Syntactic Features of Korea English: Word Order, Ellipsis, Articles, Prepositions, Passive, and Miscellaneous

Myeong-Hee Seong and Kang-Youg Lee [*]
Eulji University

For the recent discussions on the status of English in the global context and its implication for English language teaching (Canagarajah, 2006; Jenkins, 2003, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Kachru, 1985, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Modiano, 1999a, 1999b; Rajagopalan, 2004), some ELT researchers (Lee, 2007; Park, 2006, 2007) have conducted a full-scaled documentation on a uniquely common set of English rules and expressions in South Korea and termed it as 'Korea English.' In alignment with this movement, the current study presents a first investigation on idiosyncratic syntactic features of Korea English in the domains of (1) word order, (2) ellipsis, (3) articles, (4) prepositions, (5) passive, and (6) miscellaneous. Corpus data of this study come from the Cross Cultural Distance Learning program established and conducted by both Korea and Waseda universities since the late of 1990s. The data display some syntactic aspects of Korea English as the result of contact with Korean language. For its organization, the present paper firstly reviews the theoretical framework in which (1) the emergence of varieties of English in diverse settings and their legitimacy, and the issue of standards in teaching English as an international language and (2) the emergence of 'Korea English' are discussed. Secondly, the study describes the data to be analyzed. The study thirdly investigates use of English in relation to the syntactic aspects. Finally, the study concludes and discusses the future directions for studies on local varieties of English based upon corpus data.

Key Words: world Englishes, glocalized Englishes, Korea English, global English, bi-directionality

1 Theoretical Consideration and English in South Korea

1.1 Theoretical consideration

The present study fully concurs with the cornerstone ideology behind the Kachruvian model (Kachru, 1985, 1991, 1992a, 1992b) in this strict sense that it claims both the recognition of world Englishes since the postmodern era and the legitimacy of the varieties of English in their own sociolinguistic and sociocultural realties. However, the current study doubts one of the Kachruvian assumptions around the issue of standards for teaching English in this sense that the inner circle

---

[*] Corresponding author: Myeong-Hee Seong, first author: Kang-Young Lee

Englishes are arguably norm suppliers, the outer circle ones norm developers, and the expanding circle ones to be norm dependents.

This study, on the other hand, supports the recent claim contended by some researchers (Canagarajah, 2006; Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2005, 2006a; Lee, 2007; Modiano, 1999a, 1999b; Park & Nakano, 2007; Rajagopalan, 2004) that Englishes being used in both the outer and expanding circles should have a legitimate right to be equally shared internationally (EIL) or globally (Global English) or generally (General English). It is firstly because speakers of English in the nonnative circles do not use English predominantly for international purposes, but they also use the language for intranational purpose. This also brings forth the question of the ESL/EFL distinction. Secondly, while Kachru's classification of speech communities as norm providing, norm developing, and norm dependent leads to a core and periphery distinction designating the inner circle as the core and the outer and expanding circles as the periphery, the current statistics (see Graddol, 1999) of number of English speakers questions the periphery status of the outer and expanding circles and puts them into a central position in the development of English. The researchers argue that the 21st century's world speakers of English including all the speakers of the inner, outer, and expanding circles should need to develop an awareness of each other's varieties of English and call for a need to view English as what Canagarajah (2006, p. 232) describes "a heterogeneous language with multiple norms and diverse grammars," Thus, within this new ideology, all the varieties of English in the postmodern globalization relate to each other on a single level (this has been elucidated as "equal status of glocalized Englishes," by Lee, 2007; Park & Nakano, 2007) rather than on the three hierarchies claimed by the Kachruvian model. And, both Quirk's (1985) view (i.e., nonnative varieties of English are divergence of native standard English; therefore, are treated as 'error') and Kachru's suggestion (i.e., nonnative varieties of English are legitimate in their own sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts) would better be disencouraged.

1.2 English in South Korea: Korea English

In his work on a full-scaled documentation of idiosyncratic features of Korea English in S. Korea, Lee (2007) begins the work with the following remark:

> The most recent year of 2006 marked the 123rd year of systematic English education along with its tremendous impact not only in linguistic system of the South Korean language but also in cognition, behaviors, and attitudes of most of the Koreans.
>
> (p. 244)

The researcher notes that the use of English in S. Korea has linguistically brought about both Englishization (referring to any or all levels of linguistic changes in the S. Korean language due to contact with English) and nativization (referring to the influence of the S. Korean language on English used or codified in S. Korea).

