
conventions are exceptionally useful in capturing precisely how utterances are delivered,
including salient prosodic features such as intonation and pauses. In addition, relevant
nonverbal behavior was included in the transcription, especially such features as hand
gestures, eye gaze, and pointing to objects, since nonverbal expressions can also indicate
culturally embedded messages.

A closer and more thorough examination of how language is used in these TV
programs reveals not only the content and linguistic forms (i.e., morphosyntax,
phonology, idioms, etc.) considered to be important or necessary for the learner; it also
reveals stances of the program designers as well as the hosts vis-à-vis issues of degree of
difficulty, usefulness, accuracy, native norms or standards, and the overall goals of the
learners.

For the micro-level examination, tokens of the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘you’ have been
highlighted and coded to look at how they are used by both the Korean and ES hosts. The
following table shows the number of tokens appearing in the dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean hosts</th>
<th>English-speaking hosts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overt ‘we’</td>
<td>167 (Eng: 46, Kor: 121)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null ‘we’</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt ‘you’</td>
<td>99 (Eng: 59, Kor: 40)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null ‘you’</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 'we':</td>
<td>We: 303</td>
<td>You: 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ‘you’:</td>
<td>We: 116</td>
<td>You: 186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Number of tokens: the personal pronouns ‘we’ and ‘you’

The Korean pronouns have also been categorized into overt ‘we’ and null ‘we,’ since sentences lacking subjects are frequently used. These will be discussed in depth in Chapter 4.

In addition to their use of pronouns, the hosts frequently use so-called ‘equivalency-signaling’ verbs (ESVs) such as ‘to mean’ when they explain the meaning of the words or expressions used in these programs. While the ES hosts only use two kinds of ESVs: to mean and to be, the Korean hosts use four different types: uymi-ita (meaning-COP), ttus-ita (meaning-COP), mal-ita (word-COP), and yayki/iytaki-ita (story-COP), all of which translate as ‘to mean.’ The following figure gives a breakdown of the number of tokens of ESVs.

\footnote{For overt ‘we’ only the collective ‘you’ ‘yele pwun’ is used.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESVs</th>
<th>Korean hosts</th>
<th>ES hosts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Uymi-ita</em>: 9</td>
<td>To mean: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ttus-ita</em>: 110</td>
<td>To be: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mal-ita</em>: 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Yayki/iyaki-ita</em>: 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4 Number of tokens of ‘equivalency-signaling verbs’

Tokens of pronouns and ESVs are carefully highlighted and coded to examine recurrent patterns, since:

language use—any text—is always simultaneously constitutive of (1) social identities, (2) social relations and (3) social representations… that is, any text makes its own small contribution to shaping these aspects of society and culture (Fairclough, 1995b, p. 55).

In other words, language use is a way of signaling the underlying ideologies or dominant assumptions of the TV program designers and the Korean and ES hosts with regard to the teaching and learning of English throughout Korean society. This will be discussed in depth in Chapter 5.

In addition to these more micro-level analyses, other types of language use or interactions have also been examined: interactions between the Korean and ES hosts (e.g., turn taking (Sacks et al, 1974)), the use of lexicons such as qualifiers or evaluatives (in both Korean and English), and so forth. These micro- and macro-level analyses of language use will help us to discern the dominant English language learning and teaching ideologies prevalent in Korea. Although the critical discourse analysis seems to suggest
pre-determined units of analysis such as pronouns, modality, voice, etc., it is not necessary to be limited to those grammatical features in this analysis.
CHAPTER 4: THE USE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS AND CULTURAL MEMBERSHIP

4. 1. Introduction

This chapter deals with the use of pronouns by the Korean and English-speaking hosts. It is significant to examine personal pronouns such as ‘we’ and ‘you,’ since ideologies can be viewed as representations of who we are and what the relationships with others are (van Dijk, 1998). The use of ‘we’ and ‘you’ may refer to certain social groups associated with the legitimization of power and dominance. Ideologies can be expressed through language use, while language use also plays an important role in reproduction of ideologies (van Dijk, 1998, p. 5). Especially in the Korean culture, the use of ‘wuli’ reflects the group-oriented culture. For example, it is not uncommon to say wuli namphyen (our husband) or wuli nala (our country) instead of nay namphyen (my husband) or nay nala (my country).

This chapter explores how personal pronouns are used in Korean TV English instructional programs. In these television shows, Korean hosts and English-speaking co-hosts frequently use personal pronouns in both English and Korean; however, in Korean, subjects do not always overtly appear in the Korean hosts’ speech. Korean is a pro-drop language and sentential subjects are frequently encoded contextually or through other
forms of grammar. For example, honorifics can be used to encode “the speaker’s socio-culturally appropriate regard towards the addressee…and the referent…” (Sohn, 1999, p. 408). Vocatives can also serve to designate an addressee.

Personal pronouns are function words referring to the speaker, the addressee and identifiable entities or persons other than the speaker and the addressee (Biber et al, 1999). Traditionally, they are usually distinct in three ways: first person (e.g., ‘I’ or ‘we’), second person (e.g., ‘you’), and third person (e.g., ‘he,’ ‘she,’ ‘they’) (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 339). Givon (2001) also points out that pronominals can be used to express inclusion and exclusion in addition to definiteness or reference. For example, in some languages, different forms of the first person plural pronoun ‘we’ can be used to include or exclude the addressee (e.g. Samoan), while this morphological distinction does not exist in English (Levinson, 1983). In other words, the pronoun ‘we’ in English can both include one entity and exclude another at the same time, but how and when this occurs cannot always be clearly determined.

Pronouns can also differ in their degree of definiteness. Kamio (2001) identifies generic and non-specific uses of the English pronouns, ‘we,’ ‘you,’ and ‘they,’ and provides an explanation based on his notion of the speaker’s and hearer’s ‘territory of information.’ According to Kamio, ‘we’ represents the speaker’s territory, whereas ‘you’
indicates the hearer’s. Outside of the territories of both of these pronouns lies the territory taken up by the pronoun ‘they’ as is illustrated in Figure 4.

| ---We---- | ----You--- |
|------------------------- | ----They-------- |

Figure 4.1. The English generic pronouns, *we, you,* and *they*  
[Adopted from Kamio, 2001, p. 1121]

However, this representation of the personal pronouns is somewhat simple and vague. In addition, it does not provide a critical explanation of what the pronouns actually do in interactional discourse.

Pennycook (1994b) argues that a speaker/writer’s choice of pronouns may be motivated by politics in that the pronominal device can be used to construct self and other (i.e., *we*/*you* or *we*/*they*). He also suggests that pronouns have been institutionalized in various forms of discourse to mark differences in power. For example, in academic writing, authors often use ‘we’ instead of ‘I’ to conceal their voices (Pennycook, 1994b, p. 176).

Unlike the English pronouns ‘we’ and ‘you,’ Korean personal pronouns have different forms to express different levels of respect (or speech levels). Table 4.1 below illustrates how Korean first and second person pronouns are used depending on the type of social relationship between the speaker and the listener(s).
Table 4.1. Korean first and second person pronouns
[Modified version of Sohn, 1999, p. 207-208]

As can be seen in Table 4.1, the first person plural can take two different forms: plain and humble, while the second person plural can take five different forms. In this database, both forms of the first person plural are used, while no overt form of the second person plural in the above list is used. Instead, a collective ‘you’ ‘yele pwun(-tul)’ is used which refers only to the TV viewers.

This chapter examines how personal pronouns are used by the English-speaking and Korean hosts in relation to their roles on the TV shows as both program hosts and

15 ‘Yeletwun’ is generally used to address any type of collective audience: TV and radio program audiences, religious congregations, attendees at speeches or lectures, students in a classroom, and so forth. It is included as expressing the notion of a collective second person referent, similar to English ‘you.’ In addition to this pronominal function, yele pwun can also be used as a vocative.
experts in English. In the group-oriented society such as Korea, notion of ‘we’ is frequently used to signal strong solidarity with the hearer or membership of a certain group.

4.2. Use of the pronoun ‘we’

What is interesting in the TV data is that what ‘we’ is used to represent by the ES hosts is quite different from what it is used to represent by the Korean hosts. As I pointed out in the previous section, the pronoun ‘we’ can be used both to include and/or exclude the addressee. The listeners are the television viewers about which little is known except that it consists of Korean learners of English. When the pronoun ‘we’ is used, it should always include the speaker, plus an addressee or other third person referent (i.e., ‘I’ plus ‘you’ or someone else). Inclusion and exclusion depend on who the speaker includes besides ‘I.’ This makes sense since the choice to use the pronoun ‘we’ signals the speaker’s social role: that is, the ES hosts are considered and portrayed as experts of English, while the Korean hosts tend to be regarded as mediators between the ES hosts and their viewers who are Korean learners of English.

4.2.1. The use of ‘we’ by the English-speaking hosts

The native speaker hosts play an important role in this type of televised English
language instruction. They are considered experts in two ways: They are teachers of
(American) English and culture and authentic users of the English language. Example (3)
below illustrates how ‘we’ is used by a ES host to include herself and her Korean co-host
and exclude the television viewers.

(3) [Excerpt from *TV English Conversation*: 12/6/00]

(A skit was played to the viewers, the theme of which was ‘Christmas gift giving’)  
Susan:  •hh okay you might be wondering when you look at the skit. •hh u::h what (. ) i::s a Secret Santa about, we’re going to explain that a little later,  
•hh here there’s a group of friends, •hh they’re trying to decide ( . ) what to get each other for Christmas…

The American host, Susan, is trying to explain the cultural activity in the preceding skit,
i.e., “Secret Santa,” which she expects to be unfamiliar to Korean viewers. Here, the
pronoun ‘we’ refers to the program hosts while ‘you’ indicates the TV viewers. This is an
instance of an exclusive ‘we’ (excluding the viewers) used by the program hosts who
control the sequence of the show and in general have more knowledge of English than the
viewers. This use of the ‘exclusive’ function of ‘we’ is meant to differentiate the hosts
from the viewers.

However, there are many cases in the data in which the ES hosts use the inclusive
‘we,’ generally to include TV viewers as co-participants in the show. Example (4) below
illustrates.

(4) [Excerpt from *Survival English: 5/3/99*]

(Theme: Going to a bank and open checking and savings accounts)

Janna: Hey everyone (.) welcome to the show. •hh well in today’s skit (.) **we’ll see** (.) a man named Pete (.) going to (.) a bank (.) and he wants to open (.) a checking account (.) and savings account. •hh so **let’s watch** the skit and find out (.) how (.) he:: (.) does it.

This is a prototypical example of the use of an inclusive ‘we.’ The American host opens this show by introducing the day’s topic of, ‘Going to the bank.’ In providing background information for the skit, she uses the pronoun ‘we’ to involve the viewers in the program. That is, in this case, an inclusive ‘we’ is used mainly to invite the unknown viewers to watch the program and to show solidarity and community (Pennycook, 1994b). It also appears frequently in the data that the program hosts say, ‘we learned ~’ instead of saying, ‘you learned ~’ although it is the learners/viewers who are actually trying to learn English. This type of ‘we’ tends to be used when information visually available to the speaker and the hearer or information ‘close’ to both the program host and the viewers is being provided.

It is to be expected that the Korean hosts use these instances of exclusive and inclusive ‘we’ when leading the program, since both the Korean and ES hosts share in
common the status of being program hosts. Therefore the use of ‘we’ by the program
hosts transpires in a context in which they are talking about program sequence or control
(e.g., today we’re gonna take a look at the movie, ‘There’s something about Mary’), since
program activities are shared with and available to the viewers.

The role of the ES hosts, however, is not limited to leading the program sequence
or introducing topics to the viewers. Instead, they shift their ‘participation framework’
(Goffman, 1981) to demonstrate their positions, which are ‘subject to transformation’ (p.
153). In other words, they are experts on the American language and culture providing
‘real’ and authentic language resources to their Korean viewers; at the same time, they
also serve as program hosts who lead the programs, alongside the Korean hosts. They
shift their roles from one to another and vice versa. As experts in English, ES hosts tend
to use the generic or non-specific pronoun ‘we’, which may be called the exclusive ‘we’
or authority ‘we’. The function of this authority ‘we’ is to exclude the viewers, indicating
that they have the authority to tell the viewers what they speak and do in their country.
Example (5) is a segment from ‘Guide to Korea’ in which a theme is selected related to
Korean culture. This conversation occurs right after a report about Ramen, a type of
instant, dried Korean noodle.
In example (5) above, the Korean host had just asked the ES hosts whether they like *Ramyen*. Before this conversation, the ES host, Susan, had been talking about how great it is when she puts some steamed rice in her *Ramyen*. Stephen points out how Korean *Ramyen* (**rah-myun**) is pronounced in America (**i.e., Ramen**) in lines 1-2. As he speaks, the other ES host, Susan, keeps sending backchannels to acknowledge his comments.

Here, the ES host used the generic pronoun, ‘we,’ to exclude the viewers. The referent ‘we’ in this case should indicate Americans considering the fact that ‘we’ frequently co-occurs with a place deixis, i.e., ‘in America,’ since the location provides ‘anchorage points in the speech event’ (**Levinson, 1983, p. 79**, also see **Hanks, 1992**). Therefore, this type of authoritative ‘we’ is used to emphasize the fact that the ES host is a member of an
American English speaking community, which allows them to provide legitimate and unquestionable answers to the viewers.

The use of ‘we’ in discourse to establish oneself as an authority figure is not only limited to the lexical level, but it also appears within the morphological, syntactic, pragmatic, and cultural levels of language learning. Example (6) is an excerpt from TV English Conversation in which the day’s theme is ‘meeting someone’s parents.’ The ES host explains a useful idiom to the viewers in relation to the context.

(6) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 11/2/00] (Theme: Meeting someone’s parents))

(The skit is played for the viewers and then the camera refocuses on the studio hosts.)

1 Yena:   •hh that’s ri^ght. •hh you a^lways want to impress your (. ) bo^yfriend’s
2       or gi^rlfriend’s (. ) pa^rents [bu^t (. ) the thing is that they get all (. ) no^sy
3       about you:: they ask you a lot of personal que^stions like oh(h) what’s
4       your ma^jor. (. ) what’s your jo^::b hh [hh
5       6 Susan:                  [That’s true.
6 Susan:       [Yah in the Sta^tes we ca::ll that
7    (. ) a::sking (. ) twenty questions. = A:::h (. ) or am I under interrogation. =
8       but you don’t say in front of the parents. •hh usually you just say that
9       amongst yourselves.

In example (6) above, the female Korean host, Yena, summarizes the skit in which a woman introduces her boyfriend to her parents in a coffee shop, only to have her parents
interrogate her boyfriend by asking a lot of personal questions. Following Yena’s summary, the ES host, Susan provides an English idiom to describe this kind of situation in lines 6-9. Again, she starts off using an exclusive ‘we’ first to suggest a useful English expression and then switches to using ‘you’ as she explains how the sentence should be used. Again, the exclusive ‘we’ occurs with a place deixis, ‘in the States.’ This is a clear example of the we/you dichotomy or the NS/learner dichotomy. Considering that the use of place deixises such as ‘in America’ or ‘in the States’ co-occurs with the use of an exclusive ‘we,’ it can be inferred that the English that is being taught in these programs is American English.

Example (7) is an excerpt from a segment of ‘Q & A’ in which the program hosts select an interesting question sent from one of their television viewers concerning how to translate a Korean expression into English. In this example the Korean host asks the ES host how to say it in English when a lady has a hole in her nylons.

(7) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation, Q & A segment, 12/6/00]

1 No: …•hh how do you say (.) in English u::m in the stocking there is a ho^le, a::nd is out of order hh hh hh

16 The ‘Q and A’ segment is designed to allow the viewers to participate in the program by asking questions via the Internet or by postcard. People usually ask “How do you say this in English?” The Korean host in this particular segment is a comedian and not an expert in English in terms of proficiency.
3 Jody: ((laughs))

4 Jody: Oh I HATE it when that happens.

5 No: O::h

6 Jody: Uh that happens to me (.) sometimes.

7 No: Yeah.

8 Jody: U::m in English (.) we say:: I have a (.) ru^::n (.) in my stocking.

9 No: Oh ru^::n [in your stocking.

10 Jody: [Yah. (.)

11 Jody: 'cause (.) like you get a hole (.) and it s:prea^ds (.) y’know it goes all the way do^wn. (.) so we call that a ru^::n. (0.5) a::nd we use di^fferent words for stocking. (.) you can also say pa^ntyho::se, or ny^lons.

14 No: a[ha::

(Three turns skipped.)

15 No: ca *hh ilehkye yenge-lul kongpwu-hata po-myen-yo *hh cehuy-ka so like this English-OM study-INT see-if-POL we-humble-SM

16 chwungpwun-hi al-ko iss-nun tane-man cal ss-eto yenge-ey enough-ADV know-CONN exist-TM word-only well use-even though English-LOC ta

17 cekyong-toy-l swu iss-ul kes kath-untey (.) kuleh-ci ahn-supnikka? All apply-become-ATTR can exist-ATTR thing seem-CONN that-COMM not-DEF-Q

18 You’ve got a run in your stocking.

19 ‘So, when we study English, it seems that we can use all the words we already know. Right? ((Eng)) ‘You’ve got a run in your stocking.’

(Five turns skipped.)
The exclusive ‘we’ is used in line 8 when the ES host provides an English version of the Korean expression ‘my stocking has a hole’. In lines 11-13, she continues to explain how one can say ‘a hole in the stocking’ in English (i.e., ‘run’) and also gives some different names in English for ‘stocking.’ Here, the ES host uses a general term ‘in English’ instead of referring to a specific place deixis. Based on examples (5) and (6) it can inferred that this nominal referent ‘English’ in (7) indicates ‘American English.’ It is also interesting to note that the Korean host says, ‘what an English expression this is!’ when the ES host provides a different meaning for the English word ‘run’ than that which is usually encountered (e.g., I have to run to catch the bus.). This infers that what the ES host has suggested is an expression used by native speakers. Thus, the viewers can
become ‘masters’ of English if they continue to watch ‘Q and A’ (line 22) by gaining access to input from a native speaker. It is also noteworthy that the ES host frequently uses the present tense when she uses an exclusive ‘we’ (e.g., *we call ~, we say ~*), while in line 13 when the generic pronoun ‘you’ is used, she uses a modal verb, ‘can’. The ES hosts tend to use the present tense in order to increase the perceived level of factuality or truth of their speech and to emphasize that as authentic language users of English, they are authority figures. The use of ‘you’ will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3.

Before we conclude this discussion of the use of ‘we’ by the ES hosts, all instances of ‘we’ have been tallied and categorized to examine its distribution in these TV shows. Table 4.2 below displays how the pronoun ‘we’ is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the Role of Program Host</th>
<th>In the Role of English Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive-we</td>
<td>Exclusive-we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47/71 (64%)</td>
<td>24/71 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive-we&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Exclusive-we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/45 (22%)</td>
<td>35/45 (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Use of the pronoun ‘we’ by ES hosts

In this table, the pronoun ‘we’ can be used to include or exclude the television viewers. It can also be used in relationship to the roles (program host or English expert) being played by the ES hosts. Based on these frequencies, ES hosts used the pronoun ‘we’ more

<sup>17</sup> When the ES hosts in the role of English experts use an inclusive-we, they are generally providing common knowledge. For example, when the ES host explains the word ‘earth,’ she states that, ‘this is the place where we’ve lived on.’
exclusively when they were emphasizing their roles as English experts, while more inclusively when they were emphasizing their roles as program hosts. These differences in how the pronoun ‘we’ is used suggests that its use is closely related to the roles being played by the hosts. When the ES hosts speak of the American language and culture, they tend to emphasize their roles as English experts by using the exclusive ‘we.’ The next section addresses how the Korean hosts use the pronoun ‘we.’

4.2.2 The use of ‘we’ or ‘wuli’ by the Korean hosts

In these TV programs, the Korean hosts also use the pronoun ‘we’ in English as well as in Korean. While the English ‘we’ can be somewhat ambiguous to interpret, the Korean ‘we’ is even more complicated to figure out, since Korean is a pro-drop language and sentences without subjects are not only perfectly acceptable but in this database occur even more frequently than sentences which have overt subjects. Like the ES hosts, the Korean hosts also use the pronoun ‘we’ to include and exclude the viewers; however, there are some differences which will be discussed in the following section.

4.2.2.1 The use of the overt subject ‘we’

The Korean hosts are considered the main hosts of these TV shows, since most of
the viewers are assumed to be learners of English residing in Korea. The Korean hosts speak Korean in most cases except when they need to have a conversation with the ES hosts or read an English expression. As English experts, they sometimes use an English sentence or so in the middle of their discourse to make it flow smoothly.

Korean has two different types of the first person plural form: the plain form ‘wuli(-tul)’ and the humble form ‘ce-huy (-tul)’ (Sohn, 1999, p. 207). The humble form ‘cehuy’ tends to be predominantly used by speakers in establishing their participation as program hosts because it indicates that the speaker has a lower status as in example (8) below.

