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Introduction

Language selection is an issue characterised by power struggle, conflict and inequalities. In the wake of the Second World War, many third world nations including Indonesia and South Korea attained independence. During the ensuing rise of nationalism national leaders stressed unity and centralisation. In the process, local character and interests were often ignored while the centre of power, generally the capital city, was developed. National leaders usually designated one prominent dialect, usually that spoken in the capital city, as the standard language and robustly encouraged the entire population to learn it. This was achieved, inter alia, by incorporating as the exclusive standard into the school curriculum and actively discouraging people from using their regional languages/local dialects and nationalisms. This official legitimation of the standard form has resulted in the illegitimation of other dialects. 3) "Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization", within the school curriculum. Groups who speak regional languages or dialects have been discriminated against and have not the same opportunities as standard language speakers in terms of social recognition and education. Although it is imperative that speakers of local dialects maintain their mother tongues so as to retain their traditional identity and culture, their right to do so has been ignored.

South Korea is not a stranger to this kind of linguistic discrimination. In 1933 underground Korean language scholars declared the Seoul dialect the standard language of Korea. Despite this, it was not until the end of Japanese occupation in 1945 that it was finally installed as the official language when the United States military rule, acting on advice from "hoseonmohakhoe [the Korean Language Council]", gave it the force of law.

This Council also developed Korean language textbooks under the United States military rule. Since then, nationalism has resurfaced and the Korean standard language, as centred on the Seoul dialect, continues to be promulgated with the result that regional dialects are still marginalised from the formal education system. 4) This selection of the standard language was not conducted in a democratic way. Fishman considers the motive underlying the nationalistic promotion of standard languages:

Even where no unifying vernacular has immediately been available, nationalist movements have commonly set up to either find or create one, not only as a symbol but also as an agent in the diffusion of national sentiment among a wider segment of the population and in the growth of centralisation. 5)

After declaring the Seoul dialect the official standard language, South Korean rulers embarked on an aggressive campaign promoting the education of the standard language. To this day I recall how educational leaders encouraged us to use the standard language in the 60s to 70s. We had a motto

---

2) Fishman, L., A Language and an Ethnicity, Rowley: Newbury, 1972, p. 5.
have critically discussed the problems of the standardisation of the Korean language, although they have described the dialects and mentioned issues such as the different pronunciations of dialects, their geographical distribution and the need of dialectal education.

In this article I want to focus on the problems of linguistic discrimination towards dialects and suggest a new path towards linguistic democracy. I have applied the term linguistic democracy as language equality not defined politically but in favour of majority rule by consideration of people affected by the language policy over the nation. I will discuss the problems of standardisation policy first followed by a consideration of the advantages of keeping dialects in school curricula. I will then look at the dialect policies of other countries. Finally I will suggest ways to improve Korean language education in this respect.

Historical background of Korean language policy and the school curriculum

The Korean Language Council designated the Seoul dialect as the standard language in 1933 during the Japanese colonial era. After Korea’s liberation from Japan in 1945, the nation was re-established and the Korean language scholars imprisoned during the Japanese era were released, gaining control of language agenda. They endeavoured to spread it as the standard across South Korea. Subsequently, all official documents and textbooks were written in the Seoul dialect. If the textbooks did not fit the Seoul standard, the Ministry of Education under US military rule did not approve their publication.

Local dialects have been excluded from the Korean language curriculum for almost sixty years. For the sake of spreading the standard language, local dialect speakers have been discriminated against and have been deprived of the right to maintain and develop their own local dialects within the school curriculum. Even in early literacy classrooms, all the teaching materials are reading.

7) Moon Sang Soo, Hyeon Min Sung, Kim Jong Hoon, Hyeon Seong Hwan, Yong Dong Soo, Jeju老家 Jujumadeli mokkato service tongdwan jeju kohowo jeju pangun pajusom pajange pajange yi rage (searching the preservation of the Jeju language and Jeju dialect while reinforcing foreign-language jakhaleen freje im zone). Jeju Development Institute, 2002, p. 104.

written in the standard language. Although students have been able to use local dialects outside the classroom, learning dialects and disseminating them in classrooms has never been encouraged. When assessing work, teachers penalize students for writing in local dialects which leaves students open to ridicule by the school community. Students who write in local dialects are perceived as fools or even radicals against the unity of South Korea. Opposition to this policy is often regarded as a sign of a person lacking patriotism.

This language policy and other practices are reinforced by the mass media. In South Korea today, even in regional areas, all mass media including television and radio are broadcast in the standard language. In the school language curriculum dialects are never taught or tested. When Guknip gugyeongmun [Korean Language Council] decided which vocabulary should be accepted, they dropped local dialects which differ from the Seoul dialect. Through the adoption of strict standard language policy in South Korea, many pure Korean words have disappeared and the decline continues. This causes several problems.