Park and Nakano (2007) outlines the nature of English in S. Korea by providing the following two contrasting views: (1) Korea English is neither institutionalized nor codified (Song, 1998) and (2) Korea English is codified and serving as the endonormative standard for English education in Korea (Baik, 1994, 1995; Jung & Min, 1999; Shim, 1994, 1999). Those researchers who advocate codified Korea English provide both the high school English textbooks between 1987 and 1995 and Korean English newspapers as evidences that, in lexico-semantic, lexico-grammatical, morpho-syntactic, and pragmatic aspects, there are some major differences between American English and Korea English. These differences are not grammatically incorrect but, nevertheless, treated as unacceptable to native speakers of English due to their unusual and awkward 'foreignness.' However, for Korea English speakers, they are features of codified Korea English observable in high school English textbooks and English newspapers in S. Korea.

In contrast, Song (1998) views that it is premature to describe Korea English as undergoing a language shift requiring that Korean be completely forfeited in favor of English. According to him, S. Korea is now undergoing a kind of language shift due to the influence of English (especially American kind), but language shift from Korean to English has not happened yet. The reasons are that, in S. Korea, (1) English is employed neither as an official language nor a medium of instruction at public and private schools and (2) English is not used for intra-national communicative purpose.

For the claim, however, some researchers (Lee, 2007; Park, 2003, 2006; Park & Nakano, 2007) recently pose the following two main questions which are concerned on the qualification for a language to be a second (or official) language (SL): (1) are Song's above-mentioned two factors necessary and sufficient criteria for a language to be considered a second language? and (2) is there a clear demarcation of a SL from a foreign language (FL)? Should SL be considered as a continuum of FL or vice versa? Is it possible for speakers of English as a FL to become speakers of English as a SL?

Lee (2007) and Park (2006, 2007) all posit that English language and its communicative competency in the current S. Korea are on the upswings: the language has already exerted its impact at the greatest scale on its society, business, politics, and culture. It has become not only an indispensable means of acquiring global and local knowledge and information, but also a prerequisite leading to the foot of the ladder to the socio-economic and –political successes.

In details, the efforts at the governmental level to make English language more like second or official language deserve a particular attention. The government has adamantly taken an initiative to develop and sophisticate all the possible S. Koreans with communicative competence in English. The former president of S. Korea, Roh, Moo-Hyun showed his clear intention to support the initiative to make English as a second language in the country (*The Korea Times*, 2003, October 23). The mayor in Seoul, Lee, Myung-Bak (as of now, the standing president) posted this vision of establishing English-Only villages by 2005 by designating the zones in Seoul (*The Korea Times*, 2003, November 11). As many have claimed, the S.

Korean government itself seems to have been the biggest stimulator in terms of the incorporation and absorption of English language into the society under such an invincible catchphrase as 'globalization' (not Americanization).

At the educational level, starting in 1997, English has been taught since the third grade at elementary schools. In 2008, the first graders are receiving English education. Many universities encourage or even require that content-based courses be conducted in English – for example, one university (i.e., Korea University) in Seoul, more than 30 percent of all courses are conducted in English. The percentage will rise in the future. According to *The Korea Times* (February 6, 2006), Seoul National University started offering 10 percent of liberal arts courses in English to raise students' basic knowledge as well as their English proficiency. One national television news (MBC TV News, November 4, 2006) reported that the Minister of Education and Human Resources announced that by 2015, secondary school teachers will be required to teach English in English (TEE). This means that the national qualifying examination for English teachers will include essay writings in English as well as oral interview and English listening comprehension tests. Besides, English proficiency is needed more than ever for governmental jobs.

In addition, the amount of efforts, devotion, and finance most Koreans put privately for the acquisition of English is incredibly high. It has been estimated (*The Korean Herald*, 2002, December 18) that the worth of English language market in S. Korea was about four or five trillion won (approximately three to four billion US dollars), and the market is still anticipated to grow by double digits in the years to follow.

At corporate culture, such multinational companies like SamSung, Hyundai, LG, and the others have been activating their own English language programs/camps aiming at enhancing communicative competence in English for all of their employees and staff members. *The Korea Times* (2003, September 28) reported that Samsung Electronics – maybe the biggest electronics corporation in S. Korea – has conducted an English interview section to hire new employees who are more orally competent in English. To many small and large companies, English has been positively encouraged as a means of communication during small or large meetings among Korean employees.