(8) [Excerpt from Survival English: 5/3/99]

Lee: •’hh alri’ght jus’ had a glimpse of (. .) what’s coming ahead (. .)
ca onul cehuy-tul-i cwunpi-ha-n nayyong-ul camkkan yes-pwaw-ss-supnita.
So today we-humble-PL-SM prepare-do-ATTR content-OM for a second peek-PST-DEF
•’hh o-wel-tal-i-ntey mal-i-c-yo and of course we have a new monthly (. .) theme
five month month-COP-CONN word-COP-COMM-POL
() saylow-un cwucey-lul cehuy-tul-i senthayk-hay-ss-supnita.
New-ATTR topic-OM we-humble-PL-SM select-do-PST-DEF

‘((Eng)) alright just had a glimpse of what’s coming ahead. ((Kor)) so, we had a peek of what we prepared for today. It’s May. ((Eng)) and of course we have a new monthly theme. ((Kor)) We’ve selected a new theme.’

Two tokens of the Korean humble ‘we’ (cehuy-tul) were used overtly, both of which refer to the program hosts and exclude the viewers. The Korean host speaks English first and
then interprets it into Korean. In addition to the use of an overt ‘we,’ there is a null
subject in the first sentence in excerpt (8’) below. This excerpt is selected from (8) for
convenience.

(8’)

cə onul cehuy-tul-i cwunpi-ha-n nayyong-ul camkkan yes-pwa-ss-supnita.
So today we-humble-PL-SM prepare-do-ATTR content-OM for a second overlook-PST-DEF
so, we (NULL) had a peek of what we (OVERT) prepared for today.

In this Korean sentence, two types of ‘we’ can be found: one is overt and the other does
not overtly appear, while the first refers to the exclusive ‘we’ as program hosts and the
other to the inclusive ‘we’ including the TV viewers. That is, the overt humble ‘we’
(cehuy-tul) clearly indicates that the addressee has a higher social status in the
relationship than the speaker. Levinson (1983) calls this social deixis. In Korean it is also
possible to use addressee honorifics to show that the addressee has higher social status
than the speaker (e.g., honorific –si). Due to this form, it is not always necessary to use
overt subject ‘you,’ which will be discussed later in section 4.3.2.

In addition to using an exclusive ‘we’ in their roles as program hosts, the Korean
hosts use an inclusive ‘wuli’ (i.e., we) just as the ES hosts do in the earlier section. The
function of the use of this pronoun is primarily to invite the viewers to participate in the
learning activity.

(9) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 12/6/00]

Yena: …●hh ca Rachel-i way semnwul sa-nun key kkatalowu-n ci ●h hanpen

So Rachel-SM why gift buy-ATTR thing picky-ATTR COMM once

wuli-ka skit-ul salphy-e po-si-myen a-si-l swu-ka iss-supnita.

we-SM skit-OM examine-CONN see-HON-if know-HON-ATTR can-SM exist-DEF

Ca phyohyen paywu-sy-ess-unikka pitio tasi po-si-c-yo?

So expression learn-HON-PST-RSN video again see-HON-COMM-POL

‘…so, you can find out why it is hard to please Rachel in giving her a gift if we watch the skit. So, since you learned the (new) expressions, let’s watch the video.’

The Korean host uses the overt ‘we’ to try to involve the viewers in watching the skit. What is interesting here is that she also uses the addressee honorific marker –si

along with an inclusive ‘we’ (i.e., wuli-ka…po-si-myen). This type of ‘we’ suggests communality (Pennycook, 1994b) with the viewers, signaling that the viewers are being encouraged and invited to be involved in the program.

Another use of the inclusive ‘we’ involves the situation in which the Korean host includes the viewers but simultaneously excludes the ES hosts, a use of ‘we’ which is different from those of the ES hosts. Since the Korean hosts share the same culture and experience as the viewers, this usage occurs frequently and shows solidarity with the viewers. Example (10) will illustrate.
In excerpt (10), lines 1-4, the Korean host asks (in English) the ES hosts who are considered representatives of American culture what sound is made to imitate a sneeze in English. When Janna, the ES host, explains the sneezing sound in English in lines 8-9, the
Korean host tries to compare the sneezing sound in English with the sneezing sound in Korean. Here, he uses ‘wuli’ (i.e., we) to include the viewers but he excludes the ES host, in order to emphasize his membership with the Korean language and culture. The Korean ‘wuli’ co-occurs with the topic marker ‘-nun’ (see Kuno, 1973; Sohn, 1999) to create a contrast between the two languages (i.e., we vs. in English) in lines 2, 10 and 11.

Example (11) is another case of the use of an inclusive ‘we.’ In this segment, the Korean host, Lee, is emphasizing that it is important to understand information about bank accounts.

(11) [Excerpt from Survival English: 5/4/99] ((Theme: going to a bank))

After the skit

1 Lee: ●hh we::ll there’s a lo^n of information that (. ) you hafta understa^nd.

(0.3)

2 Janna: That’s right and some of it can be ve^ry co^mplicated. =

3 Lee: = um kulay-yo ●hh ku unhayng-eyse mal-i-c-yo olpal-un kyeycwa-lul

Um so-POL that bank-LOC word-COP-COMM-POL right-ATTR account-OM

4 senthayk-ha-l-lye-myen sangtanghi mahn-un cengpo-lul ihay-hay-ya

choice-do-IRR-INTEND-if considerably many-ATTR information-OM understand-do-have to

5 toy-nun ke kath-supnita. ●hh wuli-to unhang-ey ka-se mal-i-c-yo cechwuk

become-ATTR thing be like-DEF we-also bank-LOC go-and word-COP-POL saving

6 sangphwum mwe (.) i ke iss-ko ce ke iss-ko mak yayki ha-ta po-myen-un

goods what this thing exist-CONN that thing exist-CONN right story do-INT see-if-TM

7 mwe mwe-ka mwe-n ci molu-cahn-ayo...

what what-SM what-ATTR NML not know-COMM-POL
‘Yes, right. You know, if you want to select a right account in the bank, it seems that it is necessary to understand a lot of information. You know, when we also go to a bank, we’re not sure about saving goods or something like that, when we have a conversation there, right?’

The Korean host, Lee, makes a comment in line 1 on the skit they just saw, saying that it is necessary to understand different kinds of terms related to banking. Followed by the ES host’s acknowledgment of the comment, Lee interprets what he has said in line 1 and then he shares his comment with Korean viewers to elicit their agreement. In line 5, he uses an inclusive ‘we’ which co-occurs with a Korean interactional marker ‘-canh-ayo’ (line 7) to elicit the viewers’ agreement (H. Lee, 1999). In fact, an inclusive ‘we’ frequently occurs with ci-yo or canh-ayo, when the Korean host builds on shared knowledge or shared experience related to the Korean language or culture. According to Kawanishi (1994), ‘canha-yo’ indicates a higher degree of certainty, while ‘ci-yo’ a lower degree of certainty.

The Korean hosts frequently use not only the overt pronoun ‘we,’ but they also use place and social deixis, ‘wuli nala’ (i.e., our country, Korea)’ or ‘wuli mal (i.e., our language, Korean)’ when they indicate solidarity with the TV viewers. Example (12) is a segment of ‘Say Say Say’ in which the focus of the lesson is pronunciation.

(12) [Excerpt from Survival English: 6/11/01]
((Segment: Say Say Say))

1 Lee: Okay let’s move on to our next segment, say say say.
‘OK, let’s move on to our next segment, ‘Say Say Say.’ ((Kor)) So, this is the segment of ‘Say Say Say’ where you actually practice (your pronunciation). I hope you can speak loudly. Um we’re studying pronunciation together. Here’s t-h sound. As for “th” sound especially, our language (Korean) doesn’t have any comparable pronunciation, so actually we’re supposed to pronounce ‘thank you’ but we usually pronounce ‘ssayngkhyu’ or ‘ttangkhyu,’ right?’

Here, the Korean host points out that there is no equivalent sound in Korean to the English “th” sound and that Korean people often pronounce this sound in a Korean way.

Again, she uses the ‘-canh-ayo’ marker to elicit the viewers’ agreement in line 8.

A closer examination of the co-occurrence of this type of discourse (in Korea or in Korean) with the use of sentence endings also suggests that the use of the ‘wuli’ marker is related to the shared information or experience as is evidenced in Table 4.3.
Deferential form: 5 (24%)  |  Polite form: 16 (76%)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$C(i)$-anh-ayo</td>
<td>$C(i)$-yo</td>
<td>-yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. The co-occurrence of deferential and polite forms used by the Korean hosts with ‘wuli mal’ (our language) or ‘wuli nala’ (our country)

It is significant that in the table above the co-occurrence of ‘wuli mal’ or ‘wuli nala’ with the polite form is more frequent than with the deferential form. By using the polite form more often, the Korean hosts are trying to emphasize solidarity or shared cultural membership with the Korean viewers (Strauss & Eun, to appear). Strauss and Eun (ibid) demonstrate that the polite form carries that meaning of –BOUNDARY and its use by speakers thus indexes\(^{18}\) a stance of INCLUSION between speaker(s) and interlocutor(s).

It should also be noted that all the ‘ci-yo’ markers in this dataset occur with rising intonation, whose function is “to seek agreement as an English tag question does” (Sohn, 1999, p. 360).

Example (13) shows that the ci-yo form with rising intonation is used to elicit the viewer’s agreement.

(13) [TVEC: 1/24/02]

1. Stephen: …•hh we::ll (. ) an (. ) i^mpulse buyer. So:: you hafta be ca^reful, (. ) an impulse

\(^{18}\) See Strauss and Eun for a discussion of indexicality and its relationship to the polite and deferential forms.
bu^yer (.) is someone who usually doesn’ consi^der (.) a::ll the alte^rnatives •hh
the way they should. (.) befo::re they make their purchase.

Yena:

•hh i^mpulse (.) bu^yer wuli nala:: mal-ey-to^ ku:: tto^k kath-u:n
Impulse buyer weli country language-LOC also exactly same-ATTR

mal-i iss-cyo^ (.) chwu^ngtong kwumay ha-nun salam. (.) kuleh-supnita^.
Word-SM exist-COMM-POL impulse purchase do-ATTR person so-DEF

Say^ cha-lul kwuip-ha-koca ha-l ttay-nun com twu^le po-ko
New car-OM purchase-do-INTEND do-ATTR when-TM little around look-CONN

Sa-ya toy-nuntey, •hh mwe:: pakk-ey naka-se ku^mpang cha-lul han tay
Buy-have to-CONN what outside-LOC go out-and right away car-OM one-CLSF

ppopa on-tatunci, i^len kyengwu-ey^ •hh impulse buyer-la-nu’n •hh
pick come-or this case-LOC impulse buyer-QT-ATTR

phyohyen-ul ssu-l swu-ka iss-cyo?
Expression-OM use-ATTR can-SM exist-COMM-POL

‘An impulse buyer. We have the same word in our language, right?
The person who purchases by his/her impulse. Right. They should look
around when they want to buy a new car. But someone goes out and
buys a car right away or something. In this case we can use the
expression, ‘impulse buyer,’ right?’

In example (13) above, after the ES host, Stephen, explains one of the day’s key
expressions, ‘impulse buyer,’ the Korean hostess emphasizes that Korean also has the
same expression. As a person who shares cultural membership with the viewers, the
Korean hostess constantly compares English and Korean and provides the Korean
equivalent. It is also noted that she uses the –ci-yo marker with rising intonation to elicit
the viewers’ agreement in line 5, since this Korean expression is relatively common and
is presumed to be salient to the Korean viewers, while the English equivalent is not
familiar to the Koreans. Although Kawanishi (1994) claims that the –ci-yo form signals a lower degree of certainty, she does not include the various contours surrounding this form.

In the dataset, all the instances of –ci-yo co-occur with rising intonation. This also seems to signal the speaker’s high certainty of what he/she says; in this case, the Korean host displays her solidarity with the viewers as insiders of Korean culture.

On the other hand, besides using this type of inclusive ‘we,’ the Korean hosts also use an exclusive ‘we’ to indicate that they are English experts who have advanced degrees in applied linguistics or a related area of study. This type of exclusive ‘we’ refers only to English experts and excludes the viewers as can be seen in example (14) below.

(14) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 2/6/02]

Yena:  ●hh Guide to Korea, hankwuk umsik-ul sokay-ha-nun kule-n e kihoy-lul
       Guide to Korea   Korea food-OM introduce-do-ATTR that-ATTR um opportunity-OM
       malyen-hay tuli-ko iss-nuntey-yo ●hh onul-un sellengthang-ey tayhayse
       prepare-do   give-HON-CONN exist-CONN-POL today-TM ox bone soup-about
       al-a po-ass-supnita. ●hh ca sellengthang ha-myen-un phwuk kou-n ku
       know-CONN see-PST-DEF so ox bone soup do-if-TM completely boil-ATTR that
       (.) soykoki kwukmwul-i ilphwum-i-ntyey-yo ku kwukmwul kath-un
       beef   soup-SM   best quality-COP-CONN-POL that soup   be like-ATTR
       kyengwu-ey-nun-yo wuli-ka broth-lanun yenge tane-lul ssu-pnita.
       Case-LOC-CONN-POL we-SM broth-QT   English word-OM use-DEF

       ‘Guide to Korea, (we) provide this segment to have an opportunity to introduce
       Korean food. Today (we) studied about ‘Sellengthang’ (Korean ox bone soup).
       So, when it comes to ‘Sellengthang,’ it has a special taste of beef soup. In the case of the soup, we use [DEF] the English word, ‘broth.’”
In example (14), the Korean host introduces a Korean food called ‘Sellengthang’ that she considers to have a good taste, somewhat like beef soup. As she explains what this food is like, she uses the non-specific pronoun ‘we’ to refer to English experts who know the language well. This is an exclusive ‘we’ which signals that the Korean host is not just a program host, but also a member of the general group “English experts.” ‘We’ here does not necessarily include only Americans (Strauss & Eun, to appear). Even more frequent than the use of the overt ‘we’ by the Korean hosts is the use of null subjects, which will be discussed in the next section.

4.2.2.2 The null subject ‘we’

As pro-drop language speakers, the Korean hosts in the programs tend to use sentences that lack a subject more than they use sentences that have an ‘overt subject’. This null subject ‘we’ includes and excludes the addressees just like the overt subject ‘we’ does as discussed in an earlier section of this chapter. However, it may not be simple to figure out the subject referent without closely examining the tokens along with other linguistic clues and contexts.

Examples (15) and (16) excerpted from the same episode illustrate how the null subject ‘we’ excludes the viewers in referring to the roles of the Korean hosts as program
hosts.

(15) [Excerpt from Survival English: 8/19/02]

Lee: Hello everyone. = welcome to the show. (. This is Survival English.
Onul-to yeksi yele pwun-tul-ul wihayse acwu yuik-ha-n kuleha-n
Today-also also many person-HON-PL-OM for very useful-do-ATTR like that-ATTR
coh-un nayyong-ul cwunpi-hay-ss-supnita.
good-ATTR content-OM prepare-do-PST-DEF
= Right? We have a wonderful show for today.

'((Eng)) Hello everyone, welcome to the show. This is Survival English.
((Kor)) Hello this is Changsoo Lee from Survival English. We have
prepared very useful content for today. ((Eng)) Right? We have a
wonderful show for today.'

(16)

Lee: ...The rent includes (. gas (. and hot (. water.
Ilen phyohyen-i iss-ess-supnita. Cal kiek-ha-si-myense (.)
Like this expression-SM exist-PST-DEF well remember-do-HON-as
taum sikan-ey (. tto (. poyp-keyss-supnita.
Next time-LOC again see-HON-MDL-DEF
= Thank you for being with us.
'((Eng)) ‘The rent includes gas and hot water’ ((Kor)) there was this
expression. As (you) keep in mind this expression, (we’ll) see you again
in next time. ((Eng)) Thank you for being with us.

In example (15), the Korean host, Lee, introduces the TV show by greeting the viewers in
such a way that we can also understand who prepared the program even though there is
no overt subject in his greeting. The null subject should be the pronoun ‘we’ which refers
to the program hosts, while the English pronoun that follows is an inclusive ‘we.’

Example (16) provides a clear referent for the null subject, since the Korean host uses the humble form of the verb ‘po-ta’ (see), i.e., ‘poyp-ta’ (see). This form designates the addressee’s higher status over the speaker just like the humble form ‘cehuy’ (i.e., we) does. Lee then switches into English to say farewell to the viewers, ‘Thank you for being with us.’ This English accusative pronoun, ‘us,’ also provides a clue that the subject of the former sentence is ‘we’ referring to the program hosts, while ‘you’ here refers to the viewers. In short, it is possible to infer the null subject through the linguistic markers and the context.

In addition to the use of the exclusive ‘we’ to refer to themselves as the program hosts, the Korean hosts also use an inclusive null subject ‘we’ when they lead the program sequence or control the program as hosts. This is exemplified in example (17) below. The Korean host, Lee, briefly summarizes the skit which had just been performed for the viewers.

(17) [Excerpt from Survival English: 5/3/99]

Lee:  
...ca kule-myen-un () two phathu-lo nanw-e kaci-ko po-keyss-supnita. ()  
So that-if-TM  two part-INST  divide-CONN have-CONN see-MDL-DEF  
ches pen-ccay () phathu-pwuthe () po-c-yo.  
first time-CLSF  part-from  see-CONN-POL  
‘So, then (we’ll) divide it (the skit) into two parts and watch it. Why don’t we watch the first part?’
In this example, as a program host, Lee controls the program sequence and uses a null subject, an inclusive ‘we.’ Considering the context, all of the participants including the viewers are watching the skit. If the sentence were more ‘you-oriented,’ the addressee honorific –*si would be used, i.e., *po-si-keyss-supnita instead of *po-keyss-supnita. Here, the Korean deferential form is used to signal that the host is shifting the sequence of the program to the next segment as a boundary marker (Eun & Strauss, in press; Strauss & Eun, to appear). Although the Korean host has the authority and controls the sequence of the program, s/he sometimes invites the viewers to follow the sequence by using the addressee honorific –*si. In some cases such as example (18) below, the addressee honorific –*si co-occurs with this type of sentence, making it more complicated.

(18)
Yena: … hh ca taum phyohyen kathi salphy-e *po-si-keyss-supnita.
   So next    expression together watch-CONN see-HON-MDL-DEF
   ‘So, (we’ll) see the next expression carefully.’

The Korean host, Yena, uses the addressee honorific –*si when she asks the viewers to look at the next expression carefully. The use of the addressee honorific means that the null subject is ‘you’. However, it occurs with the Korean adverb ‘*kathi’ ‘together,’ to signal solidarity and to indicate that all of the program hosts are taking part in the
learning activity. In fact, this honorific –si frequently co-occurs with kathi or hamkkey, both of which mean ‘together.’ The effect of this combination is that the speaker can signal solidarity with the viewers and show respect to the viewers at the same time. When this combination is used, the subject referent tends to be dropped\(^{19}\). Although it is not possible to make a clear-cut distinction in this case of the subject (whether it is ‘you’ or ‘we’), it is categorized as the null subject inclusive ‘we,’ on the grounds that it is closer to the case that appears in example (17).

Similar to how the overt ‘we’ is used, the Korean hosts signal their membership with Korean viewers by using the null subject ‘we.’ Example (19) will illustrate.

(19) [Excerpt from *Survival English*: 01/99]

1 Brian: …●hh a study (.) group a stu^dy group is a group of stu^dents who ga^ther together to discuss the mate^rial (.) presented in cla:ss (.) or in a te^xtbook.
2 ●hh do^n’t (.) say study ci^:rcle. = That’s Konglish such an extra Konglish tip for you tonight.
3
4 Lee: ●hh ney suthati sekhul o ku ke ha-na-yo? Study group-i-lako pothong
      Yes  study  circle oh that thing do-Q-POL study group-COP-QT  usually
6 yayki-ha-key toy-ci-yo.
Story-do-ADV  become-COMM-POL

7 ‘Yes, study circle, do (we) do that? We usually say ‘study group,’ right?’

In example (19), lines 1-4, the ES host, Brian, explains the previous skit on forming a

\(^{19}\) Only one token was found in terms of a combination of –si and kathi or hamkkey among sentences with overt subjects (e.g, *wulika skit-ul salphye po-si-myen a-si-l swu-ka iss-supnita* (if we watch the skit carefully, you can understand it). Here, it is all of the participants (e.g., the hosts and the viewers) who watch the skit, but it is the viewers who can understand it if they watch it carefully.
study group in college, describing what the phrase ‘study group’ means and suggesting not to use the phrase ‘study circle’ because it is ‘Konglish’ or Koreanized English. In response to this, the Korean host, Lee asks the viewers if the noun phrase ‘study circle’ really is used very much, because this term is actually not popular in Korea. So she tries to confirm whether or not the viewers as speakers of Korean actually use this term. She then states that ‘study group’ is more commonly used than ‘study circle’. Here she uses the Korean particle plus the polite form –ci-yo in line 6, indicating that she assumes that her belief is correct and expects the audience to agree (Kawanishi, 1994; H. Lee, 1999). Therefore, it is clear that the null subject is an inclusive ‘we’ that refers to the Koreans in the audience as insiders of the Korean culture and language.

I have discussed how the Korean hosts use ‘we’ as an overt or null subject. As Table 4.4 illustrates, the Korean hosts tend to use ‘we’ as an inclusive and exclusive pronoun in the same way as ES hosts. What is interesting to note, however, is that the use of ‘we’ in their roles as English experts or instructors shows that the Korean hosts have different roles in teaching English. Table 4.5 below is re-introduced and modified for convenience.
As can be seen in the tables above, the Korean hosts in their roles as experts tend to use ‘wuli’ markers much more inclusively, when they deal with the linguistic and cultural aspects of English. On the other hand, the ES hosts in their roles as English experts tend to use a more exclusive ‘we’ as Table 4.5 clearly shows. These results depict a sharp contrast between the Korean and ES hosts in their roles as English experts in terms of how exclusive or inclusive their pronoun usage is. In contrast, when serving as program hosts there is not much difference in the use of ‘we’ between the Korean and ES hosts. In
other words, in their roles as English experts ‘we’ is used in opposite ways: the Korean hosts use it in a more inclusion-oriented way but the ES hosts use it in a more exclusion-oriented way.

These tables clearly evidence differences in the use of ‘we’ by the Korean and ES hosts. The use of the pronoun ‘we’ is closely related to the hosts’ membership in particular groups. On the one hand, the Korean hosts are portrayed as insiders of the Korean culture since they share more in common with the Korean TV viewers. On the other hand, the ES hosts serve as monolingual authority figures who are quite knowledgeable of anything within the domain of the American language and culture—and remain outsiders to the Korean culture. Although both the Korean and ES hosts apparently lead the English TV instructional programs as experts in English, the ES hosts seem to belong to a “foreign” domain which the Korean hosts or viewers may never reach.

4.3. The use of the pronoun ‘you’ by the Korean hosts

The pronoun ‘you’ includes the addressee, while at the same time excluding the speaker. Although it is used generically, it still has the specific meaning associated with the second person (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 354). According to Kamio (2001), while the
pronoun ‘we’ refers to the territory of the speaker, the pronoun ‘you’ indicates the territory of the hearer. In the instructional English television programs, the program hosts teach English to unknown viewers who are assumed to be learners of English interested in receiving useful input from native speakers of English and further elaboration of this input from the Korean hosts. In fact, as pointed out in the use of ‘we,’ the ES hosts tend to serve as ‘norm providers’ in describing how they use English. The Korean hosts, as insiders of the Korean language and culture, tend to project solidarity with their viewers or to provide interpretations of the ES hosts’ explanations.

This section will explore how the ES hosts use the pronoun ‘you’ as a device for constructing the Other (Pennycook, 1994b) as opposed to creating a sense of solidarity with their television audience.

4.3.1. The use of ‘you’ by the ES hosts

As might be expected, the ES hosts use the pronoun ‘you’ to refer to the unknown viewers in general as can be seen in example (20).

(20) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 8/14/02]
(Theme: English education in Korea)

1 Stephen: You’re gonna hear them talk about (. ) the mother’s womb. (. )
2 which is the place (. ) where (. ) a baby lives (. ) before (. ) it’s born. (. )
3 right? …then you’re gonna hear them talk about (. ) apparatus.
and an apparatus is some sort of machinery: hh or some sort of tool or machinery. And then you're gonna hear them say that hh they're eating this up.

In this example, the ES host, Stephen, introduces and explains new expressions which will appear in the upcoming skit (i.e., ‘the mother’s womb’, ‘apparatus’, and ‘they’re eating this up’). These are assumed to be difficult for the viewers to understand. Stephen uses the pronoun ‘you’ to indicate that it is the viewers who will be hearing the expressions in the skit in lines 1, 3 and 6, although the hosts will also be hearing them. Using ‘you’ in this way tends to suggest to the viewers that they should pay greater attention to these expressions. If the speaker used the pronoun ‘we,’ it would not draw the viewers’ attention as strongly to these expressions. This type of dichotomy between the use of we/you is shown below in example (21).

(21) [Excerpt from *TV English Conversation*: 11/1/00] (Segment of Q & A)

1 Noh: Jody^ hh English is getting harder and harder for me. (0.6) what can I do^ (0.3)
2
3 Jody: Jus’ stop.
4 Noh: hh hh no.
5 Jody: No:: >I mean< I kno::w English is very hard, and (.) we have a lot of expressions, and sometimes the same word means many different thi^ngs.

6 Noh: Yeah.

(.)

8 Jody: But you^ jus’ have to keep try^ing.

9 Noh: Keep try^ing yeah okay…

In this particular segment of ‘Q & A,’ Mr. Noh is a Korean comedian—not an English expert like the main hosts—and as a mediator, he tries to ask a question for the viewers. In beginning this segment, he complains about how hard it is to learn English. The ES hostess, Jody, teases him first and then addresses his comment by explaining why English is difficult to learn. To do this, Jody uses an exclusive ‘we’ in line 4 to indicate that she is an insider as a native speaker of English. She continues then to give the suggestion that ‘you just have to keep trying.’ The use of ‘you’ in line 8 is not simply directed at the Korean host in the studio; rather, it also refers to all the viewers or learners in general who should keep trying to learn English in spite of the abundance of English expressions.

It is often the case that the generic non-specific pronoun ‘you’ is used when the ES hosts give examples by using some helpful expressions or providing definitions for English vocabulary words. This is shown in excerpt (22) below. Right before this excerpt,
part of a movie clip\textsuperscript{20} was played. In this excerpt, the ES host, Susan, focuses on English phrasal expressions and gives an account of what those that appear in the movie clip mean.

(22) [Excerpt from \textit{TV English Conversation}: 11/2/00]
Susan: …\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}hh Don’ pay a\textsuperscript{ny} attention. (.) don’ pay attention. \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}hh well if you say::\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}h to pa\textsuperscript{y} (. ) attention (. ) to me\textsuperscript{u::h that\textsuperscript{t} means \textbullet}hh oh you need to rea\textsuperscript{ll}y be fo\textsuperscript{c}used on that u::h pa\textsuperscript{y}: atte\textsuperscript{n}tion to thi\textsuperscript{s}. \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}hh usually in uh stores here, atte\textsuperscript{n}tion (. ) sho\textsuperscript{pp}ers (. ) there’s a big sa\textsuperscript{le} going o\textsuperscript{n}. \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}hh now \textcolor{red}{\textbf{if you say}} don’ pay attention, a::h you should (. ) di\textsuperscript{r}regard it.

The ES host uses the generic pronoun ‘you’ to explain the meaning and the appropriate usage of the phrase ‘to pay attention’. This use of the generic pronoun ‘you’ is very close to the generic use of ‘we.’ When introducing examples, the ES hosts tend to use initial if-clauses very often to build up a context where the expressions can be used or to try to link new information to the viewers’ experiences. When the ES hosts explain the meanings of new expressions or provide English examples, they usually tend to use ‘you.’

What is noteworthy is that this generic use of ‘you’ frequently co-occurs with ‘irrealis markers’ (Givon, 2001), such as conditionals (e.g., \textit{if}) or modal verbs (\textit{can},

\textsuperscript{20} It is very popular to teach English through the use of movies. The hosts usually select useful expressions from the movie clip. Here, the movie entitled \textit{There’s Something about Mary} was selected in relation to the theme for the day, ‘Meeting someone’s parents.’
should, etc.). Yet the generic authoritative use of ‘we’ tends to co-occur with the present tense (e.g., we say...in the States). Figures 4.2 and 4.3 below illustrate the linguistic markers co-occurring with the generic pronoun ‘you’ and the generic authoritative pronoun ‘we.’ Adopted from Givon (2001), the modality is categorized into three groups: realis, irrealis, and negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditionals: 44 (42%)</th>
<th>Modals: 39 (37%)</th>
<th>Negations: 7 (7%)</th>
<th>Questions: 5 (5%)</th>
<th>Simple present: 10 (9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If: 20</td>
<td>Can: 27</td>
<td>Don’t: 2</td>
<td>-How do you say that in English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When: 18</td>
<td>Should: 3</td>
<td>Don’t wanna: 3</td>
<td>-How do you do that in English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless: 2</td>
<td>Have to: 3</td>
<td>Don’t have to: 1</td>
<td>-What do you say?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before: 2</td>
<td>Gotta: 2</td>
<td>Shouldn’t: 1</td>
<td>-Do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on: 2</td>
<td>Need to: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Might: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 4 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dial: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Call: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Say: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Put: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2. Linguistic markers co-occurring with the generic pronoun ‘you’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditionals: 1 (5%)</th>
<th>Modals: 3 (24%)</th>
<th>Negations: 1 (5%)</th>
<th>Simple present: 16 (76%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When-clause: 1</td>
<td>Will: 1, Might: 1, Would: 1</td>
<td>Don’t: 1</td>
<td>Call: 6, say: 4 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like: 2, Have: 1, Lose: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider: 1, Refer to: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3. Linguistic markers co-occurring with the generic pronoun ‘we’
As can be seen in the figures above, the generic pronoun ‘you’ predominantly co-occurs with conditionals and modals (79% altogether), while the pronoun ‘we’ when referring to Americans predominantly co-occurs with the simple present (76%). Irrealis markers suggest that there is a non-actual and weaker tie between the speaker and the viewers. Although the simple present form is also in some instances found in conjunction with ‘you’-utterances, 40% of time, the verb that appears in the simple present is the ‘equivalency-signaling’ verb ‘mean’. This type of generic pronoun which is oriented towards the domain of the learner is an instructive-you, since it is usually used for instructional purposes. Thus, this ‘instructive-you’ seems to be used to refer to non-actual and non-truth related activities, while the authoritative ‘we’ seems to be used by American NS’s, as experts on American English and culture, to refer to truths about the United States.

Additionally, although there were not many tokens of it in the data, the ES hosts also use ‘you’ to refer to Koreans in general to signal the distance between Native English speakers and Koreans as learners of English. Example (23) is one case of this.

---

21 See Chapter 5 for a full discussion of ‘Equivalency-signaling’ verbs (ESVs).
(23) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 11/2/00]

Stephen: ...he says Woo^gie’s got a sense of hu^mor now of cou^rse in Korean
you also have (.) sseynsu iss-ta (sense exist-PLN: ‘you have a sense’) right?

When the ES host explains the English expression ‘to have a sense of humor,’ he tries to compare the English expression with a corresponding phrase in Korean. His use of ‘you’ in this excerpt clearly signals his non-membership within the Korean language or culture, and his limited knowledge of Korean.

4.3.2. The use of ‘you’ by the Korean hosts

Forms of the pronoun ‘you’ used by the Korean hosts range from the English ‘you’ to Korean overt and null pronouns. In this dataset, ‘you’ could be referring to the TV viewers, the ES hosts or it could be a non-specific generic ‘you.’ In Korean, no overt pronoun is used in the case of the second person subject except for one indefinite referent functioning as a plural ‘you,’ ‘yele pwun (many person-HON)’ which can be translated as ‘all of you’, ‘you’, or ‘everyone.’ In all other cases while leading the program or explaining topics related to English, the Korean hosts use null subjects for the second person subject. However, it is still possible to understand the null subject ‘you’ by examining the Korean honorific suffix –si.
As mentioned earlier, Korean has an addressee honorific –si which designates the social relationship between speaker and hearer. According to Sohn (1999), this suffix is used “if the subject of the predicate denotes an adult who deserves the speaker’s deference” (p. 416). In the context of a television show, it is common for the Korean hosts to show respect to the viewers by using the suffix –si. What is interesting is that the Korean hosts’ –si-marked utterances are quite different from their utterances without –si in these television shows, although all of these utterances refer to the second person ‘you.’ This section will discuss how the Korean hosts use the pronoun ‘you’ in English and Korean.

4.3.2.1. The use of the overt subject ‘you’

Overt subjects used by the Korean hosts include the English ‘you’ and the Korean ‘yele pwun.’ As English experts as well as mediators, the Korean hosts speak English when they need to have a conversation with the ES hosts or when they need to request an explanation about information concerning English language and culture. Example (24) is a case in point.
In example (24) above, the Korean host introduces the day's topic which is

‘Deposit ing and withdrawing money from the bank.’ After the Korean host interprets the
two key words into Korean in lines 1-5, she switches into English and asks the ES hosts
to explain their meanings. This code switching in line 5 signals that she is an English expert and a mediator between the ES hosts and the TV viewers as a bilingual speaker of Korean and English. This type of question using the English ‘you’ frequently occurs when issues related to American English and culture surface. The Korean hosts use the English ‘you’ (line 5) in such a way that it portrays the ES hosts in the studio as representatives of American language and culture and treats them accordingly. An additional indication that the ES hosts are being considered representatives of American language and culture is that both the Korean and ES hosts often use the place and social deixis, ‘in America,’ ‘in the States,’ ‘in English’ when they have a conversation related to American English and/or American culture.

As previously mentioned, the Korean television programs predictably do not use any overt second person pronouns; the only convention used in the programs as an overt address marker similar in function to English “you” is the address form yele pwun. Yele pwun is used both as a vocative and as a collective second person subject referent. In (25), it is used as a vocative to draw the addressee’s attention (Sohn, 1999, p. 341).

22 When yele pwun is used as a vocative, it is used without any vocative case marking particles. Whether or not a vocative particle is present, the vocative itself serves to call the attention of the addressee and also to indicate the social relationship between speaker and addressee. (For a detailed discussion on the use and absence of vocative case particles, see Sohn, 1999, p. 341). When yele pwun is used as a collective second person subject in these data, it occurs with an overt subject marker or topic marker.
The Korean host, Lee, tries to end his explanation by making sure to ask the viewers to keep in mind the banking terms that will be useful to them if they go to the US. Here, there are two tokens of ‘yele pwun-tul’ in lines 1 and 2. The first token is used to check the viewers’ understanding of what the program presented; and the other ‘yele pwun-tul’ is used to emphasize that the viewers should remember the banking terms because it is very useful in the States. He also uses the ‘ca’ token, which is also frequently used to get the viewers’ attention when he begins a new topic or tries to end his discussion of a topic. After Lee’s remark in excerpt (25), he moves on to the next segment of the program, using ‘yele pwun-(tul)’ to foreshadow that he will be shifting the program sequence. ‘Yelev{'\textit{pwun (tul)}}’ can be also used as a collective ‘you’ with the subject case marker –{\textit{i}} as in
In (26) above, ‘yele pwun-tul’ in line 2 is used as a collective you rather than a vocative, since it co-occurs with the subject marker. Nevertheless, it seems to function like an attention marker just like a vocative. In this excerpt, after the English speaking host, Janna, explains the skit, the Korean host anticipates that the viewers will have difficulty understanding the English idiom, ‘He has a crush on her.’ The next section examines how the Korean hosts use the null subject ‘you.’

4.3.2.2 The null subject ‘you’

In this dataset, the Korean null subject ‘you’ occurs more frequently than the Korean null subject ‘we.’ In these TV programs, the honorific addressee –si is
predominantly used to refer to the TV viewers, since the hosts address to the viewers, or the learners. According to Sohn (1999), this honorific marker is used “if the subject of the predicate denotes an adult who deserves the speaker’s deference” (p. 416). In these programs, however, it does not just serve as an indicator of the social relationship or respect. The Korean hosts tend to use –si-marked utterances to target the learners’ domains when they are playing the role of program hosts. Since this is an English instruction though television, it is important for the program hosts to make the learners more engaged in the TV program. On the other hand, they do not tend to use –si when they are dealing with the English usage or providing English-related instruction as English experts. Excerpt (27) below, which appears at the very beginning of the program when the Korean and ES hosts greet the viewers, is a prototypical example of the combination of –si with the null subject ‘you.’

(27) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 2/6/02] (Theme: TV commercials)

1 Yena: annyen-ha-sey-yo yenge hoyhwa-i-pnita. Peace-do-HON-POL English Conversation-COP-DEF ‘Hello. This is English Conversation.’

2 Susan: He^llo everyone we^lcome to the English Conversation.

3 Stephen: It’s (. ) wo^nderful to ha^ve you with us today.

(1.2)
4 Yena: He^llo everyone, (. ) welcome back to the sho^w. •hh ca i-wel ches sikan
   So two month first time
5 yenge hoyhwa icy (. ) onul mwun-ul yel-keyss-nuntey-yo. •hh yenge-lo
   English conversation now today door-OM open-MDL-CONN-POL English-INST
6 toyn kwangko-lul po-si-myense kwungkum-ha-sy-ess te-n kes (. )
   become commercial-OM see-HON-as curious-do-HON-PST RETRO-ATTR thing
7 eps-usy-ess-eyo? •hh i wel han tal tongan cehuy-wa hamkkey
   not exist-HON-PST-POL-Q two month one month during we-HON-with together
8 kwangko kongpwu-ha-si-myense tto (. ) yenge-lul cengpok-hay
   commercial study-do-HON-as again English-OM conquer-do
9 po-si-c-yo.
   see-HON-COMM-POL

  ‘Hello, everyone. Welcome back to the show. So, this is the first time for
this month of English Conversation. Today we’re going to start (the program).
For February, we’ve prepared the skit centered on (English) commercials.
Wasn’t there anything curious [ADD HON] as you watch [ADD HON]
English commercials? Why don’t you try to conquer [ADD HON] English as
you study [ADD HON] commercials with us for a month?’

As can be seen in example (27), lines 4-9, the Korean host, Yena introduces the
day’s topic as she greets the viewers. Four tokens of the addressee honorific –si are found.

The Korean hosts tend to use the –si marker in relation to sequencing the program rather
than teaching English itself, i.e., content of the English lesson, because this marker is
used to directly address the viewers and personalize their teaching. In other words, if the
Korean hosts use the –si marker, they can reduce the gap between the hosts and the
learners and get the viewers more involved in the program. On the other hand, the Korean
hosts do not use –si marked utterances when they depersonalize their teaching or make
their teaching more objective. As example (28) below illustrates, they tend to teach English expressions without using the –si marker.

(28) [Excerpt from TV English Conversation: 11/16/00]
((This a segment of ‘Vocabulary Check’))

Lee:  

mence buy-ka nao-key toy-pnita. •hh b-u-y ani ilehkey swi-w-un  
First of all buy-SM appear-ADV become-DEF b-u-y no like this easy-ATTR  
kes-ul •hh ha-si-l-nun ci-to molu-keyss-ci-man mwe  
thing-OM do-HON-IRR-ATTR COMM-also not know-MDL-COMM-but what  
it’s always good y’know (.) to reinforce I think  
•hh a-nun ke-l tto tasi a-l-myen coh-c-yo mwe mwulken-ul  
know-ATTR thing-OM again again know-IRR-if good-COMM-POL what merchandise-OM  
sa-ta kulentey (.) that’s a good buy ilehkey mal-ha-key toy-myen  
buy-PLN but that’s a good buy like this say-do-ADV become-if  
acwu cal sa-n kes-i-ta-lako mal-hal swu iss-supnita. Ba- b-u-y-lako  
very well buy-ATTR thing-COP-PLN-QT word-do can exist-DEF ba- b-u-y-QT  
ha-nun kes cachey-ka tongsa-lo-to ssu-l swu-ka iss-ko •hh  
do-ATTR thing itself-SM verb-INST-also use-ATTR can-SM exist-CONN  
myengsa-lo-to ssu-i-nun kyengwu-ka iss-ki-nun iss-supnita.  
Noun-INST-also use-PASS-ATTR case-SM exist-NML-TM exist-DEF

‘First of all (we have a word) buy. You may think [ADD HON] ‘What an easy word b-u-y is!’ but ((Eng)) it’s always good, you know, to reinforce I think. ((Kor)) It’s good to learn again something you already know, right? (This means) ‘you buy some merchandise.’ But if you say ‘That’s a good buy’ (in English), you can say, ‘You bought it well’ (in Korean). Ba- b-u-y, you can use (the word) as a verb and there’s a case that it is used as a noun, too.’

Here, the Korean host, Lee explains some key vocabulary words for the viewers by first introducing the word ‘buy’ and adding that it can be used as a noun as well as a verb. Here, she does not use the honorific –si when she provides an instruction about
English. In some instances, it is also acceptable for the Korean host to say, ‘-ssu-si-l swu-ka iss-ko’ ‘You can use [ADD HON] (the word).’ If the Korean host uses the –si marker in this manner, it may signal that the viewers should use the English expression in a certain way so that it is very personalized. However, since the role of the Korean hosts is translators of what the English-speaking hosts said, they tend to use–si marked utterances less when they play the role of English experts. In other words, when they explain the English usage as English experts, they tend to depersonalize their teaching, avoiding the –si marker by making their discourse more general, since the domains the Korean hosts deal with are distant from what they possess. Table 4.6 below shows the types of verbs occurring with the Korean addressee honorific marker –si.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With –si</th>
<th>Without –si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensing verbs(^{23})</td>
<td>73 (39%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental verbs</td>
<td>63 (34%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression verbs</td>
<td>44 (23%)</td>
<td>43 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action verbs</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Verb types co-occurring with the Korean addressee honorific marker –si

In the table above, sensing verbs (e.g., ‘see,’ ‘listen’) are most frequently found with the use of –si. This makes sense since the viewers learn English through television

\(^{23}\) I categorized the verbs co-occurring with –si into four types: sensing, mental, expression, and action verbs.
where visual and aural materials are readily available. As the main host, the Korean host uses these types of verbs to lead the viewers in following the program sequence. *Mental verbs* are verbs which relate to the cognition of the viewers (e.g., ‘remember,’ ‘study,’ ‘think,’ ‘know’ ‘understand’ etc.). These verbs are also frequently used by the Korean hosts in their roles as program hosts in order to perform another one of their main tasks. They point out some important facts to remind the viewers of what they already know or to help them remember new terminology. *Expression verbs* (e.g. ‘say, ‘call, etc.) are directly related to giving instructions about English, e.g., English usage, the meanings of English phrases, etc.. It is noteworthy that these verbs actually tend to occur without the –si marker when compared with the other types of verbs as can be seen in Table 4.6. The Korean host tries to make his teaching more depersonalized and thus make it more factual, since they do not have the same kind of authentic resources of English as English-speaking hosts. That is, their role is limited to explaining English in general—not just applicable to the TV viewers, since the Korean hosts have relatively less legitimate privilege to provide answers directly related to American English and culture. As a result, they tend to distance themselves from the domains of American English and culture, which is not their membership.