Needless to say, mixing (i.e., English mixed with Korean in a lexical level) and switching (i.e., English adopted at a sentential level) with English in the media such as television, radio, and newspapers and magazines, etc. have been prevalent (Jung & Min, 1999). English has become a popular medium of expression in various advertisements through the major media. Since the 1990s, it has been more and more popular in advertising. Especially in TV programs, there have been a bursting number of television programs to teach English as an alternative to classroom learning and teaching (Eun, 2003).

In sum, English has been exerting its impacts on the S. Korean society beyond the lexical level – that is, its adoption and assimilation have been influencing the S. Korean sociocultural aspects such as their cognition, behaviors, and attitudes. Such amount of time and money spent on English language education as well as occupation and career opportunities through the communicative

competence of English language might be a clear indication that English language is more than a simple foreign language in S. Korea.

It is in this respect that Park (2003, 2006, 2007), Park and Nakano (2007), and Lee (2007) all contend that what the Kachruvian model calls the 'expanding circle' in its delineation of the English-using speech fellowships in the three circles somewhat ignores the way that English in S. Korea (including Japan English) has been socially, historically, and culturally constituted. Users of English in S. Korea, according to the researchers, consistently employ certain forms, phrases, grammars, sentences and so forth due to their culture, customs, and tradition – indicating some aspects of the nativization of English and becoming endonormative standards in Korea English. As long as they are grammatically appropriate considering its sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts, those nativized forms and usages should be regarded as norms among all the varieties of English. It is true that due to Westernization, traditional Korean culture is said to be changing and be multi-cultured. But Korea is still preserving and cherishing many of its unique cultural features and customs which, indeed, greatly impact English. Park (2007) defines 'Korea English' as follows:

> Korea English refers to the English employed by educated Korean speakers of English with Korean nuances and distinctive characteristics in lexicon, syntax, and discourse to express unique Korean ideas.
>
> (p. 21)

Korea English, used by the majority of educated S. Koreans should be seen as a 'primary language of the majority or as a priority foreign language' (see Crystal, 1997); thus, Korea English should be regarded as a 'glocalized English.'

Park (2003, 2006, 2007) and Lee (2007) in S. Korea raise their voice in a similar way as some (Canagarajah, 2006; Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2006; Modiano, 1999a, 1999b; Rajagopalan, 2004) did, to propose 'the issue of bi-directionality.' The bi-directionality is conceptualized within all members of glocalized Englishes existing in this world. They are all related to one another at an equal level, not hierarchically. Each glocalized English can be a legitimate candidate to be globalized (called Global English). So, to be standard and competent in the Global English, awareness and acquisition of each glocalized variety is much necessary. In teaching, it is, thus, argued that each glocalized English needs to be served as a pedagogical model, chiefly because the bi-directionality refutes the hierarchical concept of 'uni-directionality,' in which the so-called non-native speakers of English all have been compelled to follow the so-called native rules, values, and norms reflected in their use of English.

2 Analytical Consideration

The data that the present study has employed come from the corpus study. Jenkins (2006b) reports from her well-known ELF (English as a lingua franca) projects to provide EIL speakers with core features of phonology among the varieties of

Englishes that corpus data might be the most legitimate source to "find out which items are used systematically and frequently, but differently from native speaker use and without causing communication problems, by expert speakers of English from a wide range of L1s" (p. 169).

It is the CCDL (Cross-cultural Distance Learning) program that provides the present study with the corpus data. The CCDL program has been established and conducted jointly by Korea and Waseda Universities – each university is one of the highly prestigious universities in its country - for their own mutual academic benefits. Since the late 1990s, many students in both universities have been registering cross-cultural courses offered by both universities via telecommunication. During the courses, students also have to engage each other to have written discourses through the Internet. Each participant's written texts are saved for a record. The data collected for this study are mostly frequently observed syntactic forms or usages among students of Korea Univ. in the program, which all could features a variety of English in the S. Korean reality.

It has been indicated (Park, 2005) that the program has been successful in enhancing students' motivation and interests of both the universities in (1) exploring cultural similarities and differences existing between Korea and Japan and, most of all, (2) in English communicative competence.

3 Syntactic Features of Korea English: Word order, Ellipsis, Articles, Prepositions, Passive, and Miscellaneous

3.1 Word order

English is an SVO language whereas Korean is an SOV language. Some examples are as follows:

Korean: SOV	**English: SVO**
1) I there go.	I go there.
2) The words never heard of.	I have never heard of the words.

It has been argued (Park, Lee, & Ju, 2003) that despite the fundamental difference, Korean users of English scarcely fail in arranging words in right order when having interaction in English. From the numerous examples, The researchers provide some simple ones from the cross cultural distance learning (CCDL) program:

1) Can you recommend the best one? (CCDL, 2001-12-14, Korea Univ.)
2) I don't have much time to read. (CCDL, 2001-12-14, Korea Univ.)

However, Korean learner's internalization of the English word order (SVO) does not necessarily mean that there is no interference at all from the Korean language (Park, Lee, & Ju, Ibid). This could be supported by the data in which even advanced Korean users of English make frequent errors in the word order using the

Korean SOV order. The followings are the examples in comparison of English ones, which, in fact, are all minor errors attributed by L1 of Korean.

1) *<u>Today korea's weather is fine</u> (CCDL, 2001-12-14, Korea univ.)
   → Today's weather is fine in Korea.
   → We have a fine weather today in Korea.
   → Today's weather in Korea is fine.

2) *<u>Today was very difficult but exciting</u> (CCDL, 2002-12-04, Korea univ.)
   → It was very difficult but exciting today.

3) Anyway, *<u>every my mistake</u>, write down! (adjectival order in Korean is different from that of English)
   → my every mistake
   You wanna wear *<u>this my ring</u>?
   → my ring or this ring or a ring of mine.
   *<u>I and my children</u> are all right.
   → My children and I
   This paper said about <u>our this year's fortune</u> (data from Sohn, 1986)
   → our fortunes of this year or this year's our fortunes

4) I'm your student who take *<u>Tuesday 6th class</u>. (CCDL, 2003-03-31, Korea univ.)
   → I'm your student who is taking the class on Tuesday at 3:30 pm.

5) Dear *<u>Park Professor</u>. (CCDL, 2003-03-31, Korea univ.)
   → Dear Professor Park.

6) *<u>Washington president</u>. (CCDL, 2003-03-31, Korea univ.)
   → President Washington.

Here, it is interesting to notice that all of the examples reflect some syntactic (i.e., word order) errors transferred from L1 of Korean; however, there is not too much of difference in delivering its intended meaning from that of grammatical English sentence; especially taking the following examples into consideration – ex.) Today Korea's weather is fine. This, in fact, could be one of the idiosyncratic syntactic features of Korea English.

3.2 Ellipsis

In Korean, that situationally or contextually predictable words can be deleted from a sentence is prevalent as long as it makes the speaker's intended meaning clear. For that reason, most Korean users of English could be induced to make errors related to ellipsis when having conversation in English. This becomes an idiosyncratic

syntactic feature of Korea English. The following CCDL data (2002-12-04, Korea univ.) provide some examples.

    1) Today hot. (* subject and be verb have been deleted)
       → It was hot today.
       → Today was hot.

    2) Have to teach how to study. (*subject and object deleted)
       → I have to teach someone how to study.

    3) Know how to go (*subject deleted)
       → I know how to go.

    4) Have to persevere until send a car (* subject and oblique case deleted)
       → You have to persevere until I send a car.

    5) In Korea have four season (* subject deleted)
       → In Korea, there are four seasons.
       → Korea has four seasons.
       → There are four seasons in Korea.

    6) I thanked for. (* object deleted)
       → I thanked you for that.

All of the elliptic data which have been caused by the influence of L1 of Korean reveal free deletion of any nominal elements recoverable situationally and contextually. That has been very much frequent in the use of Korea English.

3.3 Articles

Articles are another constantly observed aspect in features of Korea English. According to Sohn's (1986) data, articles take up 15% out of the total errors among Korean speakers of English. In English, there are three distinctive articles such as indefinite articles ('a,' 'an') and definite article ('the').

In Korean, there exist articles, but their syntactic and semantic complexity make Korean learners of English rarely achieve a native-like control of articles. In details, the Korean topic (-nun) and focus (-ga or -ka) markers only partially overlap with the English definite (the) and indefinite (a and an) articles in a way that the Korean (-nun) and the English (the) are referred to as old information; on the other hand, the Korean (-ga or -ka) and the English (a or an) are related to new information. Thus, many Koreans get confused and make lots of errors related to the English articles.