In addition to this generic use of ‘you’ without –si, there are also instances as
seen in example (29) below, in which the Korean hosts use passive constructions when they explain English usages.

(29) [Excerpt from Survival English: 9/9/02]

Lee:  
\[ e \text{ here's my wife June ha-myense June-ul sokay-ha-ko iss-supnita. } \]
\[ Um \text{ here’s my wife June do-as June-OM introduce-do-CONN exist-DEF } \]
\[ Anay ilum-i June-i-yey-yo. Ku-nikka-n e wuli-ka al-ko iss-nun \]
\[ Wife \text{ name-SM June-COP-POL that-REASON-TM um we-SM know-CONN exist-ATTR } \]
\[ kyeycel mwe tal ilen ttus-to toy-ciman ku tongsii-ey salam \]
\[ season \text{ what month this meaning-also become-but that same time-LOC person } \]
\[ ilum-ulo-to manh-i ssu-i-pnita. A-si-keyss-c-yo? \]
\[ name-INST-also many-ADV use-PASS-DEF know-HON-MDL-COMM-POL \]

‘um ((Eng)) Here’s my wife June. ((Kor)) He’s introducing his wife, June. The wife’s name is June. I mean, (the word ‘June’) can mean the season or month that we know, but it is also commonly used as a person’s name. Do you understand?’

As can be seen in example (29), the Korean host uses a passive construction to ‘defocus the agent’ (see W. Jung, 1998; Shibatani, 1985) when he mentions that ‘June’ as a word which can refer to the name of a month, and can also be used as a person’s name. Here, where and by whom the word ‘June’ is commonly used is not focused; rather, it is simply assumed that the more important information is that this word is commonly used as someone’s name. This agentless passive type of construction tends to be used when the Korean hosts explain English usage. Since it is clear that the hosts are operating on the assumption that what they are teaching is American English, they do not need to
emphasize in which English-speaking countries these useful expressions are used as is indicated in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive Constructions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensing verbs</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental verbs</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression verbs</td>
<td>15 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action verbs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Types of verbs co-occurring with passive constructions in Korean

In the table above, the verbs that co-occur with passive constructions are predominantly expression verbs. Even among sensing verbs which appear with passive constructions, 6 out of 8 tokens are the verb ‘hear’ as in (30). This verb is certainly related to giving instructions in that it expresses how English pronunciations can be heard. In (30), the Korean host focuses on how the phrases, ‘couple of places’ and ‘fit our needs’ are pronounced in natural discourse.

(30)

Lee: *hh i couple of ha-l ttay i of palum-i cal an toy-ketun-yo? Cou’ple a’ place
This couple of do-ATTR when this of pronunciation-SM well not work-CONN-POL couple of place
cou’ple a’ place hay kaciko of f palum-i cal an tul-li-ko >kutamey< *hhh e ()
couple of place do have of f pronunciation-SM well not hear-PASS-CONN then um
fit’our nee::ds ha-l ttay ku fit () ha-l ttay thu palum-i cal an tul-li-cyo?
fit our needs do-ATTR when that fit do-ATTR when t pronunciation-SM well not hear-PASS-CONN-POL
Fit our () nee::ds () need-z ka ani-ko nee::ds ilehkey palum-toy-pnita::
Fit our needs needs-SM not-CONN needs like this pronunciation-become-DEF
*hh ca kathi han pen tule potolok ha-cyo.
So together one time hear INTEND do-CONN-POL
‘In the case of ‘couple of,’ it’s not easy to pronounce (the preposition) ‘of.’ The pronunciation is not heard well because it sounds like ‘couple a’ places.’ And then when you say ‘fit our needs,’ when you say ‘fit,’ ‘t’ sound is not heard well, right? Fit our needs, it is not ‘fit our need-z’ but it is pronounced like this, ‘needs.’ So, why don’t we try to listen to this together?’

Here, while explaining the anticipated difficult point in listening the English phrases, the Korean host uses passive constructions. This use of passive co-occurs with the sensing verb, to be heard’ in this case, but this is also closely related to the phonological aspect of English. This effect of the passive form is similar to depersonalization because it enables the Korean host’s explanation to sound more factual.

In sum, the Korean hosts tend to avoid using the addressee honorific –si to give instructions related to the English language. This makes their teaching more depersonalized when they provide explanations on American language and culture. While the English-speaking hosts have a higher status in possessing authentic and ‘personal’ resources, the Korean hosts need to frame themselves as English experts who have the same status as the English-speaking hosts, although they actually are. In the same way, the Korean hosts choose to use passive constructions in order to defocus the agent and simply focus on the ‘fact’ as it relates to the teaching of English. This is closely related to the status and roles of the hosts since the Korean hosts in their roles as English experts do not have the same status or legitimate entitlement to teach English as the ES hosts do,
which presumably reflects the expectations of the viewers.
CHAPTER 5: THE USE OF EQUIVALENCY-SIGNALLING VERBS IN MEANING MAKING

5.1. Introduction

This chapter examines what the Korean and English-speaking (ES) hosts focus on in explaining and interpreting the meanings of the target English expressions in their English instructions. Specifically, the chapter explores how both Korean and ES hosts use a variety of ‘equivalency-signaling’ verbs (ESVs), such as ‘to mean’—both in Korean and in English—in their roles in the TV instructional program under investigation. The Korean hosts use a wider range of ESVs in translating and interpreting English than the ES hosts do. The ESVs used by Korean hosts include ‘-uymi-(i)ta’ (meaning-COP) ‘- ttus’-ita’ (meaning-COP) ‘-mal-ita’ (word-COP) and ‘-yayki/iyaki-(i)ta,’ (story-COP), all of which translate into English as ‘X means Y.’ These verbs co-occur with the quotative -attributive marker ‘-la-nun’ in most cases, with a few variations (e.g., ttus-i toyta lit. ‘the meaning becomes,’ kulen/ilen ttus-ita lit. ‘(it) is that/this kind of meaning’). Compared to the Korean hosts’ four verbs, the ES hosts mostly use two verbs: ‘to mean’ and ‘to be.’ The Korean hosts use these equivalency-signalling markers to explain the content of the skit.

24 ‘Ttus’ is a Korean word which is translated as ‘meaning,’ while ‘uymi’ is a Sino-Korean equivalent.
where situated interaction is presented between English speakers,\textsuperscript{25} or translate and interpret what the ES hosts explain in English, while the ES hosts use them when they explain the skit in English.

Closer examination of the use of ESVs can lead to the observation that the Korean and ES hosts have different roles in interpreting the meanings of the target English expressions. The ES hosts tend to focus on idiomatic or lexicalized expressions used in the United States, which are assumed to be closer to their language and culture regardless of their origin. In other words, their explanations seem to center on ‘native-like’ expressions such as, ‘He’s a laugh a minute\textsuperscript{26},’ ‘to kick the bucket,’ or ‘Is the Pope Catholic?’ These types of expressions cannot be interpreted literally; only the person who is deeply involved in the target culture can more readily gain access to their underlying meanings. As Cooper (1999) states, idiomatic expressions are those “whose meaning cannot always be readily derived from the usual meaning of [their] constituent elements” (p.233). Due to the non-literal meanings of idiomatic expressions, the term “non-idiomatic” sometimes means “nonnative-like” discourse (Lennon, 1998). Therefore it can be inferred that the acquisition of idioms is one of the most challenging tasks for second/foreign language learners, since they are used by different regions and should be

\textsuperscript{25} Korean speakers do not usually appear in the skit.
\textsuperscript{26} These examples of idiomatic expressions are selected from the dataset in the TV programs.
used in appropriate contexts.

In Steiner’s (1975) terms, the Korean hosts tend to serve as ‘bilingual mediating agents’ between both the English and the Korean-speaking worlds. As interpreters and mediators, the Korean hosts cover the linguistic and cultural aspects involved with learning English on these television programs. As insiders to Korean language and culture, however, their role tends to be marginal, i.e., delivering what the English-speaking hosts present, although they are actually experts in English teaching. Their teaching usually focuses on how the ES hosts actually use particular expressions in the United States. For example, because of their awareness of the expectations of Korean viewers, the Korean hosts begin their interpretation of English expressions with the most literal or salient meanings for Koreans, which may not be appropriate to English speakers, and then shift the basis of their explanations from what they expect as insiders of the Korean culture to so called ‘native-like’ expressions, i.e., non-salient use in Korean contexts. The Korean hosts present their knowledge by focusing on the potential errors the TV viewers may face and then correct their misuse so that they can learn more appropriate use of expressions.

According to Nida and Taber (1969), the primary aim of translation is to reproduce a particular message in one language in another so that the recipients have a
correct understanding of the meaning of that message. For this reason, the Korean hosts try to provide Korean equivalents for English linguistic and cultural items when they interpret them into Korean for their Korean viewers. What is said in English, however, does not necessarily have a corresponding equivalent in Korean. Lexicalized or idiomatic expressions especially cannot be interpreted literally (Nunberg et. al, 1994). Since two different cultures often have dissimilar ways of perceiving the world in meaning making activities when the same or equivalent meaning is being conveyed (Rosales Sequeiros, 2002) and considering that translation is a matter of communication (Gutt, 2000), it is essential for the Korean hosts to ‘enrich’ their translations in order to be successful in explaining the Korean meanings of certain English expressions. Nevertheless, the Korean hosts consistently reinforce the simplistic view that language is a one-to-one relationship as if even English idioms always had Korean equivalents. This may be because the main role of the Korean hosts is to make the English-speaker’s input as “digestible” as possible to the Korean viewers, rather than question the appropriateness of the use of the expressions in Korea. The goal of these English lessons seems to prepare the learners to speak appropriate English being used in the United States.

According to Taft (1981), mediators facilitate communication and understanding between persons or groups who are of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. They
also have the role of “interpreting expressions, intentions, perceptions and expectations…by establishing and balancing the communication between them” (ibid, p.53). However, in the TV programs in this dataset, the Korean hosts tend to be portrayed as insiders of Korean culture rather than “balanced” bilingual or bicultural experts, while the ES hosts tend to be regarded as agents of all information while having ownership over “native-like” expressions. In other words, the Korean hosts tend to interpret English words or expressions into ones as close to their Korean equivalents as possible, despite a resulting decrease in accuracy—in explaining the meaning. Their translations are not just limited to language. They also try to translate cultural or pragmatic elements into their corresponding Korean equivalents. Thus, the Korean hosts seem to act as if they view the English and Korean languages as having a one-to-one correspondence with each other.

5.2. Use of ‘equivalency-signaling’ verbs (ESVs)

In Korean English instructional programs, the main role of the Korean and the English-speaking (ES) hosts is to explain useful English expressions while also describing the linguistic and cultural aspects relevant to the day’s topic. As both of the hosts shed light on the English expressions--one mostly in English and the other in Korean, they frequently use ‘equivalency-signaling’ verbs (ESVs) in defining or
interpreting words/phrases/clauses in the lesson or the ES hosts’ explanations. A closer look at what they focus on while using these verbs enables us to discover what the ES and Korean hosts emphasize in their explanations of English expressions.

The Korean hosts use four types of Korean ESVs: ‘uymi-(i)ta’ (meaning-COP) ‘-ttus-ita’ (meaning-COP) ‘-mal-ita’ (word-COP) and ‘-yayki/iyaki-(i)ta,’ (story-COP). All four of these verbs can be translated as ‘X means Y’ as seen in (31). Even though the following four sentences (a through d) use different verbs which are composed of different nouns plus the Korean copula, -ita, they all have the same meaning in Korean.

(31) [Four types of ESVs used by Korean hosts]

a. convenient-nun phyenlihan-i-la-n uymi-(i)-ta
   convenient-TM convenient-COP-QT-ATTR meaning-COP-PLN

b. convenient-nun phyenlihan-i-la-n ttus-i-ta
   convenient-TM convenient-COP-QT-ATTR meaning-COP-PLN

c. convenient-nun phyenlihan-i-la-n mal-i-ta
   convenient-TM convenient-COP-QT-ATTR word-COP-PLN

d. convenient-nun phyenlihan-i-la-n yayki-(i)-ta
   convenient-TM convenient-COP-QT-ATTR story-COP-PLN

‘Convenient’ means ‘phyenlihan’ (convenient) (in Korean)’

Examination of these verbs illustrates to how the Korean hosts are portrayed in their English-teaching role, which is distinct from the ES hosts. These four ESVs are usually used when the Korean hosts provide Korean equivalents to the target English
expressions, in order to translate/interpret the content of the topic or what the ES hosts have just explained. This limited role of the Korean hosts indicates that there seems to be a directionality of information flow, i.e., from the English hosts to the Korean hosts as a bridge, and finally to the TV viewers. The domain they deal with in English lessons seems to be limited to grammatical forms other than translation, which the ES hosts usually do not mention, while the focus of the target translation does not go beyond the sentence level in most cases.

The ES hosts, on the other hand, are portrayed as monolinguals who do not understand Korean, explaining English words using only English ESVs. Unlike the Korean hosts who use 4 ESVs, the ES hosts only use two types of English ESVs: ‘to be’ and ‘to mean.’ Example (32) below illustrates how these verbs are used in these TV programs.

(32) [Use of ESVs by the ES hosts]

a. When you ‘get the urge to do something’ **means** you get a feeling that you really wanna do something.

b. Bangs **are** the front part of your hair over here.

In (32a), the ES host explains the target phrase ‘to get the urge to do something’ by providing a dictionary meaning: ‘to get a feeling that you really wanna do something.’

The host uses the English ESV, **mean**. The English copula, **be**, is used in (32b) when the
ES host defines one of the key vocabulary words, ‘bangs,’ as s/he introduces the topic of ‘going to a beauty salon.’ In these cases, these two verbs also function as ‘ESVs’ as they signal similar or equivalent meanings.

While the four Korean ESVs have the same meaning (i.e., to mean), all the tokens of these types of verbs have been examined to see how they are different in function--especially the focus of the instructions that co-occur with these ESVs. Using these verbs, the Korean hosts tend to deal with different levels (e.g., lexical, discourse) of language use. For example, they sometimes only pinpoint a specific word that is selected as important and interpret it into Korean, although the whole sentence is presented. These verbs can indicate that the Korean and ES hosts deal with different domains of discourse. The Korean hosts only serve as a bridge between the ES hosts and the Korean TV viewers, while the ES hosts are usually considered more authentic English users.

To examine when the ESVs are used, the focus of these instructions is divided into four levels. When the Korean and ES hosts explain English expressions in the skit--or what the ES hosts say in the case of the Korean hosts, they sometimes zero on the target words or phrases that they select to be more important instead of explaining it in the whole context. These levels the hosts deal with are categorized as lexical (e.g., convenient), phrasal (e.g., to make it), clausal (e.g., we don’t carry DVD titles here), and
discourse, which includes a summary or any type of contextual meaning that is beyond the sentential level. An example of instructions at the discourse level appears in the expression, ‘Can I have some stamps?’ which means ‘I want to buy some stamps.’ Table 5.1 illustrates how these four verbs are used differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uymi (meaning: Sino-Korean)</th>
<th>Ttus (meaning: Korean)</th>
<th>Mal (word or language)</th>
<th>Yayki/iyaki (story)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>8/9 (88.9%)</td>
<td>35/110 (31.8%)</td>
<td>15/42 (34.1%)</td>
<td>7/51 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>44/110 (40.0%)</td>
<td>11/42 (26.9%)</td>
<td>6/51 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>0/9 (0%)</td>
<td>29/110 (26.4%)</td>
<td>8/42 (19.5%)</td>
<td>11/51 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>1/9 (11.1%)</td>
<td>2/110 (1.8%)</td>
<td>8/42 (19.5%)</td>
<td>27/51 (52.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1. Focus of instructions co-occurring with the ESVs used by the Korean hosts

In the table above, four verbs show a continuum on which ‘uymi’ tends to be used with instructions that focus on the lexical level (88.9%). In the case of ‘ttus,’ while occurring most frequently, it mainly centers on the lexical and phrasal levels, when the Korean hosts explain the expressions in the lessons. However, ‘mal’ appears to cover more discourse level than ‘uymi’ and ‘ttus.’ While ‘yayki/iyaki’ is used at all levels, it tends to co-occur the most (52.9%) with instructions that focus on the discourse level.
The table above illustrates a continuum in terms of the co-occurrence of particular ESVs with the focus of instruction as can be seen in Figure 5.1.

**LEXICAL** uymi >> ttus >> mal >> yayki/iyaki  **DISCOURSE**

(meaning:SK) (meaning) (word) (story)

Figure 5.1. Continuum of the co-occurrence of Korean ESVs with the Korean hosts’ focus of instruction

Compared with the Korean hosts, the ES hosts tend to use only two ESVs\(^{27}\): *to mean* and *to be* in most cases. Table 5.2 shows how the verbs are used in English in relation to the ES hosts’ focus of instruction. Here, ‘to be’ is used to define English lexicons, while ‘to mean’ is used to cover a wider range of levels, while primarily lexical and phrasal levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>12/16 (75%)</td>
<td>5/41 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal</td>
<td>4/16 (25%)</td>
<td>26/41 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>8/41 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>2/41 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. The co-occurrence of ESVs with the ES hosts’ focus of instruction

**LEXICAL** be >> mean >> **DISCOURSE**

Figure 5.2. Continuum of the co-occurrence of English ESVs with the ES hosts’ focus of instruction

---

\(^{27}\) Only one instance of ‘stand for’ was found.
As Table 5.1 and 5.2 illustrate, the Korean and ES hosts tend to deal with the levels below the sentence level most of the time in their lessons. It is noteworthy that in these TV programs the Korean hosts use a wider range of ESVs to convey the meanings of English expressions than the ES hosts do. To examine the roles of both Korean and English-speaking hosts more closely, it is necessary to look in detail at how these types of verbs are used depending on the focus of instruction.

5.3. The role of the hosts and the use of ESVs

This section addresses the correlation between the use of ESVs and the role of the Korean and ES hosts. In spite of their expertise in English, the role of the Korean hosts seems to be quite different from that of the ES hosts. When we look closely at the way ESVs are used by both hosts, recurrent patterns, which are not unrelated to the audience’s expectations, are found with regards to their focus of instruction.

While the Korean hosts serve as mediators who know not only the Korean culture and language of their viewers but also have expertise in English as bilinguals, they have limited roles in this English teaching, i.e., interpretation and explanation of form-based grammar. The ES hosts, on the other hand, are considered authority figures and are framed as monolinguals of English, and as such, insiders to American culture.
Therefore, these ES hosts have the privilege to provide authentic explanations of American language and culture. For example, the ES hosts focus on lexicalized or idiomatic expressions, since it is presumed that only English speakers or native speaker of English can have access to their true meanings. Unlike the ES hosts, the Korean hosts tend to deal with those idiomatic expressions as interpreters only after the ES hosts mention or explain them, while reinforcing the importance of learning these idiomatic expressions used in the United States.

5.3.1 Focus of interpretation by Korean hosts

5.3.1.1 Simple translation

As interpreters, the Korean hosts simply translate the English words and expressions appearing for the day’s lesson into Korean equivalents that have roughly the same meaning in Korean, thus providing a corresponding Korean meaning. Usually, this type of simple and direct translation frequently occurs at the lexical or phrasal levels words that are familiar to the TV viewers. Example (33) below is a prototypical instance of this.
Lee: …●hh we can so\^lve this problem (.). ourse^lves-la-ko ha-pnita. S-o-l-v-e^\\n\\nWe can solve this problem ourselves –QT-CONN say-DEF. solve
so\^\cdotive la-ko ha-myen, ●hh haykyel-ha-ta la-nun ttus-i toy-canh-ayo^ (.)
solve-QT-CONN say-if solve-do-PLN QT-ATTR meaning-SM become-COMM-POL
so\^\cdotive (. the problem. (. mwuncey-lul haykyel-ha-ta: la-nun ttus-i toy-l
solve the problem problem-OM solve-do-PLN QT-ATTR meaning-SM become-ATTR
they-ntey ●h wuli-kkili mwuncey-lul haykyel-ha-ca la-ko hay-ss-nuntey
thing-CONN we-together problem-OM solve-do-PR QT-CONN do-PST-CONN
●hh kulssey cal toy-lye-nun ci molu-keyss-nuntey-yo.
well well become-INTEND-ATTR whether not know-MDL-CONN-POL

‘In the skit they say ((Eng)) ‘We can solve this problem ourselves.’ ((Kor))
If you say ‘S-o-l-v-e’ ‘solve,’ it means ((Kor)) ‘solve’ right? So ((Eng))
‘solve the problem’ means ((Kor)) ‘solve the problem.’ They said ‘Let’s
solve the problem ourselves, but I’m not sure if it will work.’