However, errors in the use of the English articles seem not only just from the native language (Korean)'s interference, but from the fact that it could be intralingual (i.e., errors delivered from the English language itself by looking at the

fact that both a first language learners and a second language learner make similar mistakes due substantially to the syntactic and semantic complexity of the English articles) and developmental (i.e., it can be happening over the process of the language development in nature).

In the syntactic features of Korea English, three different types of usages in the use of the English articles can be recognized from the CCDL data collected on Nov. 20, 1999 at Korea University. They are the omission of articles, the addition of articles, and the misuse of articles.

The definite article 'the' is frequently omitted by the Korean users of English in the following manner:

1) I believe Thanksgiving Day is the biggest holiday in ( ) US.
2) ( ) First immigrants were called pilgrims.
3) ( ) Pilgrims were good friends with (   ) Indians
4) …after ( ) harvest.
5) …after they had arrived in ( ) new land.
6) In ( ) present, it is a huge ceremony, as big as a Christmas.

The indefinite article 'a' is also frequently omitted by the users as follows:

1) They had ( ) big dinner.
2) They are ready for ( ) wonderful dinner.
3) Take care. I'll send you ( ) email.

The addition of articles are observed from the Korean users of English in a way that they put unnecessary articles (both indefinite and definite ones) while the articles which are necessary are omitted. Here are some examples from the data (CCDL, 1999-11-29, Korea Univ.):

1) The Pilgrims and the Indians has a big dinner together to give a[*] thanks to God for their good luck.
2) The Americans came from the[*] Europe about three hundred and fifty years ago.
3) They were good friends with the Indians and tried to grow the[*] corn and Other crops.
4) Thanksgivings day is the day in which the Christians thank the[*] God.
5) They had a[*] stillness and a[*] comfort.
6) We can eat it by putting it in the[*] boiling water for a moment.

The articles are misused frequently by the Korean users of English in a way that they are confused – when to use 'a/an' and 'the'. That brings about an awkward and even unacceptable use of articles. This is mainly because, as mentioned, the complexity of articles in their syntactic and semantic usages. The followings are the misuse of 'a/an' when 'the' is appropriate in the context.

1) I have been to a[*] hospital for a 4 months,...
2) I don't know whether I can get a[*] ticket. (CCDL, 1999-11-29, Korea univ.)

In addition, the followings are the examples of the misuse of 'the' when 'a/an' is needed:

1) It's the[*] story about the guy who wanna be the best cook. (CCDL, 1999-11-29, Korea Univ.)
2) It is the[*] seasoned beef. (CCDL, 1999-11-29, Korea Univ.)

3.4 Prepositions

Prepositions are also an important area where both syntactic and semantic interference of Korean become ostensibly frequent. As in the case of articles, prepositions in English are found among Koreans somehow very difficult to master, and the following three different types of preposition usages have been numerously used by most users of Korean English: (1) deletion of prepositions, (2) addition of prepositions, and (3) wrong use of prepositions.

As for the deletion of preposition, the following CCDL data collected by Park, Lee, and Ju (2003) draw attention:

1) I graduated ( ) high school in 1984.
2) I graduated ( ) gyeonggi high school.
   → I graduated from Gyeonggi high school.

The sentences just above illustrate the deletion of a preposition where one (this case, 'from') is needed. The deletion is due to the verb 'graduate' in the sentence which has been semantically combined with the preposition 'from.' Thus, the verb 'graduate' does not require any preposition whereas the preposition must be placed in English.

Prepositions are also added when they are not necessary in sentence by most of the Korean users of English. The examples are from the CCDL data as follows (Park, Lee, & Ju, 2003):

1) So I'm missing them by[*] now.
   → So, I'm missing them now.
2) He doesn't want to marry with[*] her.
   → He doesn't want to marry her.

As in the case in the deletion, the adverb 'now' in Korean needs 'by' for delivering its meaning such as 'jigumggaji (by now).' In addition, the verb 'marry' in Korean semantics needs this word (-wa) to be completed, which is equivalent of the English preposition (with). In details, the Korean expression (-wa gyeolhonhada) literally means 'somebody with marry.' Thus, such usages become visibly frequent.

Prepositions are sometimes misused among many Korean users of English. The followings are particularly most frequent made by the L1 transfer (Park, Lee, & Ju, 2003):

1) I want to study about* many fields.
　→ I want to study many fields.
2) I can speak and listen a little about* English.
　→ I can speak and listen a little English
3) My hobby is reading about* any books.
　→ My bobby is reading any books.

As in the case of the verb 'marry' in the Korean language structure and semantics, the verb 'study (-url gogbuhada) must need the '-url,' which represents the English preposition 'about.' Likewise, the verbs 'speak (-url malhada)' and 'listen (-url deuhda)' could structurally and semantically need the English preposition 'about' to be communicatively correct.

3.5 Passive

In the area of passives, both structural and semantic differences between Korean and English are the main generators of error from the native varieties of English, However, that frequently-used form, at the same time, is considered the idiosyncratic feature of Korea English. Particularly, the following data draw attention:

1) She was really welcomed him. (CCDL, 2002-02-04, Korea univ.)
　→ She has really welcome him.
2) My husband is recovered his health little by little (Sohn, 1986).
　→ My husband recovered his health little by little.

In Korean, 'hwangeong-baht-da (to be welcome)' and 'heibog-dea-da (to be recovered)' are set structurally and semantically in a way that 'baht' and 'dea' have passive meaning themselves. Thus, those two examples are much recurrent among users of Korea English

3.6 Miscellaneous

The deletion of 'be' verb is frequently found among the features of Korea English. The linking 'be' verb is very much necessary in English sentence construction, while, in Korean, it is not necessary. The following demonstrates the possibility:

It ( ) difficult to have chat at same time. (CCDL, 2002-06-05, Korea univ.)
→ It is difficult to have a chat at same time.

In Korean, the word 'eoryeobda (difficult)' is a verbal form which can be used independently. Here are some more from the CCDL (2002-02-04, Korea univ.):

1) I ( ) living Seoul. (* 'living' functions as a verbal form)
   → I am living in Seoul.

2) Seoul ( ) located in middle of Korea. (* 'located' is a verbal form)
   → Seoul is located in the middle of Korea.

3) I ( ) hungry now. (* 'hungry' is a verbal form)
   → I am hungry now.

4) I ( ) familiar with her. (* 'familiar' is a verbal form)
   → I am familiar with her.

5) You have to ( ) patient until I send you a car. (*'patient' is a verbal form)
   → You have to be patient until I send you a car.

The deletion of infinitive marker 'to' among many Korean users of English appears to be idiosyncratic. Particularly, the following datum seems interesting:

1) Of course I want ( ) chat with my first schejuled partner!! (CCDL, 2000-11-14, Korea univ.)
   → Of course, I want to chat with my first scheduled partner!

In Korean, 'malhagi weonhanda (chat want)' is acceptable where neither preposition nor postposition marker is necessary.

Lastly, the pluralization of non-countable nouns in Korea English needs to draw attention. The marker 'deul' in Korean is used right after a noun to indicate a plurality. This includes any non-countable nouns including abstract nouns. Thus, the following data, among many, are most constantly observed:

1) Please send me more informations[*] about your company. (CCDL, 04-12-2003, Korea univ.)
   → Please send me more information about your company.

2) She gave me many helpful advices[*] about living abroad. (CCDL, 04-12-2003, Korea univ.)
   → She gave me many pieces of helpful advice about living abroad.

4 Conclusion and Study's Limitation

This present study examined the use of English among many students at Korea University registering and participating in the CCDL courses in light of such syntactic aspects as word order, ellipsis, articles, prepositions, passive, and

miscellaneous. From the syntactic areas, the current paper found some possible existence of English nativized mainly due to both syntactic and semantic interference of the Korean language. Many educated users of English in S. Korea very much frequently employ those aspects of nativized English, which features part of Korea English.

Within the 'bi-directionality' framework, Englishes used by its members in a speech community are suggested to be glocalized Englishes which all have an equal right to be the Global English and, thus, to be shared equally in teaching. Glocalized Englishes should be explained in terms of acceptable rules rather than unacceptable exceptions.

The present study employed the corpus data from the CCDL course conducted by Korea and Waseda universities. Since the late 1990s, students taken the courses have had benefits in enhancing not only their own academic depth but also English communicative competence. The use of English detected among students at Korea university offers the safeguard against the danger of idiolectal bias (Collins, 1991, cited in Jung & Min, 1999, p. 37) and provides which items in syntactic aspects are used systematically and most frequently by educated speakers of English in S. Korea. However, it is limited only to the university students and needs to explore more widely to other educated speakers of English in S. Korea, which, in fact, calls for a larger amount of corpus data in further studies on Korea English. In addition, the future studies have to incorporate data related to spoken Korea English and its materials in light of those syntactic aspects.