As the Korean host explains the previous skit, she simply gives a word-by-word
translation from English into Korean. This is not uncommon when Korean has an
equivalent meaning for a particular word. Here, solve is translated as ‘haykyel-hata’ (‘to
solve’) in Korean and ‘to solve the problem’ as ‘mwuncey-lul haykyel-hata’ (‘to solve the
problem’) respectively. The Korean hosts also demonstrate their roles as experts with
respect to grammatical issues.

In the example below, the Korean host seems to anticipate that the verb, ‘to solve’
is a relatively easy word for Korean learners. He simply translates it and uses ‘-canh-
ayo,’ expecting the viewers to agree.
Stephen:...he says yea^h (.) I go^t the (.) u^rge to (.) when you (.) ge^t the u^::rge to do so^mething (.). means, you ge^t •hh a fee^::ling that you rea^lly wanna do^ somethin’ so o^ne night, •hh he rea^lly (.) fe^It like (.) re^modeling the apa^rtment •hh an’ he started kno^cking down the wall, (.) an’ he di^dn’ (.). finish.


‘If the phrase ‘get the urge to’ is followed by a basic verb form, that means ‘to suddenly feel like doing something. So, the verb ‘to renovate’ is followed.’

Following the ES host’s explanation of the day’s key expressions, the female Korean hostess, Yena selects the phrase that is considered as the most important to the viewers.

She interprets in Korean what the ES host has just said, providing a Korean equivalent to the English phrase, ‘to get the urge to do something.’ It is also not uncommon for the Korean hosts to provide a grammatical formulation to help the viewers understand the expressions (i.e., ‘get the urge to’ + ‘basic verb form’). She uses the deferential form when she translates in order to establish her expertise in English grammar as opposed to the use of ‘canh-ayo’ in (33) (see Eun & Strauss, in press; Strauss & Eun, to appear),
While Korean ‘ttus’ and ‘uymi’ share the same meaning as equivalency-signalling verbs, ‘uymi’ does not occur as frequently\(^{28}\) as ‘ttus’ does. It seems to be used when it signals nonliteral meaning or contextual meaning, although focusing on the lexicon itself, as in (35).

(35) [SE: 12/5/00]

Lee:  

*hh ku taum tto finally nao-key toy-pnita.  
\*h fi^nally fi^nally, ca tutie la-nun*  

That next again finally appear-become-DEF finally finally so finally QT-ATTR  
\*mal-i toy-keyss-cyo^\^  
\*hh fi^nally  
\*hh ku kyokwase-eyse-nun mwe at la^::st ile-n*  
word-COP become-MDL-COMM-POL finally that textbook-LOC-TM what at last this-ATTR  
\*sik-uy phyohyen-ul wuli-ka manh-i kongpwy-hay-ss-te-n kiek-i*  
style-GEN expression-OM we-SM many-ADV study-do-PST-RETRO-ATTR memory-SM  
na-nuntey^\^  
\*hh olayss-tongan kitalye wa-ss-ta-nun kule-n uymi-lul*  
appear-CONN long during wait come-PST-QT-ATTR that-ATTR meaning-OM  
\*manh-i nukki-l swu iss-key ha-nun tane-pnita...*  
many-ADV feel-ATTR can exist-CAU do-ATTR word-DEF

‘Next, we have the word ‘finally’ again. Finally, finally. It means ‘ca’ (so) ‘tutie’ (finally) in Korean, right? Finally. I remember we learned this kind of expression, ‘at last’ in the textbook a lot. This is the word that makes us feel that it means someone has been waiting for a long time.’

The Korean hostess, Lee, introduces the word ‘finally,’ she first uses the ESV, ‘mal’ when directly translating the word. She also uses ‘-cyo’ with rising intonation to expect the viewers to agree with her (Sohn, 1999). Since it is a relatively easy translation, she expects them to understand it. Later, she switches to ‘uymi’ when she explains its

\(^{28}\) Only 9 tokens of uymi were found, while 110 tokens of ‘ttus’ were found for this study. However, it would be a further study to examine the difference between ‘ttus’ vs. ‘uymi.’
pragmatic meaning that it implies that someone has been waiting for something, although she does not present a specific context.

5.3.1.2 Formulation

The Korean host also tends to deal with grammatical issues by providing a mathematical-like formula as can be seen in example (36) below.

(36) [TV English Conversation: 8/22/01]

(Prior to this clip, the ES host had just explained that the expression, ‘What’s the apartment like?’ means ‘how’s the apartment?’)

Yena:  ●hh okay the first expression i::s ●hh wha^t’s the apartment li^ke ●hh
aphathu-ka ettay:: ette-n aphantu-ya:: la-ko cilmwun-ul ha-nun
Apartment-SM how what-ATTR apartment-Q-INT QT-CONN question-OM do-ATTR
kes-i-cyo? ●hh wha^t ku taum-ey mwuncang twi-ey like-ka
thing-COP-CONN-POL what that next-LOC sentence after-LOC like-SM
hapchy-e-ci-myen ku-key:: ho::w-uy ttus-i-ketun-yo? ● h ho::w is the
combine-PASS-if that-thing how-GEN meaning-COP-CONN-POL how is the
apartment. Aphantu-ka (.) e^tte-n aphantu-ya:: la-ko ha-ko
apartment apartment-SM what-ATTR apartment-Q-INT QT-CONN do-CONN
siph-ul ttay^ ●hh ho::w’s the apa^rtment.
want to-ATTR when how’s the apartment
ttonun wha^t’s the apartment li^ke. ●hh twu kaci motwu:: pakkw-e
or what’s the apartment like two CLSF all exchange-CONN
ka-myense ssu-i-l swu-ka iss-supnita.
Go-as use-PASS can-SM exist-DEF

‘OK, the first expression is, ((Eng)) ‘What’s the apartment like?’ ((Kor))
This expression is that they’re asking ‘How’s the apartment?’ ‘What kind of apartment is it?’ Right? When the word ‘what’ is combined with ‘like’ at the
end of the sentence, it means ‘how.’ ((Eng)) How’s the apartment? ((Kor))
When you want to ask, ‘What kind of apartment is that?’ you can use
((Eng)) ‘How’s the apartment?’ or ‘What’s the apartment like?’ ((Kor))
These two can be used [DEF] interchangeably.’

In example (36) above, as the Korean hostess, Yena, interprets what the ES host has just
explained, she creates a formula, which is ‘what + like = how,’ adding grammatical
information as an expert knowledgeable of the structure of English. Interestingly, when
she articulates that these two expressions (i.e., what…like? = how…?) can be used
interchangeably, she uses the deferential form29 to demonstrate her expertise. The
Korean host emphasizes interchangeability of the two expressions to make the lesson
easy to understand. While the ES hosts give more meaning-focused explanations, the
Korean hosts are portrayed as expert in grammatical issues or form-focused lessons.

Below is example (37) exemplifying that the Korean hostess focuses on form
rather than actual meaning of the content and extends her explanation based on the form.

The day’s topic is ‘Dining out in a restaurant.’

(37) [SE: 1/22/01]

Lee:  ... ●h diet-la-nun palum cachey-ka ccokkum ikswuk-ci anh-ass-ki ttaymwuney
         Diet QT-ATTR pronunciation itself-SM little familiar-not –PST-because
      ●h kwi-ey cal an tule wa-te-n ka siph-eyo^ ●hh we::ll it’ s caffei^ne free (.) an’
          ear-LOC well not in come-RETRO-ATTR-seem-POL well it’s caffeine free and

29 For a detailed discussion of Korean honorific alternations, see Eun & Strauss (in press) and Strauss &
Eun (to appear).
‘Because he was not familiar with the pronunciation of the word, ‘diet,’ he may not easily understand it. (The waiter) is explaining it like, ‘Well, it’s caffeine free and low in sugar.’ When we say something is free, that means it doesn’t contain it, right? So in ‘sugar free’ there’s no sugar and ‘caffeine free’ means that there’s no caffeine. If you say ‘low in sugar,’ it’s not that there’s no sugar, he’s saying that it has a little bit of sugar. OK he’s saying like this. I think it would be good if you know this kind of expression.’

Before the above excerpt, a Korean ‘challenger’ participated in the segment called

*Survival in the USA* where he should order a meal in an American restaurant in Washington, D.C. While he is ordering food, the American waiter asks him if he wants a Diet Coke, but the guest could not catch the pronunciation. The guest then requests that the waiter explain what ‘diet’ means. While he doesn’t quite understand the pronunciation of the word, he may know the meaning of the word. The Korean hostess, Lee focuses on
the English suffix ‘-free’ and explains the meaning. She then tries to formulate her explanation \((X\text{-}free)\) without carefully looking at what the waiter actually says. Although the word ‘diet’ may not refer to ‘caffeine free’ as the waiter explains, she does not mention it because it was uttered by an American waiter in the United States, which is truly authentic and unquestionable.

5.3.1.3 Shift from shared/salient to non-shared/non-salient meaning

The Korean hosts serve as mediators on these TV programs, meaning that they function both as experts of English and hosts who share the same Korean language and culture in common with their television audience. Therefore, they frequently shift from their positions as insiders of Korean culture to experts of English who have advanced degrees in a linguistically-related area.

(38) \[ \text{Survival English: 9/9/02} \]

((Lee: male Korean host))

Lee: \(\text{•} \)h e:: he’re’s my wife (. ) Ju’ve ne. ha-myense (. ) June-ul sokay-ha-ko

Um here’s my wife Jung say-as June-OM introduce-do-CONN
iss-supnita:: (. ) anay ilum-i Ju’ve-i-yey-yo:: kunikka-n e:: wuli-ka
exist-DEF wife name-SM June-COP-POL so-TM um we-SM
al-ko iss-nun (. ) kyeycel mwe tal ihe-n ttus-to toy-cima::n
know-CONN exist-ATTR season um month this-ATTR meaning-also become-but
tong-si-ey salam ilum-ulo-to manh-i ssu-i-pnita.
Same-time-LOC person name-INST-also many-ADV use-PASS-DEF
A-si-keyss-cyo?
‘Um (he’s) introducing June as he says, ‘Here’s my wife June.’ His wife’s
ame is June. So, um the word (June) can mean (name of) the season or
month, but at the same time, it is also commonly used as name of the
person. Do you understand?’

The Korean host tries to interpret the utterance in the skit, ‘Here’s my wife, June.’ He
pinpoints the English word, ‘June,’ which has multiple meanings. He first addresses the
most salient meaning to Korean viewers (i.e., name of the sixth month, June) and then
shifts into his position as an English expert, explaining a relatively non-salient meaning
to the viewers (i.e., the name of a person, June). It is worth mentioning that he points out
shared information first by using the generic inclusive pronoun ‘wuli’ (we), thus framing
himself as an insider to Korean culture (i.e, ‘wuli-ka al-ko iss-nun’ – ‘the meaning that
we know’). Again, when he projects his position as an expert, he alternates to the
deverential form (‘salam ilum-ul-to manh-i ssu-i-pnita’ - ‘it is also commonly used as
name of a person’). When the hosts shift from shared to non-shared information, they
often use Korean contrastive markers, such as ‘-nuntey’ (i.e.,’but’), ‘-ciman’
(i.e.,’however), ‘kulena’ (i.e., ‘but’), as well as other similar function markers ‘-anila’
(i.e., ‘instead of’), and ‘-pota-nun’ (i.e., ‘rather than’). Example (39) below is another
case.
(39) [Survival English: 5/10/99]

(Lee: male Korean host)

Lee: …ton-ul (.) pwu^chi-n-tako kule-l ttay ssu-nun tongska-ka, •hh
Money-OM send-IND-PLN-QT say so-ATTR when use-ATTR verb-SM
wi^re-ka toy-keyss-supnita. = so, (.) I wan’ to wi^::re (.) some money
wire-SM become-MDL-DEF so, I want to wire some money
()
(') to a fri^::end in Pusan. Ile-l ttay wi^re-la-nun ke-nu’n •hhh
(') to a friend in Pusan this-ATTR when wire-QT-ATTR thing-TM
cen-sencwul-i ani-ko, (.) tongsa-lo ss-e kaci-ko ce’nsinhwan-ulo
electric-wire-SM not-CONN verb-INST use-CONN have-CONN cable transfer-INST
pwuchi-n-ta^ ile-n mal-i toy-keyss-supnita.
Send-IND-PLN this-ATTR word-SM become-MDL-DEF

‘The verb used when you send money will be ‘wire.’ ((Eng)) I want to wire some money to a friend in Pusan30. ((Kor)) In this case, as for the word, ‘wire’ is not a noun meaning ‘electric wire’ but (it is used) as a verb meaning ‘to send money by cable transfer.’

In order to explain the English expression, ‘I want to wire some money’ in the example above, the Korean host, Lee focuses on the English verb, ‘to wire.’ This is commonly used in the banking context but not in everyday situations. He focuses first on the salient or shared meaning that the viewers would initially expect the expression to mean and then shifts into his role as an expert. He also uses an equivalency-signaling verb (ESV), -mal-ita, which co-occurs with a Korean contrastive marker ‘-ani-ko’ to negate the expectations of the viewers.

30 Pusan is the second largest city in Korea.
Example (40) in which the Korean hostess explains a vocabulary word with polysemous meanings, is similar to example (39). The Korean hostess, again, first focuses on the salient meaning of the English intransitive verb ‘to work,’ meaning ‘to do a job,’ and then shifts to explaining the contextual meaning in this situation.

(40) [Survival English: 4/10/01]
Lee: ...tha’t didn’ wo’rk. •hhi ani ku kes-i i::l-ul ha-ci anh-ass-ta. ()
That didn’t work no that thing-SM work-OM do-COMM not-PST-PLN
work-ha-myen-un il-ul ha-ta:::-la-nun ttus-i-l theyn tey
Work-do-if-TM work-OM do-PLN-QT-ATTR meaning-COP-ATTR MDL
mal-i-cyo?() yekise-nun •hhi cey hyokwa-lul () palhwi-ha-ta-la-nun
word-COP-POL here-TM proper effect-OM display-do-PLN-QT-ATTR
ttus-ulo, () work-ka ssu-i-pnita.
meaning-INST work-SM use-PASS-DEF

‘((Eng)) That didn’t work. ((Kor)) Gosh, (literally) it did not work. When you say ‘work,’ it means ‘do a job,’ right? Here (in this context) the word ‘work’ is used to mean ‘to have a proper effect.’

She does not use a contrastive marker; instead, she uses the place deixis ‘yekise’ ‘(here)’ with the topic marker ‘-nun’ to signal a contrast (see Kuno, 1973 for Japanese topic marker –wa and Sohn, 1999 for Korean). These contrastive markers contrast the domain of what is literally said with that which is implicated in a particular context. They also contrast the domain of information which is shared with that which is not.
5.3.1.4 Translating the un-translatable

As insiders of Korean culture, the Korean hosts frequently provide the closest Korean equivalents to English idiomatic and lexical expressions, including ones which go beyond the sentence level. As linguistic and cultural ‘bridges’ between the English- and Korean-speaking worlds, they try to interpret not only linguistic elements, including idiomatic expressions, but also culturally-loaded discourse in order to provide the closest possible Korean equivalents. This is achievable because the Korean hosts not only have the ability to decode the explanations of the ES hosts but also a deep awareness of Korean culture. Example (41) is a segment of ‘Q & A’ in which the Korean American hostess, Dorothy, tries to provide an English equivalent for a Korean word. Although this excerpt does not contain any of the four target forms, this is a prototypical example of providing a Korean equivalent responding to the English word.

(41) [Survival English: 12/5/00]
((Q & A segment))

Dorothy:  

Hello:: welcome to Dorothy’s (. ) Q^ an’ A:: co^rner. (0.8) onul
Hello welcome to Dorothy’s Q and A segment today
cilmwun-un-yo (0.8) what’s your; (. ) cwu’min tunglok penho. (. )
question-TM-POL what’s your resident registration number
cwumin tunglok penho. = yenge-lo ethchkey ha-cyo? (1.0) mikwuk-ey
resident registration number English-INST how say-COMM-POL USA-LOC
iss-umyen-yo:: (0.8) so’cial (. ) se’curity (. ) number. (. ) Social security
exist-if-POL social security number social security
nu’mber. Kuntey yeki ha’nkwuk-seyse-nun kunyang (.) what’s your number but here Korea-LOC-TM just what’s your ide’nification number. Nemwu kil-cyo. (.) kunyang ccalp-key^ what’s identification number too long-COMM-POL just short-ADV what’s I-D:: number. (.) what’s your I-D number. (0.4) al-keyss-cyo^:: then we’ll ID number what’s your ID number know-MDL-COMM-POL then we’ll see you nex’ti::me. Bye bye.

See you next time bye bye

‘Hello. Welcome to Dorothy’s Q and A segment. Today’s question (from the viewer) is, ‘What’s your resident registration number?’ How do you say ‘resident registration number’ in English? If you’re in the States, they have a social security number, social security number. But here in Korea, you can just say ‘What’s your identification number?’ It’s too long, right? To make it short, what’s ID number, what’s your ID number? Do you understand? Then we’ll see you next time. Bye bye.’

In this Q&A segment, the program designers choose a question sent from TV viewers and try to answer it. Here, the question is ‘How do you say ‘cwumin-tunglok-penho’ (‘resident registration number’) in English?’ The Korean American hostess, Dorothy provides an English equivalent (e.g. ‘social security number’) which is supposed to have the same meaning. However, these two numbers are not the same because in Korea a ‘resident registration number’ refers to the number on a person’s ID card. This is not the same as a social security number or a driver’s license number. This type of inaccurate interpretation comes about because of the question, ‘How do you say it in English?’ This implies that there is always an English equivalent to the Korean language and culture and
vice versa. Furthermore, the underlying assumption in these programs behind this type of ‘How do you say it in English?’ question is that ‘in English’ is a synonym for ‘in the United States,’ even though it is not explicitly stated that American English is what is being taught.

Similarly, the Korean hosts also try to directly translate culture-laden discourse, even though it may not always be possible to directly translate. Example (42) below is a case in point.

(42) [TV English Conversation:11/2/00: Theme: ‘Meeting boy/girlfriend’s parents’]

Yena: •hh Li’nda, (.) has told us (.) so:: much about you. •hh wuli mal-lo-to ile-n
Linda has told us so much about you we word-INST-also this-ATTR
mal koyngcanghi manh-hi ssu-si-cyo? •hh Linda:: eykeyse mal cengmal
word strikingly many-ADV use-HON-COMM-POL Linda from word really
manh-hi tul-ess-eyo. •hh we heard so^ much about you from Li’nda. Ile-n
many-ADV listen-PST-POL we heard so much about you from Linda. This-ATTR
ttus-i toy-keyss-cyo? (.) ca taum phohyen-un-yo?
meaning-SM become-MDL-COMM-POL so next expression-TM-POL

‘((Eng)) Linda has told us so much about you. ((Kor)) We also use this expression really often in Korean, right? I heard a lot about you from Linda. ((Eng)) We heard so much about you from Linda. ((Kor)) That’s what it means, right? So, the next expression is…’

The Korean hostess, Yena explains the expression appearing in the previous skit,

‘Meeting your boyfriend’s parents.’ Here, the relatively lexicalized expression, ‘X has told me so much about you,’ has been translated into a Korean equivalent, ‘X heard so
much about you from Y,’ which is also a lexicalized expression in Korean. Yena frequently signals ‘we-ness’ by using the inclusive ‘wuli’ (e.g. ‘we’) when she tries to provide the Korean version of an expression. In this case, the hosts evidence a rather simplistic view of language and culture as having a one-to-one correspondence.

Therefore, comparison and contrast is one of the main strategies used when translating the utterances being interpreted. Example (43) below is another example of this.

(43) [TV English Conversation: 8/14/02]
Lee: …ôhh ca^ yele kaci ôhh akka ku Jody-ka^ (. ) now (. ) I thought I heard
So many kind before that Jody-SM now I thought I heard
everything-i-la-ko hay-ss-nuntyei, okay now (. ) seen everything ilehkey
everything-COP-QT-CONN do-PST-CONN OK now seen everything like this
mal-ha-mye^n ôhh seysang-ey (. ) pyel kkol-ul ta po-keyss-ta-la-nun
word-do-if world-LOC special shape-OM all see-MDL-PLN-QT-ATTR
mal-i toy-nun ke-ko^ (. ) pyel huy^han-ha-n yayki-l
word-SM become-ATTR thing-CONN special wonder-do-ATTR story-OM all
ta tut-keyss-ta^ ile-n yayki-ka toy-keyss-ney-yo.
all listen-MDL-PLN this-ATTR story-SM become-MDL-CRM-POL

‘So, many things- a while ago, Jody said, ‘Now I thought I heard everything.’ When we say like this, ((Eng)) ‘OK now seen everything,’ ((Kor)) it (literally) means (in Korean), ‘Gosh, this is what I really don’t want to see’ or ‘this is what I really don’t want to hear.’

The Korean hostess, Lee, translates the idiomatic expression, ‘I thought I heard everything,’ into Korean idioms. What is interesting here is that she is signaling that Korean also has the equivalent to an English idiomatic expression by juxtaposing two
verbs from each language (i.e., hear vs ‘tut-ta’ ‘hear’/ ‘see’ vs. ‘po-ta’ ‘see’). She does this even though the two utterances are not directly translatable or have equivalent meanings. Example (44) below is a similar case.

(44) [TV English Conversation: 2/6/02]

Yena: •hh an’ the se^cond expression, •h is the Po^pe (. ) Ca^:tholic. •hh ca

And the second expression is the Pope Catholic so

the Po’pe-la-ko ha-my’e’n (. ) mwu’llon ku:: khatholik-kyo-cyo?
The Pope-COP-QT-CONN say-if of course that Catholic-religion-COMM-POL

Kyo’kwang-I-la-nun tane-i-ntey-yo •hh kyokwang-i

Pope-COP-QT-ATTR word-COP-CONN-POL Pope-SM

chencwukyo-i-pninka? la-ko mwul-e po-nun ke-nu’n •hh

Catholic-COP-DEF-Q QT-CONN ask-CONN see-ATTR thing-TM

ne’mvuna tangyen-ha-n il-ul way mwul-e (. ) po-nu-nya:: la-nun

very much natural-do-ATTR matter-OM why ask-CONN see-PRS-Q QT-ATTR

ttus-i-pnita:: •hh is the Pope Ca^:tholic? (. ) wuli mal-lo ha-my’e’n (. )

meaning-COP-DEF is the Pope Catholic we word-INST say-if

twu mal-ha-myen cansoli-cyo:: (. ) ka toy-keyss-cyo?

Two word-do-if nagging-COMM-POL-SM become-MDL-COMM-POL

‘And the second expression is, ‘Is the Pope Catholic?’ So, if you say ‘the Pope,’ of course he’s Catholic, right? The word means the Pope. When you ask, ‘Is the Pope Catholic?’ that means, ‘Why do you ask me what is so obvious?’ ((Eng)) Is the Pope Catholic? ((Kor)) In Korean it will be (literally) ‘If you say it twice, of course it’s nagging,’ right?

Again, in the example above, the Korean hostess provides a Korean idiomatic equivalent for the English idiomatic expression ‘Is the Pope Catholic?’ She implies that it has the
same meaning as the Korean idiom ‘twu mal-ha-myen cansoli-ci’ (lit. ‘if you say it twice, it’s nagging’). This type of comparison occurs often, especially when the Korean hosts provide a Korean version of an English idiom. This can provide a misconception that it is actually possible to translate even one’s culture as well as one’s language, which is being viewed as one-to-one corresponding relationship.

In example (45) below, the Korean host tries to compare the English ellipsis with Korean speech.

(45) [Survival English: 9/9/02]
Lee: ...kulayse Hi^ Ro^bert, ha-myense •hh gla^d you can ma^ke it. (.)
so hi Robert do-as glad you can make it
I^'m glad-ciman kunyang I’m-ul saynglyak-ha-ko chin-ha-n
I’m glad-but just I’m-OM omit-do-CONN close-do-ATTR
sai-eyse-nun-yo cwue tongsa:: pothong ilehkey cwue-lul
relationship-LOC-TM-POL subject verb usually like this subject-OM
saynglyak-ha-myen-un •hh pan-mal pisus-ha-key toy-pnita...
omit-do-if-TM half-word similar-do-ADV become-DEF

‘So, as he’s saying, ‘Hi, Robert,’ he’s saying, ‘Glad you can make it.’ It’s supposed to be ‘I’m glad,’ but ‘I’m’ is just omitted between people with close relationships. If you omit the subject and verb, it is usually similar to the half-talk in Korean…’

This example clearly shows that providing the Korean equivalent is not just limited to the sentential level, but that it can also be applied at the level of discourse. In this case, the colloquial use of subject-verb ellipsis is made equivalent to non-honorific speech, which
may not be directly translatable.

5.3.2  Focus of interpretation by the ES hosts

5.3.2.1 Insiders of American culture

Unlike the Korean hosts, the ES hosts tend to deal primarily with lexicalized or idiomatic expressions that belong within their domain, being considered the only ones who have access to the deeper nuances of these expressions. By nature, the idiom is a very fixed expression, its “semantics and pragmatic functions [being] opaque and specialized” (McCarthy, 1998, p. 130). In comparison with the Korean hosts, the ES hosts use mainly two ESVs: *to mean* and *to be*. Table 5.3 below is re-introduced for convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>12/16 (75%)</td>
<td>5/41 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal</td>
<td>4/16 (25%)</td>
<td>26/41 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>8/41 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>0/16 (0%)</td>
<td>2/41 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. The co-occurrence of ESVs used by the ES hosts with the focus of instruction

Here, the verb, ‘*mean*’ is used with all types of instruction, whereas the copula ‘*be*’ deals more with instructions that focus on the lexical level (75%). Even when the instructional focus is at the lexical level, the vocabulary words used tend to be highly related to culture,
specifically American culture. Example (46) below illustrates how the verb is used in defining a word lexically.

(46) [TV English Conversation: 8/22/01]
((They show an American movie clip entitled “Someone like You.” Watching the clip, the Korean hostess asked the ES host what American houses are like.))

1 Stephen: …usually, in America, (1.0) tsk um uh uh mo^st people uh Susan and I bo::th I think come from su^bu::rbs of (. ) big cities. •hh jus’ o^utside of the big cities, •hh an’ usually we live in a three^:: ( . ) or ( . ) fou’r bedroom ho^use. There’re three or four bedrooms •hh usually what we call (. ) a ma^ster bedroom. •hh an’ a ma^ster bedroom is the biggest bedroom. •hh an’ o^ften ha::s a ba^throom (. ) attached. (. ) okay?…

2 Yena: •hh selmyeng-ul tul-e po-nikka hankwuk-hako kutaci pyel chai-ka
Explain-OM listen-CONN see-because Korea-with much specially difference-SM
iss-nun ke kath-ci-nun anh-ney-yo…((sentences skipped)) •hh exist-ATTR thing same-CONN-TM not-CRM-POL
>kulem< wuli nala-ey:: e –lo chi-myen-un pwumo-nim-tul-i
so we country-LOC um -INST regard-if parents-HON-PL-SM
cwumwusi-nun pang ku an-pang-ul, •hh master bedroom-i-la-ko
sleep-HON-ATTR room that inside-room-OM master bedroom-COP-QT-CONN
pwulu-pnita. Kuliko, ku an-ey:: bedroom an-ey, •hh ku:: ku yoksil-i::
call-DEF and that inside-LOC bedroom inside-LOC that- that bathroom-SM
ttal-ly-e:: o-nun kyengwu-ka manh-cyo?…
attach-PASS-CONN come-ATTR case-SM many-CONN-POL

‘Since we heard what he (i.e., the ES host) explains, it seems that (American houses) are not much different from Korean ones…((sentences skipped))
So, considering the Korean (context), the room in which parents sleep is called ‘master bedroom’ (in English). It often has a bathroom attached, right?…’
In the discourse just preceding example (46), the Korean hostess had asked a culture-related question concerning the structure of American houses. While the ES host, Stephen, is supplying information within his domain as an authority on American culture in line 1, he defines the term ‘master bedroom’ using the ESV, be. It is known that he is referring to American culture, because he uses a place deixis, in America. It is also significant that he often uses the frequency adverbial ‘usually,’ since this adverbial serves as a generalization marker signaling that the ES host is there as a representative of American language and culture. Following this, the Korean hostess again translates what the ES host has said, while translating this culturally-laden word by indicating that ‘the master bedroom is equivalent to ‘an-pang’ (‘inside room’) in Korean. Again, the Korean hostess, as an insider to the Korean culture, tries to compare the two cultures by stating ‘wuli nala-lo chi-myen’ which means ‘supposing the equivalent word in Korea.’

Example (47) is similar in that when the Korean hostess asks what ‘Secret Santa’ is, the ES host supplies a lengthy explanation of the cultural activities behind the use of this phrase.

31 Traditionally, ‘An-pang’ (i.e., inside room) in classical Korean is used to refer to a room where the female master slept in Korea, whereas guests stayed in the outer rooms. Today, ‘an-pang’ refers to the main room where parents or grandparents sleep.
(47) [TV English Conversation: 12/6/00]

(Theme: “Christmas Gift Giving”)

1 Stephen: Oka^::y Se^cret (. ) Sa^nta is a:: h when you:: have a group of people:: or group of fri::nds o^r (. ) coworke::rs. •hh a::n’ you don’ wanna bu:: a present for (. ) ea::ch (. ) indivi^dual. So you ju^s’ put each other’s na::mes into a ha^t, an’ (. ) pi^ck (. ) out a (. ) si^ngle name:: okay? •hh an’ then you’re (. ) bu^y something for that pe^rson, •hh so e^veryone knows (. ) who Sa^nta Clau::s it, right? •hh we::ll (. ) you do- the other pe^rson (. ) doesn’ know who^:: is buying a gift for each of the^m. •hh u::h e- who:: (. ) is buying the gift fo::r the other pe^rson. (. ) so:: it’s (. ) just a- a- an i^nteresting way to gi- exchange presents an’ make it a little bit chea^per (. ) becuz you don’ hafta bu:: presents for (. ) e^verybody.

2 Yena: .....e yelepwen yeys-nal-ey:: ku manitto kkeyim-i-la-nun ke
Um everyone old-day-LOC that Manitto game-COP-QT-ATTR thing
kiek-ha-si-nun pwun keyesi-myen-un ihay-ha-ki swi-wu-l
remember-do-HON-ATTR person-HON exist-HON-if undertstand-NML easy-ATTR
ke kath-supnita...
thing same-DEF
‘…um hello viewers, if you remember ‘Manitto Game’ from before, it seems easy to understand…’

The ES host answers a question about the culturally-laden activity specified by the phrase ‘Secret Santa,’ providing very detailed information which may not be easily accessible to the Korean hosts. Then, the Korean hostess explains the tradition specified by this term by basically supplying a translated version of what the ES host has just said. What is noteworthy is that the Korean hostess again shifts from her stance as an insider of the Korean culture, providing a Korean equivalent for the American tradition. In the
programs, ‘easy’ seems to be an important objective in English teaching. Again, this is because the Korean hosts play their role as bridges to make the ES hosts’ explanation more understandable to the TV viewers. The Korean hosts’ role is to make the ES hosts’ information easier to understand to the Korean viewers as interpreting it in the light of Korean contexts.

5.3.2.2 Focus on idiomatic expressions

The ES hosts not only serve as authority figures who can provide answers to questions about culture, but they are also portrayed as experts on American culture. For these reasons, they mainly focus on explaining lexicalized and idiomatic expressions. In excerpt (48), the ES host explains one of the key expressions (i.e., to get a kick out of something) before the skit is shown. This illustrates how the ES host deals with English idioms.

(48) [*TV English Conversation: 3/20/02]*

Stephen: …key expression number two^hh I^ get a kick (.) out of wa^tching them (.) rumble (.) in the ri^ng. (.) o(h)kay. (.) cou^ple of things to explain. *hh I get a ki^ck out of somethin’, mea::ns (.) I enjo^y (.) ituh. (.) or, (.) it makes you ha^ppy (.) u^p. (.) okay? You can also get a kick (.) out of (.) three^ cups of co^ffee. (.) okay? *hh if you drink (.) three^ cups of coffee, (.) you get a ki^ck out of it. (.) it makes you u^p. (.) right? *hh wa^tching them ru^mble mea::ns (.) to
In focusing on the English idiom, ‘to get a kick out of something,’ the ES host provides synonyms using the ESV mean, displaying his knowledge of collocations that co-occur with this idiomatic phrase. This type of idiom has a more or less fixed meaning and grammatical and pragmatic usages. For this reason, the domain of meaning specified by this type of idiom is not always easily accessible to the non-native speaker of English. Additionally, when the ES host addresses the context of boxing in the States, he gives an example of the verb ‘rumble,’ the meaning of which is also non-salient to Korean learners, since it is a verb which is not commonly used. It also noteworthy that when the ES host supplies the definition of a relatively common word ‘ring’\(^{32}\), he does not seem to pay much attention to the word while providing a more culture-free explanation.

Excerpt (49) is another example of the ES host trying to teach the audience idiomatic or ‘native-like’ expressions.

\(^{32}\) Ring as a place where boxing occurs as well as ring as a piece of jewelry is salient to Koreans, since this word is commonly used as a loanword.
Susan: …•hh okay •h there’ll (. ) a^lways be somethin’ coo^ler coming •h ju^s’ around the corner. (. ) here coo^::l (. ) does not have (. ) a^ny reference to:: the te^mperature. •h it **means** something that is •h rea^lly chi::c (. ) somethin’ rea^lly interesting •h u::h (. ) something that i::s more adva^need. (. ) ju^st around the (. ) corner. •h so^ it’s- if it’s (. ) just around the co^rner, •h what it **means**- it’s (. ) very close (. ) at hand.

The ES hostess focuses on the salient meaning first, a pattern which is similar to that of the Korean hosts. She starts out by explaining that the adjective ‘cool’ in this particular context does not refer to a low temperature, which is a more salient meaning in general than its meaning of ‘attractive.’ Thus, she focuses on the salient meaning first and then shifts to a less salient meaning. What is noteworthy, however, is that this meaning of the word is not necessarily the most salient just to the Korean viewers but is what the ES hostess judges to be the word’s most obvious meaning for everyone. Susan follows the same pattern of focusing on what she considers the most salient meaning first when she points out that the idiomatic expression ‘just around the corner’ does not always mean physically what is said.
5.4 Summary: The flow of information concerning the language/culture of the United States on Korean instructional English TV programs

This chapter has examined how ESVs are used as the focuses of instruction by Korean and ES hosts on Korean English instructional programs. The Korean hosts serve as translators and mediators between the English- and Korean-speaking worlds. They tend to emphasize ‘simplicity’ in teaching English by directly translating English expressions into what they consider to be Korean equivalents and by creating formulations. In order to frame themselves as experts of English and to be more aware of their audience—Korean viewers, their translations also tend to begin with a focus on what is more salient to Korean viewers and then shift to an explanation of more non-salient meanings. The Korean hosts even translate culturally-laden English expressions into what they consider to be the closest Korean equivalents, even if the direct translation leads to a decrease in accuracy. This indicates that the Korean hosts view language as having a one-to-one relationship. The ES hosts, on the other hand, tend to focus on explaining lexicalized and idiomatic expressions which seem to belong within their domain.

Based on the roles of the Korean and ES hosts, the information flow seems to have the directionality displayed in Figure 5.3 below.
This figure illustrates the roles of each host and the flow of linguistic and cultural norms. The ES hosts (#2) serve as answer-providers to questions concerning American English and culture (#1), while the Korean hosts (#3) usually receive authentic resources from the ES hosts. The norms of American English and culture flow via their collaborative transmission by the ES and Korean hosts to the Korean viewers/learners / non-native speakers (#4) through the television program. What is also interesting is that the ES hosts are portrayed as monolinguals, while the Korean hosts are bilinguals who still cannot reach the same status with the ES hosts and only can play the role of mediators or translators of language and culture. In sum, on television, the ES hosts are portrayed as representatives of American English and culture, while the Korean hosts serve as both ‘translators’ and ‘bridges’ so that the Korean viewers/learners can more easily absorb the authentic information provided by the ES hosts. The role of the Korean
hosts is limited to translation of what the ES hosts say and translation for the sake of the
viewers.
CHAPTER 6: NATIVE SPEAKERS AS PROVIDERS OF THE NORMS OF AMERICAN ENGLISH/CULTURE

6.1. Introduction

This chapter examines the notion of the native speaker (NS) as opposed to the non-native speaker (NNS) and focuses on the extent to which NSs of English are valued in English teaching contexts in Korea. As the value of English is growing in importance, native speakers are becoming highly valuable resources in all kinds of language teaching contexts, regardless of the level and type of educational setting—from kindergarten language classes to university seminars, from private language schools to public broadcast television programs. The NS of English has been sought out, well respected, and even well rewarded for his/her contributions to English language learning especially since it is not easy to gain access to native speech or native language intuitions in Korea as native speakers of English are relatively scarce.

Because of the emphasis of communicative language teaching on the notion of authenticity, the value of NSs has grown stronger in Korean society. Although this rather simple and abstract construct of NS/NNS has started to be questioned recently, the majority of recent research on the NS-NNS dichotomy has focused on European contexts and Indo-European languages (e.g., Blyth, 1997; Belz, 2002a; Kramsch, 1997, 1998;
Cook, 1999). However, relatively little work has revealed how native norms are reinforced and perpetuated in contexts involving the teaching of English as a foreign language in East Asia. Furthermore, previous research has only discussed the issue from a more abstract, philosophical perspective and not from an approach based on data.

This chapter discusses how NSs of English are portrayed in teaching contexts in EFL countries—specifically at the level of televised instructional language programs in Korea, dealing more with macro-level discourse. In these TV programs, American norms tend to be strongly emphasized and reinforced through the ES hosts who serve as ‘providers’ of the norms of American language and culture (Eun, 2001). The first section addresses the previous research concerning the role of the NS in the teaching of English as a foreign language and the second section examines how ES hosts reinforce American norms in the TV programs.

6.2. Previous studies on the dichotomy between NS and NNS

In recent years, a number of SLA researchers have questioned the notion of the NS and have attempted to re-conceptualize the rather simplistic dichotomy between NS and NNS (see Cook, 1999; Davies, 1991, 1995, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kramsch,
The issue of the NS-NNS dichotomy, however, has not remained confined to the field of SLA, but has spread to other educational contexts. Because of this dichotomy, the primary concerns of researchers have been with the privilege and status awarded to NS teachers at the expense of quite qualified NNS teachers (see Amin, 1997; Braines, 1999; Lie, 1999; Tang, 1997; Medgyes, 1994, 2000).

As Firth and Wagner (1997) point out, this simplistic view suggests that NSs are the only people who know their first language perfectly. This perception is based on the Chomskyan view of NS competence. According to Chomsky (1965),

linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance (p. 3).

This understanding of language leads to idealized monolingual speakers being conceived of as the perfect role-models for second or foreign language learners. Romaine (1995) also points out that this theory of linguistics originates from “western Europe and the major Anglophone countries, which attach some special significance to the monolingual and the ethos of ‘one state-one language’” (p. 6) thus conceiving of bilingualism as inherently problematic.

---

33 For earlier discussions on the notion of the NS, see Coulmas (1981) and Paikeday (1985).
In language teaching/learning contexts, teachers tend to take it for granted that the ultimate goal is for their students to learn the target language and gain a native-like competence so that they will be able to communicate in any situation without problem (Cook, 1999). This may mean that the language of NNS (e.g. second or foreign language learners) lies somewhere on a continuum\(^\text{34}\) between their L1 and the target language and is thus an ‘inter-language’ as Selinker (1972) terms it. As such, NNS can be stigmatized as defective communicators who have limited and underdeveloped linguistic competence (Firth & Wagner, 1997) as they perpetually struggle to attain a NS-like competence. However, to be able to speak a second or foreign language with native-like competence is both an unattainable and unrealistic goal for the majority of language learners. As Rampton (1990) puts it, to set as a goal native-like competence is equivalent to “the learner [being] left playing a game in which the goal-posts are being perpetually moved by people they cannot often challenge” (p. 99). That is, it is ethically problematic that NNSs are labeled \textit{permanent learners}, while NSs can always be in the position of being \textit{norm providers} regardless of how little educational training they have.

Recently, second language acquisition (SLA) scholars have been attempting to rethink the idealized notion of NS/NNS. For example, Kramsch (1998) and Cook (1999)

\(^{34}\) For a better understanding of the interlanguage continuum, see Medgyes (1994).
redefine the NNS as an ‘intercultural speaker’ and ‘multi-competent speaker,’ respectively, in an attempt to emphasize some of the privileges that NNSs have. In other words, NNSs should not be regarded as deficient communicators in pursuit of idealized monolingual target language norms; but rather, as communicators who in a way have more resources at their disposal than NSs do (e.g., Belz, 2002c). Rampton (1990) also decomposes the notion of NS as being comprised of three different elements, i.e., expertise, inheritance, and affiliation. For example, a NNS who has expertise in English can still be considered a NS.

The common thread between the above concepts is that the NNS is not simply a defective communicator but an active user of a language other than his/her own—thus placing them in a position of advantage rather than one of disadvantage. These newer accounts seem to indicate that the monolithic perspective of the NS cannot serve as a guideline for setting a realistic and appropriate goal for L2 learners, who now find themselves stuck between two languages and cultures. In spite of the more recent literature, which calls into question the idea that the NS is the ideal role model, this perspective still exists and English language teaching in Korea is one such case. NSs are considered highly valuable in Korea for their language skills and they also serve as ambassadors for their culture.
6.3. Native speakers as providers of American norms in Korea

This section addresses how ES hosts are indeed portrayed as providers of the norms of American English and culture in the English teaching/learning context of instructional language television programs in Korea. The Korean viewers/learners are portrayed as both deficient communicators and makers of errors, who need to imitate and/or master these American norms in order to gain a native-like competence.