References

Baik, M-J. (1994). Syntactic features of Englishization in Korea. *World Englishes,13*(2), 155-166.

Biak, M-J. (1995). Language, ideology, and power: English textbooks of two Koreas. Seoul: Thaekaksa.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 3*(3), 229-242.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge:Cambridge Univ. Press.

Eun, O-J. (2003). *How idealized American English norms are created reinforced in English lessons on television: A discourse analysis of two popular English language TV shows in Korea.* Unpublished master thesis. The Pennsylvania State University

Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol & U. Meinhof (Eds.). *English in a changing world* (pp. 57-68). Guildford: AILA.

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2005). ELF at the gate: the position of English as a Lingua Franca. Humanising Language Teaching, 7(2), retrieved May 20, 2007 from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/mar05/idea.htm

Jenkins, J. (2006a). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157-181.

Jenkins, J. (2006b). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 137-291.

Jung, K-T & Min, S-J. (1999). Some lexico-grammatical features of Korean English newspapers. *World Englishes, 18*(1), 23-37.

Kachru, B.B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (Eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, 25, 3-13.

Kachru, B.B. (1992a). Models for non-native Englishes. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 48-74). Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B.B. (1992b). Teaching world Englishes. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 355-365). Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Lee, K-Y. (2007). Korea English. In K-J Park & M. Nakano (Eds.). *Asia Englishes and miscommunication* (pp. 241-315). Seoul: Korea Univ. Press.

Modiano, M. (1999a). International English in the global village. *English Today*, *15*(2), 22-34.

Modiano, M. (1999b). Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today, 15*(4), 3-13.

Na, J-J.. (2003, November 11). English required for graduation. The Korea Times. Retrieved Dec. 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.hankookki. com/times.htm>

Park, K-J. (2005). *Korean English as a glocalized English*. Paper presented at the Waseda University Digital Campus Consortium.

Park, K-J. (2006). Directionality issues in teaching English: with reference to expressions by non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 1-22.

Park, K-J. (2007). Theoretical consideration. In K-J Park & M. Nakano (Eds.). *Asia Englishes and miscommunication* (pp. 17-114). Seoul: Korea Univ. Press.

Park, K-J, Lee, H-K, & Ju, Y-G (2003). *Syntactic transfer by Korean learners of English*. Paper presented at the Waseda University Digital Campus Consortium.

Park, K-J & Nakano, M. (2007). (Eds.). Asia Englishes and Miscommunication. Seoul: Korea Univ. Press.

Quirk, R. (1985). The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk & H.G. Widdowson (Eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning The language and literatures* (pp. 1-6). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ.Press.

Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implication for ELT. *ELT Journal, 58*(2), 111-117.

Seo, J-Y. (2002, December 18). English study market soars. <u>The Korea Times.</u>
        Retrieved Dec. 1. 2005, from the World Wide Web: <u><http://www.hankooki.</u>
        <u>com/times.htm></u>

Shim, J-Y. (2003, October 23) Roh backs English as second official language. <u>The</u>
        <u>Korea Times</u>. Retrieved Dec. 1, 2005 from the World Wide Web:
        <<u>http://www.hankooki.com/times.htm</u>>

Shim, R.J.Y. (1994). Englishized Korean: Structure, status, and attitudes. *World*
        Englishes, 13(2), 225-244.

Shim, R.J.Y. (1999). Codified Korean English: process, characteristics and
        consequence. *World Englishes, 18*(2), 247-258.

Song, J.J. (1998). Forum, English in South Korea revisited via Martin Jonghak Baik
        (1992, 1994), and Rosa Jinyoung Shim (1994). *World Englishes, 17(*2),
        261-271.

Myeong-Hee Seong
General English Education Div. in Dept. of Leisure Design
Euliji University
212 Yangji-dong, Soojung-gu (461-713), Seongnam-shi,
Gyeonggi-do, Korea
Phone: 82-31-740-7255
Fax: 82-31-740-7363
E-mail: seong@eulji.ac.kr

Kang-Young Lee
General English Education div. in Dept, of Leisure Design
Euliji University
212 Yangji-dong, Soojung-gu (461-713), Seongnam-shi,
Gyeonggi-do, Korea
Phone: 82-31-740-7423
Fax: 82-31-740-7363
E-mail: lky7423@eulji.ac.kr