6.3.1. Dichotomizing the world

In these TV programs, both the ES and Korean hosts implicitly signal that they teach American English by frequently using the place deixis, ‘in America’ or ‘in the States,’ although it is not explicitly expressed that the English they deal with is American English. Example (50) below in which the ES hostess, Susan, provides synonymous expressions for the phrase ‘to go bankrupt’ illustrates how this is the case.

(50) [TV English Conversation: 11/2/00]
Susan: …I lo^s’ my jo^b. (. .) u::m hh now I:: was (.) fi^red. (. .) or I was (.) laid off. (. .) these are o^ther ways we can sa^y (.) that we lo^s’ our jo^b. ● I got the (.) pi^nk slip. (. .) oka^y? so^ (.) these are no^t (.) goo^d (.) new^s to get this is (.) ba^d news, ● h but then ● h what is the reason this person, (1.0) lost his job? (. .) we^ll (. .) the company went (. .) bankrupt. ● hh no::w (. .) if the company is bankrupt it mea::ns that (. .) they have (. .) no^ mo^ney, ● h in the bank anymore. = basically, ● hh u::h what we say in the Sta^tes (. .) i::s (. .) they fi^led (. .) Chapter (. .) Ele^ven. ● hh so^ ● hh this company, filed Chapter
Eleven, it’s bankrupt, ·hh it’s no longer ·hh got any fund (. . ) to gi::ve (. . ) pe^ople (. . ) in the company.

The ES host first provides the idiomatic expression, ‘I got the pink slip,’ which is synonymous with ‘I lost my job.’ Later, she explains the second expression, ‘to go bankrupt.’ This indicates that she is primarily concerned with providing explanations for (idiomatic) expressions which are commonly used in the United States. Another point that is striking in this dataset is that the program hosts tend to use the words “foreign” and “American” or sometimes “the West” and “American”—interchangeably. Example (51) below is a case in point.

(51) [Survival English: 1/22/01]

Lee: …onul hamkkey ha-key toy-l cwucey-ka palo^ (. ) siksa (. ) ha-ki:::- Today together do-ADV become-ATTR topic-SM right dining do-NML i-n ke iss-cyo? Hh din::ing (. . ) i?v-i toy-keyss-supnita.
COP-ATTR thing exit-POL dining in-COP become-MDL-DEF ·hh ca^ oy-kwuk-ey naka-ss-ul itay:: ·hh way kulehkey oy-kwu-key
So foreign-country-LOC go out-PST-ATTR when why like that foreign-country-LOC naka-myen pay-to cacwu kophu-n ci molu-keyss-eyo. ·hh kuntey i yenge go out-if stomach-also well hungry-ATTR not know-MDL-POL but this English myech kaci phyohyen-ul cal molu-ki ttaymwuney, ·hh nay-ka:: cal mek-ul some kind expression-OM well not know-NML because I SM well eat-ATTR swu eps-ess-ta ha-nun ku kes chelem cham ekwul-ha-n il-to can not-PST-PLN say-ATTR that thing like very regret-do-ATTR matter-also eps-ul ke kath-supnita.
Not exist-ATTR thing seem-DEF
‘Today's topic that we’re going to talk about is dining, right? It will be ‘dining in’ in English. So, **when we go to the foreign country**, I’m not sure why we get hungry so often **when we go to the foreign country**. But it would be really regretful if we can’t eat well because we don’t know some English expressions.’

In excerpt (51), the Korean hostess, Lee, introduces the day’s topic, addressing the difficulty of eating in a restaurant when one goes to a foreign country. In the following skit, however, they actually show the situation taking place in an American restaurant, while they discuss American food. Thus, in fact ‘foreign country’ implicitly refers to ‘America’. The hosts tend to not only use these two words interchangeably; they also tend to dichotomize the world into ‘the West’ and ‘the East.’ In excerpt (52) below, the ES host, Andrea, explains some new expressions before the skit, which is about divorce rates in Korea and the U.S., is shown to the viewers.

(52) [*TV English Conversation*: March, 1999]
1 Andrea: …hh they’re making a (. ) compa^rison (. ) between divo^rce (. ) in Korea (. ) an’ the United Sta^tes. ●h they se^cond way of comparing so^mething, ●hh jus’ the o^pposite (. ) o::r you can use (. ) it’s (. ) jus’ the sa^::me. ●hh so (. ) it seems to me:: (. ) that it is (. ) jus’ the o^pposite in Kore^a. (. ) again, >they’re< making a compa^rison (. ) between Kore^a (. ) an’ the United Sta^tes, in divo^rce, (. ) or maybe we can say the We^stern world…

((In the skit))
...

---

35 Even though the topic deals with dining out in an American restaurant, they call it ‘dining in.’
2 Jason: Hi:: you know there’s rea^lly high divorce rate in the United States. an’ it’s on the rise in Korea as we’ll unfortunately.

3 Denise: Yeah so tonight we’re gonna compare divorce rates in Korea, a::n’ Western countries.

In this excerpt, the ES hostess, Andrea, suggests that ‘the United States’ can be replaced by the ‘Western world,’ which is basically the same idea as in the following skit. This example clearly shows that the discourse of this instructional TV program presents a dichotomized worldview, framing the U.S. as a representative of the Western world. These programs predominantly provide American English input, while reinforcing a simplified stereotype of what constitutes American culture/language.

6.3.2 Consulting with representatives of American English and culture

One of the most common patterns that shows up in these TV programs is that when the Korean hosts are faced with information that needs a linguistic or cultural explanation, they will consult with the ES hosts. The purpose of having these types of conversations with the ES hosts is to try to gain information from an authentic resource. What is interesting is that when the Korean hosts anticipate a source of potential trouble for their viewing audience, they will confirm or consult with the ES hosts before they provide an explanation for it. This activity is important because just like the Korean TV
viewers, the Korean hosts are also not members of the American culture; therefore, this is
a necessary step, to check accuracy of information from the ES hosts who are
representatives of American English/culture. Excerpt (53), the topic of which is making
purchases, illustrates how interactions like these between a Korean host and a ES hostess
take place.

(53) [Survival English: 5/12/99]
(The Korean host here explains the content of the previous skit to the viewing audience.)

1 Korean host:   …Alright I need your driver’s license, here’s your recei::t uh
you hafta be careful with thee (.) pronunciation of this word
receipt becuz there’s a silent le::tter **right**?

2 Janna:   **Mhm you don’ say the “p:”**

3 Korean host:   Mhm.

4 Janna:   So it’s a lo::ng e:: sound recei::t.

5 Korean host:   recei::p’t.

6 Janna:   Heh heh nope [recei::t.

7 Korean host:   **[phi ppay-ko phi ppay-ko.**

8 Janna:   Recei:t.

10 Korean host:   **Ney palum-ul cwwui-hay-ya twe-keyss-supnita:**
‘Okay you should pay attention to the pronunciation.’

In the above example, the Korean host anticipates a potential source of trouble for viewers—how to correctly pronounce the English word, “receipt” (e.g. without realization of the “p”). So, he consults the ES hostess for her phonological knowledge of this word. The purpose of having this conversation with the ES hostess is to try to get an “authentic” explanation from her. He confirms the pronunciation with his American co-hostess after first pointing out in line 1 that there is a source of trouble, alluding to the fact that there is a “silent letter” within ‘receipt’ and then using a tag question in order to elicit the NS’s response and demonstration of how it is in fact the letter “p” that is silent. In spite of her so-called demonstration, the Korean host still mispronounces the word in line 5, thus framing himself as a clear cut defective communicator and again reinforcing the American NS as the clear cut ideal speaker of English. This type of factual request for confirmation from a NS is not only limited to inquiries into the phonological aspects of English but also includes inquiries into the grammatical, pragmatic and cultural aspects of English as well—and these type of requests for confirmation are frequently found throughout both programs. Example (54) below in which the Korean hostess asks the American co-hostess to explain how culturally meaningful it is to meet the parents of a
boyfriend or girlfriend in the United States illustrates how the Korean hosts constantly consult purported NS experts on issues of culture.

(54) [TV English Conversation: topic–meeting someone’s parents: 11/2/00]

1 Korean hostess: Ca (‘so’), ye^sterday we talked about (.) asking someone out on a date • hh toda^y (.) we’re gonna talking about meeting (.) your boyfriend’s or girlfriend’s pa^rents. • hh I wonder (.) how big (looking at the American hostess) uh (.) uh deal this is in America (.) becuz in Kore^a this means that you’re very serious about the relationship it’s like • hh you are: considering getting engaged even getting ma^rried.

2 American hostess: Exactly well y’know in the Sta^tes • hh it’s no^:t a big deal • hh a- actually it’s a na^tural thing for the parents to want to meet • hh the (.) boyfriend or girlfriend (.) of their children.

3 American host: Sure

4 American hostess: [an’ it’s not (.) considered (.) the (.) step before getting engaged or married.

5 American host: Not especially no they (.) parents just wanna know exactly who^ their son or daughter is hanging out with.

6 Korean hostess: Mhm

( .)

‘Yes, that’s right. How important meeting a girlfriend’s or boyfriend’s parents is, you know in Korea if so, people think, “Oh you’re getting engaged or you’re getting married” But in America it is not like that, the two teachers said so, right? Just as the parents want to know who their children are getting along with, this kind of meeting occurs very naturally, they said.’

In this rather extended excerpt, as in other instances throughout the data, the Korean hostess constantly consults with the ES hosts to gain culturally-specific information about America in order to understand how exactly American culture is different from Korean culture. It is not uncommon for both the Korean and ES hosts to try to make generalizations about each other’s cultures in order to compare and contrast the two. Here, the NSs seem to be portrayed as representatives with expertise in every area of American
culture, as if this were really possible. In contrast, the role of the Korean hostess, as an insider of Korean culture, is limited to explaining the Korean counterparts to these certain cultural aspects of the U.S. She also formulates and conveys in Korean, information about the American culture based on what the NSs have just said.

Note that the hosts frequently appeal to generalized cultural norms by using words like, “in Korea” or “in the States” (e.g. lines 1 and 2). The Korean hostess also contrasts the differences in what it means in both cultures to meet the parents of a boyfriend or girlfriend, using the Korean topic marker –nun (at line 7, *hankwuk-eyse-nun kuleh-canh-ayo*, lit. ‘it is so in Korea, right?’ *mikwuk-eyse-nun* ‘in America’). What this topic marker does here is to set up a sharp contrast between the two cultures or countries. Again, in line 7, the Korean hostess reformulates in Korean what the two NSs have just said (e.g., the two teachers said so, right?) about American culture.

In excerpt (55) below, which is similar to (54), the Korean hostess asks what the phrase ‘PIN number’ stands for.

(55) [*Survival English: 12/5/00*]

1 Lee:  

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{hhu ku taum-un of cou::rse jus- do- ju^s’ don’ forget your pa^ssword.} \\
&\text{That next-TM of course just do just don’t forget your password} \\
&\text{–i-la-ko ha-nuntey-yo ca^ ta:: mwullon sayngkak- kule-l swu}
\end{align*} \]

36 Note that the Korean hostess uses ‘canh-ayo’ ‘right?’ to strongly signal the fact that she shares the same knowledge of Korean culture as the viewers.
And then he’s saying ((Eng)) ‘Of course, just don’t forget your password.’ ((Kor)) So, this means that it is possible but the important thing is that you don’t forget your password. (The English word) ‘Password’ here means PIN number, of course. So I guess (we) have to ask Isaac and Dorothy what PIN number stands for. ((Eng)) Do what does P-I-N stand for please?'

2 Isaac: Isn’t that a personal information number?

3 Dorothy: um personal identification number.

4 Lee: identification.

5 Isaac: a:h.

As can be seen in the example above, the Korean hostess, Lee asks in line 1 what the acronym, PIN, stands for in the context of banking. What is interesting is that when...
the ES host, Isaac, in line 2 signals his somewhat uncertain knowledge of it with a question in which he presents an unexpected answer, Lee actually provides a repair in line 4, along with Dorothy in line 3. This clearly shows that the Korean hostess already knew what the acronym represents (i.e., personal identification number). This excerpt shows that the culture- or language-related questions of the Korean hosts may not be authentic; but that these consultations with the NSs are conducted in order to frame themselves as outsiders of the American culture.

6.3.3 Knowledge transmission and “disguised” realization markers

This section explains more clearly how knowledge of American English/culture flows from the ES hosts to the Korean hosts—and finally to the Korean viewers. When the ES hosts provide information on American English/culture, the Korean hosts frequently use the ‘cognitive realization markers’ (Strauss, under review) –kwun and -ney to signal newly perceived information. As example (56) below illustrates, this type of marker occurs in most cases right after what the ES hosts have said.

---

37 In this dataset, as Strauss points out, -kwun and -ney are present realization markers, as opposed to –tela which indicates past realization.

(56) [Survival English: 11/16/00]
(Theme: “buying computers”)

1 Lee: ... ●hh ca ku ke-l yenge-lo ha-ca-myen ilehkey ha-l swu

So that thing-OM English-INST say-INTEND-if like this say-ATTR can

iss-keyss-ney-yo.
exist-OM-INST-POL
● hh the compu^ter (.) has se^ttled in our li:ves (.)
as one of the most important (.) nece^ssities. = Do I sound okay?
‘.so, if I say that in English, it will be like this: ((Eng)) the computer has
settled in our lives as one of the most important necessities. Do I sound
OK?’

2 Isaac: Sounds pre’ good to me. ●hh I use my computer for e^mail, send my (.)
mail, comes back (.) immedia’ly (.) rea’lly fast.

3 Dorothy: Yea:h (.) I (.) can’ (.) live without my laptop. ●hh of course most people
say no^tebook (.) but ●hh la’ptop is okay (.) in- in the United States.

4 Lee: Umm okay. ●hh kuleh-kwun-yo: ●hh ca cikum pangkum mal-hay

So-OM-INST-POL so now right now word-do

swu-n kes-chelem (.) laptop-to kuleh-ko notebook compu^ter (.)
give-ATTR thing-like laptop-also so-CONN notebook computer

-kkaci ilk-ki-lul pothong hay cvu-n-tako kule-pnta: ile-n tungtung-uy
-until read-NML-OM usually do give-PRS-QT-CONN so-DEF this-ATTR and so on-GEN

yele kaci phyohyen-tu:l (.) han-pen i^ kihoy-ey twule po-tolok
many kind expression-PL one-time this opportunity-LOC around see-INTEND

ha-l-kka-yo?
do-FUT-Q-POL

‘Um OK. Oh I see [CRM]. So, as (they) just said, the laptop is the same.
(They) Usually say ‘notebook computer’ (instead of simply saying
‘notebook’). Shall we look around for many other expressions like this?’

As the Korean host, Lee, foreshadows the day’s theme of ‘Buying computers,’ she
emphasizes in Korean the importance of computers in our lives and then translates her utterance into English. What is interesting in this excerpt is that in line 1, Lee again asks the NS if her translation is correct. Following this, the ES host, Isaac confirms that the English sounds OK to him. This indicates that the NS serves as an English checker, even evaluating the English of the Korean hosts who are known as experts of English—but maybe not as experts of *American English*.

In line 3, Dorothy, who is a Korean American host, implicitly explains that the word ‘laptop’ is used more commonly in the States than ‘notebook’ is. As a Korean American, she is portrayed as a person who knows both the Korean and American cultures. The difference between Dorothy and the Korean hosts is that as a Korean American, she seems to be considered closer to American culture, while also being highly familiar with Korean culture (i.e., of course most people in Korea say ‘notebook’ when referring to portable computers). Here, Dorothy contrasts the use of ‘notebook’, which is popularly used in Korea, and the use of ‘laptop’ in the States. Right after presenting this cultural information, the Korean hostess uses the ‘cognitive realization marker’ – *kwun* in line 4 to signal that new knowledge has just been transmitted. It should also be noted that the hosts often use generalization markers such as ‘usually,’ ‘most people,’ or ‘*pothong*’ (‘usually’), when they explain the Korean and American cultures as is the case in excerpt
1 Lee: ... ● hh ca > kuntey < yekise made this is the ‘word’ that is used in the Korean style before that we-language style INST kunyang < one room hay-ss-nun team mal-1-cyo. ● hh u:: h one room just one room do-PST-CONN word-COP-POL uh one room Is that an acceptable expression in English?
‘…so, but here (the challenger) just said, ‘one room’ in the Korean style. ((to Susan)) uh one room, is that an acceptable expression?’

2 Susan: ● hh well a actually one room is a very Kore an expression, an’ the correct expression is to say () studio () apartment. ● h so () you would say, () not one room but () studio apartment, ● h I I know someone, () who’s () renting out () studio apartments h in Kangnam39.

3 Lee: a:: kulehkey mal-hay-ya toy-nun-kwun-yo made this is the ‘word’ that is used in the Korean style so-TM I know I know someone () ku taum-ey who ilehkey pwuth-i-nun ke a si-keyss-cyo? Someone that next-LOC who like this stick-CAU-ATTR thing know-HON-MDL-POL mwve mwve-ha-nun salam-ul a n-ta. ● hh > kulayse re renting out o ut What what do ATTR person OM know-PST-PLN so renting out mwullon out ppay ko kunday renting hay-to toy nun tey renting o ut of course out omit-CONN just renting do may CONN renting out ● hh ku taum ey one room taysin ey stu dio kule sy eya that next LOC one room replacement LOC studio that HON have to toy keyss supnita a:: hh one room kulehkey ha mye n cal mos ha myen become MDL DEF one room like that do if well not do if o ne () be droom apartment lo () al a tul e kaci ko chimsil ha na ka () one bedroom apartment INST know CONN listen have CONN bedroom one SM ttalo iss nu n kule ha n aphathu lo made this is the ‘word’ that is used in the Korean style () chakkak ha l swu iss supnita…

39 ‘Kang-nam’ is the southern area of Seoul, Korea, specifically the area south of the Han River in Seoul.
aside exist-ATTR so-do-ATTR apartment-INST mistake-do-ATTR can exist-DEF

‘O::h, we should say it like that [CRM]. So, do you understand you should put ‘who’ following ‘I know someone,’ right? That means ‘I know someone who blahblahblah.’ So, of course you can just say ‘renting’ omitting (the particle) ‘out.’ Renting out. And then you have to say ‘studio’ instead of ‘one room.’ If you say ‘one room,’ people may mistake it for a one bedroom apartment that has one separate bedroom.’

Preceding this excerpt is the segment “I Can Do it,” where several students are asked to introduce an available apartment to a foreigner who needs one. A challenger, in an attempt to introduce an apartment, uses a Koreanized expression (often called ‘Konglish’): ‘one room’ instead of the more accurate expression ‘studio.’ The Korean host, Lee, asks the ES hostess, Susan, whether or not the expression ‘one room’ is acceptable. Susan indicates that it is not a correct expression and suggests that ‘studio apartment’ is more appropriate. In response to this, the Korean host uses the cognitive realization marker, -kwun, to signal this newly perceived information. What is striking here, however, is that the Korean host seems to have known that in the States, the expression ‘studio apartment’ is more commonly used. Although it is not mentioned at all by the ES host, Lee adds the reason why ‘one room’ should not be used, using what I would call a ‘disguised realization marker.’ The Korean hosts frequently use this marker when they pretend to perceive the information being sent from the ES hosts.
Here, it is clear that the norms of American English are strongly reinforced in these programs through confirmation from or consultation with ES hosts about American English/culture. In addition, there is a directionality to the flow of knowledge, i.e., from the ES hosts to the Korean hosts, and finally to the TV viewers. What is noteworthy is that not a single instance is found in which the ES hosts ask a question of the Korean hosts; rather, the ES hosts are always portrayed as ‘answer providers.’

6.3.4. The use of qualifiers

When the Korean and ES hosts emphasize useful expressions for the TV viewers, they tend to focus on particular types of expressions. A closer examination of their use of qualifiers or evaluative expressions helps us understand the expressions these TV programs are targeting. Qualifiers here include all evaluative adjectives and adverbials—especially those used with regard to English expressions. Example (58) is a prototypical instance illustrating how qualifiers are used in these programs. Shortly before this excerpt, there was a segment entitled “Go for it” in which Korean “challengers” were asked to act as simultaneous interpreters between a foreigner and a Korean. In this task, the challengers are expected to translate from English into Korean and vice versa. Immediately following this simultaneous translation task, the Korean host and American
hostess will evaluate the Korean students’ performance.

(58) [Survival English—topic: Making purchases: 5/12/99]
(After the segment “Go for it,” where challengers are asked to simultaneously translate between a foreigner and a Korean.)

1 Korean host: …uh cash (. ) or card, of course here she meant to say credit card, cash or card wud be underst- understood- understanda
2 American hostess: Mhm
3 Korean host: but the standard expression is
4 American hostess: Cash (. ) or charge.
5 Korean host: Um[m
6 American hostess: [That’s a really common expression.
7 Korean host: Yey cenghwak-ha-key phyohyen-ha-ca-myen ca:sh (. ) or (. ) cha:rgge
yes correctness-do-ADV express-do-if cash or charge
wuli payw-ess-cyo? Charge-la-ko hay-ss-e-yu toy-nuntey
we learn-PST-COMM-POL charge-QT-CONN say-PST-have to- become-CONN
cash or credit card mwe kulehkey ha-l swu iss-supnita-man
cash or credit card what like that do-ATTR can exist-DEF-but
kulena •hh mikwuk salam-tul-i ssu-nun kule-n mal-i ani-pnita
but America person-PL-SM use-ATTR that-ATTR word-SM not-DEF

‘Okay correctly expressing, ‘cash or charge’ as we already learned, right? He (the challenger) should have said ‘charge.’ You can possibly say cash or credit card, but it’s not the kind of expression Americans use.’

Here in line 3, again, the Korean host confirms with the ES hostess that ‘cash or charge’ is not the standard expression.
card’ is an understandable expression and using the contrastive marker ‘but’, goes on to elicit the preferred way to phrase this. The American hostess provides the desired phrase ‘cash or charge’ and goes on to state that this is a really common expression. Agreeing with the NS, the Korean host again suggests that the expression, ‘cash or charge’ should be used. The expression ‘cash or card’ is understandable, but is not used by Americans. Therefore, as is indicated in line 3, it is not the standard expression. Four qualifiers are used in this excerpt: ‘understandable,’ ‘standard,’ ‘common’ ‘cenghwak-hakey,’ and ‘correctly’ (lines 1, 3, 6, and 7), all of which indicate that there is an idealized native norm.

Example (59) below, the topic of which is “Apartment hunting”, is part of the previous example (57), which is reintroduced for convenience.

(59) [Survival English: 8/19/02]

1 Lee: ...•hh ca >kuntey< yekise•• hh akka ku:: wuli-mal () >sik-ulo
So but here before that we-language style-INST
kunyang< one roo‘m hay-ss-nuntey mal-l-cyo. •hh u::h one roo‘m.
just one room do-PST-CONN word-COP-POL uh one room
Is that an acceptable expression in English?
‘…so, but here (the challenger) just said, ‘one room’ in the Korean style.
((to Susan)) uh one room, is that an acceptable expression?’

2 Susan: •hh well a‘ctually one roo::m is a very () Kore‘an expression, an’ the correct expression is to say () stu:dio () apartment. •h so () you
would say, (. ) not o^ne room but (. ) stu^dio apartment, •h I- I kno^w someone, (. ) who’s (. ) renting out (. ) studio apartments •h in Ka^ngnam.

In example (59), the Korean host, Lee asks if ‘one room’ is acceptable to the NS. Susan contrasts the Korean expression with the correct expression, thereby implying that using a ‘Korean’ expression means using an ‘incorrect’ expression. Thus, it can be inferred that using Korean expressions is strongly discouraged and even should be avoided, since the norms implied by Korean expressions deviate from the norms implied by American expressions.

Table 6.1 provides an overview of how qualifiers are used by Korean and ES hosts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Correct</th>
<th>(2) Common</th>
<th>(3) Easy</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-cenghwak-han, ‘correct’</td>
<td>-cacwu tungcang-ha-nun ‘frequently appearing’</td>
<td>-kipon-cek-in ‘basic’</td>
<td>-coh-un ‘good’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cenghwah-hakey ‘correctly’</td>
<td>-mikwuk-eysen hunhi pol swu iss-nun ‘commonly used in America’</td>
<td>-elewuun ‘difficult’</td>
<td>-yuyong-han ‘useful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cayen-sulewun ‘natural’</td>
<td>-pokcap-han ‘not present in America’</td>
<td>-swiwn ‘easy’</td>
<td>‘useful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ceytaylo ‘properly’</td>
<td>-pisus-han ‘similar’</td>
<td>-kCHANT-han ‘simple’</td>
<td>‘important’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hankwuk-cek-in ‘Korean style’</td>
<td>-kantan-han ‘too long’</td>
<td>-kongcanghi manh-hi ssu-i-nun ‘really commonly used’</td>
<td>‘worth knowing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yenge-cek-in ‘(genuine) English style’</td>
<td>-nemwu kin ‘too long’</td>
<td>-kutaylo ‘as it is’</td>
<td>‘great’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandable</td>
<td>-kutaylo ‘as it is’</td>
<td>-great</td>
<td>-so useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.1. The underlying ideologies behind how qualifiers are used by Korean and ES hosts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ES hosts</th>
<th>-normally</th>
<th>-correct</th>
<th>-proper</th>
<th>-understandable</th>
<th>-better</th>
<th>-very Korean</th>
<th>-strange</th>
<th>-very common</th>
<th>-more common</th>
<th>fairly easy</th>
<th>-fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

An examination of the qualifiers used to specify certain expressions may lead us to understand what the program designers of each show emphasize, since evaluative qualifiers regarding the English expressions under focus are extremely common. As can be seen in Table 6.1, three main underlying assumptions for explaining useful expressions are as follows: (1) correct; (2) common; and (3) easy.

Correctness emphasizes the importance of following or imitating certain norms (see Davies, 2003) which in this dataset are clearly based on idealized American norms. What is striking is that the norms of American English are reinforced in these TV programs as not only the preferred way, but also as the only appropriate and correct way of using English. This is evident in how the Korean hosts, who themselves speak like
near native speakers of American English, consistently confirm the “correctness” of grammatical, phonological, pragmatic, and cultural aspects of English with their American co-hosts, as if the American co-hosts were undisputed experts of both the English language and culture. An expression that deviates from an American English norm thus would sound very “strange” or “Korean.”

Commonness is also an important criterion in the teaching of English on these television programs. Whether or not an expression is good seems to depend on whether or not it is commonly used in the States. This is the reason why knowledge of fixed or idiomatic expressions is highly respected in Korea. Idiomatic expressions are those expressions used primarily by native speakers of a language to which non-native speakers as outsiders to that culture cannot easily gain access. The hosts frequently emphasize that the viewers should memorize certain expressions, since they are commonly used. However, the hosts do not always explicitly state where and with whom these expressions are common. Furthermore, who commonly uses these target expressions is completely not clearly stated. As Morrison (1993) points out, NS-ship can be closely related to race\(^{40}\); in these TV programs “American-ness” means “White-ness” (p. 47). “Western” tends to refer to “American” and from there “American” tends to refer to those who are

---

\(^{40}\) The relationship between language and race is beyond the scope of my study. For further research, native speakership of Korean Americans can be investigated.
“White.” In this sense, there seems to be a hierarchy to the level of native speaker-ship assigned the hosts on Korean instructional English television programs based on the degree to which they are perceived to own the commodity called “real English” as can be seen in Figure 6.1 below.

Correct (norm independent)  >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  Incorrect (norm-dependent)
1) American NS >> 2) NSs in other English speaking countries >> 3) Korean American >> 4) Korean experts in English >> 5) Korean learners

Figure 6.1 Hierarchy of native speaker-ship (and therefore possession of idealized norms) on English instructional television programs in Korea

As evidenced in the figure above, the closer to the American norms an expression is the more correct or authentic it is perceived to be. In other words, American NSs are ‘norm-independent’ authority figures whose utterances are always ‘correct’, while the Korean learners are strongly ‘norm-dependent’ and therefore their utterances are always considered likely to be ‘incorrect.’

Finally, being ‘easy’ is strongly valued in that the expressions are often evaluated based on translatability. If an English expression can easily be translated into Korean (e.g., ‘Come back again’), it is regarded as an easy expression, while something that is not literally translatable is an elywun or a ‘difficult’ expression (e.g., ‘to pull over’).
Additionally, a long sentence is treated as difficult and complicated, because it is
cognitively demanding and not easy to translate into Korean. This view of language
suggests that this program is teaching English based on the assumption that a sentence
consists of smaller bits or units. Therefore, it is important to provide more
“comprehensible input” (Krashen, 1985) by pointing out some isolated expressions first.
Translation is not just limited to language, but it also applies to elements of culture. That
is, the hosts frequently attempt to translate even the non-translatable by providing a
Korean equivalent.

6.4. Summary

This chapter has examined how idealized American norms are reinforced and
maintained through English instructional television programs in Korea. While the taken-
for-granted notion of the NS as the ideal speaker has been challenged because of the
diversification of the world, the value of the NS is still considerably strong in Korean
society. Even in the programs under investigation, the Korean hosts frequently confirm or
consult with the ES hosts about information related to American English/culture.
Strikingly, the Korean hosts often use the ‘disguised’ realization marker (e.g., -kwun) to
frame themselves as outsiders of American culture in spite of their expertise in English.
The way qualifiers are used also helps to explain the underlying assumptions and ideologies in these programs. They revolve around an emphasis by the Korean and ES hosts to teach English that is “correct,” “common,” and “easy.” A useful expression is one commonly used in the States and should not deviate from ‘native-likeness.’

Translatability is another important criterion in the teaching of English/American culture. Finally, who is considered a native speaker is also closely related to race and is determined based on how much ownership of American English language/culture a person is assigned. In this sense, the American NS is the most respected, since s/he is able to provide ‘real’ and ‘authentic’ resources to Korean learners who are positioned at the lowest end of the hierarchy. In sum, it is clear that in these TV programs, idealized American norms are not only highly valued, but also reinforced and perpetuated in every aspect.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

7.1. The native speaker as an idealized norm provider in Korea

This paper has demonstrated how native speaker norms are deeply rooted in English teaching contexts in Korea in such a way that Korean learners are trying to imitate these norms in order to master English. Due to the strong value placed on being a native speaker, non-native speakers are portrayed as “norm imitators” as opposed to “norm providers.”

In Korea, as the value of English increases in importance, native speakers are becoming highly valuable resources across language teaching contexts, since they are believed to be the only authentic users of English. In addition, it is not easy to gain access to native speaker input or intuitions, since NSs are relatively scarce in Korea.

This rapid growth of English—especially American English—may not be unrelated to the historical background of Korea, as discussed in Chapter 2. Even though Korea has never been colonized by an English speaking country like India, the Philippines, or Singapore, it has been economically and politically under the influence of the United States. English now serves as a survival tool and a necessary commodity people are striving to possess in order to succeed. However, it is important to rethink which English is meant when we say
English. According to Kachru (1985) today English should no longer be treated as a singular noun, but it instead should be treated as a plural noun such as World Englishes.

Furthermore, it is a myth that one nation has only one language or one culture. For example, American English is composed of many different dialects and a variety of speech communities which co-exist under the name American English.

However, in TV instructional English programs, the native speakers are portrayed as norm providers who consistently answer all kinds of questions related to language and culture. They mislead the TV viewers/English learners by influencing them to believe that they can master American English only if they absorb all the information offered on language and culture. In this sense, the learners will remain “defective communicators” (Firth & Wagner, 1997), since they have started a game that they can never win. This idealized norm, which has been established based on the monolingual bias in mainstream linguistics (see Piller, 2002), may exist only in the teacher’s/learner’s mind, but not in the real world. As Cook (1999) also points out, “L2 students cannot be turned into native speakers without altering the core meaning of native speaker” and it is “like saying that ducks fail to become swans” (p. 187) when non-native speakers fail to reach this unattainable goal. In other words, L2 or foreign language learners are stigmatized as “incurable” deficient communicators in comparison to the monolingual
native speaker who is a “pure” and “perfect” model for acquirers of the target language.

This paper has demonstrated that American English norms are consistently reinforced and sustained through TV instructional English programs in Korea. What is striking in the dataset is that American English norms are reinforced as not only the preferred way but as the only acceptable and correct way of using English. In a sense, this may not be unrelated to the fact that Korea has a standard language, which is the dialect of Seoul, its capital. This may lead Korean learners of English to believe that there is a standard or correct way of speaking English. This idea of a “correct” way of speaking English is important not only from the instructor’s or TV program host’s point of view, but also from the learner’s point of view. That is, these idealized norms seem to be reinforced in a cycle, by being emphasized through the media and at the same time, teaching using these norms reflects the expectations of the learners.

7.2. The underlying ideologies and use of discourse

This paper has also attempted to show the relationship between the micro-level language use and the macro-level ideologies underlying these TV instructional English programs. As Fairclough (1989) points out, “Institutional practices which people draw upon without thinking often embody assumptions which directly or indirectly legitimize
existing power relations” (p. 33). This means that underlying ideologies can be manifested and perpetuated by the ways language is used.

To this end, the use of personal pronouns and equivalency-signaling verbs (ESVs) has been examined. The personal pronouns used by the ES hosts tend to exclude Korean speakers, while the Korean hosts use these pronouns more inclusively. This is because the native speakers are portrayed as insiders of the American language and culture who are expected to provide authentic information in the teaching of English. In the case of the Korean hosts, they are not publicly authorized to provide this kind of information about English. Thus, they always remain outsiders in terms of authenticity in spite of their expertise in English.

To investigate what the Korean and ES hosts focus on and how they explain meaning, “equivalency-signaling” verbs (ESVs) have been examined. The results indicate that the role of the Korean hosts is limited to translating what the ES hosts have just said or beginning with an explanation of the most salient meaning in Korean and continuing from there to explain a more non-salient meaning. On the other hand, the ES hosts emphasize lexicalized or idiomatic expressions that need “insider accounts of what is going on in a particular society or group and avoid the imposition of outsider categories” (Piller, 2002, p. 184). Thus, the ES hosts are the only true providers of knowledge about
the American language and culture.

The Korean hosts try to provide the Korean equivalent in every case to the point that they even translate expressions which are un-translatable or unavailable in the Korean language and/or culture. The Korean hosts serve only as mediators or translators between the ES hosts and the TV viewers/English learners. The philosophy underlying these roles is the notion that language--or even culture--always has a one-to-one correspondence. The language use of the Korean and ES hosts clearly serves to sustain and perpetuate the underlying assumptions of these TV programs. Considering the power of the media, this distorted and simplified view of language and culture contributes to shaping and strengthening the stereotypes and biases of the learners/TV viewers.

From the standpoint of actual language pedagogy, it is evident in the structure of both programs that the methodology used is nothing more than a modernized and camouflaged version of the grammar-translation method, which has already been demonstrated as ineffective in helping students achieve communicative competence in any foreign language. In these programs, the hosts consistently emphasize syntactic constructions whose structures mirror those of the original Korean so that the viewers are encouraged to see an “easy” way of learning English. These shows are essentially not much different from the type of language instruction which focuses on grammar,
translation, and rigid perspectives of “correctness” and “accuracy” that is already so pervasive throughout Korea.

A closer examination of the interactions between the Korean and ES hosts enables us to reveal that the information clearly has a directional flow: from the ES hosts to the Korean hosts, and finally to the Korean viewers/learners. The Korean hosts consistently ask questions about the linguistic and cultural aspects of new information whenever there is something that needs explaining. This occurs not because the Korean hosts do not know the information; rather, it is expected by the TV viewers. This type of questioning or confirmation check does not transpire in the other direction, i.e., from the ES hosts to the Korean hosts. What is also striking is that the Korean hosts frequently use “disguised” realization markers to signal newly perceived information, indicating that the Korean hosts pretend not to know all of the information being presented by the ES hosts. The Korean hosts tend to frame themselves as learners or deficient communicators to support the idea that the ES hosts serve as “omniscient and omnipotent” communicators on these TV programs.

The use of qualifiers has also been examined in this paper, the results of which reveal three main ideologies: correct, common, and easy. The programs tend to emphasize the correct way of expressing something that the learners should imitate--
idealized American English. This is also evident in that the Korean and ES hosts

collaboratively use qualifiers such as “correct,” “standard,” or “acceptable.” However, it

is not explicitly revealed which norms they are targeting, although it is implicitly shown

that the instructors are teaching with the idealized norms of American English and culture

in mind. Another emphasis in their teaching is commonness, introducing the expression

that is commonly or frequently used and should be memorized by the learners, since it is

considered important. Again, however, it is not made clear where and by whom these

expressions are commonly used.

Ideologies may not be simply visible when we read/see texts under normal

conditions. However, they can come to our attention when we carefully examine the ways

in which language is used. As Fairclough (1989) puts it,

ideology is most effective when its workings are least visible. If one becomes

aware that a particular aspect of common sense is sustaining power inequalities

at one’s own expense, it ceases to be common sense…And invisibility is

achieved when ideologies are brought to discourse not as explicit elements of

the text, but as the background assumptions which on the one hand lead the text

producer to ‘textualize’ the world in a particular way, on the other hand lead the

interpreter to interpret the text in a particular way. Texts do not typically spout

ideology. They so position the interpreter through their cues that she brings

ideologies to the interpretation of texts—and reproduces them in the process! (p.

85).

In conclusion, this paper has examined how underlying ideologies and language
use are related through the TV instructional English shows broadcast in Korea. These ideologies may reflect the prevailing assumptions throughout Korean society concerning the teaching/learning of English.

7.3. Future research

In this paper the relationship between race and native speakership has briefly been addressed in Chapter 6. The status of English teachers tends to be determined according to the degree of ownership of English they are considered to have. That is, the closer to being a native speaker, the higher their status is. In this view, the native speaker is placed in the highest rank, while the TV viewers or English learners are in the lowest. Between those two poles are positioned Korean American hosts and Koreans with expertise in English.

It was also found in this study that the notion of who is a native speaker within the context of these television programs is associated with race. Not a single African American host was found in the dataset. Considering that visual presentation is a powerful tool in the media, the racial issue, i.e., skin color, which may also related to the historical background of Korea, tends to be another important factor in what defines a native speaker. This issue needs to be more closely examined in the future.
Secondly, this paper has mainly focused on the perspective of the program designer. It would also be meaningful to investigate the learner’s perspective—especially how English learners perceive the notion of the native speaker in East Asian contexts.

Finally, a study such as this can be extended to classroom settings. Native speaking and non-native speaking teachers can be compared from the learners’ or teachers’ perspectives. Little research has been conducted on educational settings in East Asian countries where the value of a native speaker has been highly emphasized. Using actual classroom data will help to uncover the underlying assumptions prevailing in classroom discourse.

7.4 Implications

The benefits for ESL/EFL teachers is made explicit in this paper. For example, teachers need to be made aware of the fact that many native speakers of English, just because they were born speaking the language, do not necessarily have a sense of the linguistic institutions necessary to be able to effectively teach and explain grammar and other topics. Generally, native speakers are rounded up throughout Korea to teach English conversation, regardless of their actual teaching experience and ability and regardless of their own actual linguistic sensitivity. In the same vein, Korean students automatically
expect these native speakers to be able to answer all types of questions about language
and culture and consider them as omniscient and omnipotent representatives of the
American language and culture. More importantly, these untrained native speakers can
contribute to perpetuating, idealizing, and simplifying cultural stereotypes so that the
learners end up learning something different from reality.

It is important to emphasize that non-native teachers should not be stigmatized as
“inferior” to NS teachers; instead, they have a number of advantages in that they share
prior experiences and cultural information with the learners. They know better about the
weaknesses and challenges the learners might experience during the learning process. In
addition, as multi-competent speakers (Cook, 1991, 1999), NNS teachers have more
resources at their disposal in that they speak more than one language.

Another important issue in teaching English is to increase the level of sensitivity
for different types of English by providing more exposure to a variety of norms and
speech communities in TV programs and English textbooks. Authenticity does not always
fit the situation, since something entirely acceptable in one context may be awkward in
another. Thus, appropriateness is more ideal for language learners. To this end, it is
necessary to include discourse-based data when writing textbooks rather than simply
relying on native speaker intuitions or emphasizing idiomatic expressions. They may not
be so helpful for English learners, considering the fact that native speakers are often reluctant to use these expressions with foreigners because they expect that they may not understand these expressions.

If English is an international language, learners do not have to imitate only the idealized American English norms. This may simply contribute to the spread of the “linguistic imperialism” of American-ness. For example, it is simply not appropriate to use American English when Koreans communicate with Japanese by using English to communicate. The non-native speakers do not need to remain permanent learners.
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# APPENDIX A.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADD HON</td>
<td>Addressee Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Adjectival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR</td>
<td>Attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLSF</td>
<td>Classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Committal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Cognitive realization marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Deferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genetive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Interruptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEND</td>
<td>Intend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Irrealis marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDL</td>
<td>Modal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NML</td>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Object marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETRO</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSN</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Topic marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Vocative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

[Modified version of Atkinson & Heritage, 1984]

TIMING

(. )  Micro pause (for pauses less than .2 of a second)
(2.6)  Timed pause
Timing of pauses based essentially on: “one one thousand” = one second

[ ]  Overlapping speech (note if there is one bracket, there must be another
bracket lined up vertically on the following line)

Example:
Bob:  It was rea:::^lly [great.
Tony:    [oh wo::^w.

=  Latched speech (immediately contiguous utterance, wither within a turn
or between turns)
>  <  Compressed speech
(XXX)  Inaudible speech
(    )  Uncertain speech
-  False restarts (e.g., nayka- mwela kuleci?)

PROSODY AND OTHER PARALINGUISTIC FEATURES

(h)  aspiration
(hh)  longer aspiration (this could also include laughter)
(hhh)  very long aspiration

•h  in-breath
•hh  longer in-breath
•hhh  very long in-breath
:            sound stretch (wither on vowels or consonants)
::           longer sound stretch
:::          very long sound stretch

WOW          upper case letters—increased volume
°darn°       decreased volume/whisper (word should be within two degree symbols)
.            Falling intonation
?            Strong rising intonation
,            Continuous rise only     (kulyse, )
^            Pitch peak
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