The impact of strict standardisation language policies on Korean language education

It is reasonable to adopt one national standard language through which people can communicate with people from different areas. However, the Korean language policy stresses the standard language to an unjustified extent. Firstly, the exclusion of local dialects in the school curriculum causes dialect speakers to lose their own dialect, something which forms an important part of cultural heritage. There are four major dialects spoken in South Korea, Seoul, Choeakchung, Cholla and Kyongsang. Spanning from the capital and its surrounding villages, around 19 million people speak the Seoul dialect. Towards the middle of South Korea, 4.6 million use the Choeongchung dialect which characteristically is known for its delayed ending. Remaining are the 5.3 million South-Western Koreans who speak the Cholla dialect and the 13 million South-Easterners who rely on the unique strong accent of the Kyongsang dialect. Apart from this division, two more minor dialects exist; one is Yongdung dialect which covers the middle of North-Eastern South Korea used by one million people and the other is the Juju dialect mentioned above and used by half a million people. The latter is very distinct from the other existing dialects and communication with other dialectal speakers is often hard. Although these divisions are technically geographical and provincial, these lines of dialectal separation can often become blurred. Take for example, Yongdong in the Choeongchung province. This area is engulfed by numerous influential dialects such as Cholla and Kyongsang. What can be seen in their speech styles is a combination of the characteristics of the Choeongchung, Kyongsang and Cholla dialects.

These dialects have been developed and used throughout history. They have their own unique cultural connotations, traditions, and values in which cultural identities are embedded. Dialect speakers are considered rural and unsophisticated, while Seoul standard language speakers are correct and sophisticated under the standardisation policy. Thus all other dialects are in the process of decline. Despite the efforts of local language enthusiasts and their encouragement of local dialects in the arts and through events such as local dialect contests, it remains unsuccessful because of the force of its decline. Due to the strict regulations on the formal

school curriculum, local dialects are generally only accepted within the family home, local community and among peers in informal settings.

Secondly, the exclusion of local dialects in the school curriculum is against people's wishes. In Korea the majority of dialect speakers want to keep their dialects and use them. In South Korea, scholars and academics are not encouraged to undertake research on the decline of local dialects in favour of the standard dialect. Therefore it is not easy to find statistical data to back up this research. However, I did find a few recent studies. According to Kim Ju Sun's research of secondary school students perception of dialect education in the Cholla province, 202 out of 250 respondents wanted to retain their dialect. Im Chul Sung found that 62.8% of Korean dialect speakers want to speak their own dialects in areas where the standard language is used. Kim Ju Sun, Shin Hee San and Moon Sung Sook et al. commonly found that dialect speakers feel that using their dialect gives them more solidarity, identity and increases emotional bonding amongst their communities. This finding is consistent with Rosenberg's research in the German context in which he argues that people prefer to use their dialects because it provides improved communication at a personal level. Yet Korean schools do not teach dialects in their school language curriculum.

Thirdly, the exclusion of local dialects in the school curriculum can be detrimental to the learning of dialect speakers. Teaching the standard language can cause students to feel alienated from school because the language they use at home is different from that which they learn in schools. Im Chul Sung argues that using only the standard language in the classroom is detrimental to childhood learning. He points out that

we need to use dialect in the classroom and reduce it gradually. If the school curriculum teaches dialect in addition to the standard form, students will not feel alienated from schooling. In Germany, teachers are allowed to use local dialects in their teaching materials. Exclusively teaching the standard language in schools deprives dialect speakers of the equal opportunity to become accustomed to schooling and to achieve literacy skills in their dialects.

Fourthly, the definitions of the standard language do not represent the majority of Koreans, even in the Seoul area. According to language ruchumcheop [the reformation of Korean alphabetical systems], the standard language is the language which the educated Seoul population use widely. This is strikingly different from the Moonhweo [North Korean standard] which has been codified and refined in the perspective of farmers and labourers. In addition according to statistics published in 2001, only about 20 percent of the Seoul population were born in Seoul. The constant flux of citizens also indicates that the term cannot signify a static body. Further the vocabularies which are related to fishery, agricultural and forestry are not commonly used in Seoul because there are no such industries there. Thus the persistence of the Seoul standard language has had an unnatural effect on the development of the Korean language in these fields.

Fifthly, the Seoul standard language is the most prone to change and has been easily corrupted and influenced by foreign languages. On the other hand, local dialects are not easily corrupted due to their relative isolation from foreign influences. By blocking the introduction of dialects into the standard, there is an opening for words to be borrowed from foreign

---

17) Im Chul Sun, op. cit., p. 49.
20) Moon Sung Sook et al., op. cit., p. 112.
22) Im Chul Sun, op. cit., p. 51.
28) Seo Jun Sung, op. cit.
languages\(^{29}\). Thus, appointing the Seoul dialect as the exclusive standard invites the criticism that there has been a corruption of the Korean language through the adoption of many foreign words, even though equivalent Korean words already exist in local dialects. Cho Oh Hyun et al.\(^{30}\) espouses the view that there are too many foreign words in the Korean vocabulary. Yet in North Korea, the Pyongyang standard called munhwaewo [cultured language] had accepted about 3,100 vocabularies from dialects by the end of 1980 and has continued to include vocabularies from these dialects rather than borrowing from foreign languages\(^{31}\). Kwag Choong Koo\(^{32}\) also points out that the Pyongyang standard has more pure Korean vocabularies than the Seoul standard. This of course is attributable to North Korea's geoheumsim (self-reliance) policy; however, it does show the great potential to utilise dialectal expressions in the Seoul standard through the school curriculum.

There are some academicians who overlook the problems I have discussed above and promulgate theories in support of the exclusion of dialects in the school curriculum. I will now consider these theories and expose their inherent weaknesses.

First, scholars like Yang Soon Phil\(^{33}\) insist that for the unity of nations it is better for all people to exclusively learn and use a standard language. However, we cannot achieve unity by ignoring dialect speakers' wishes\(^ {34}\). The word unity\(^ {35}\) here is not used in democratic terms. From the Seoul point of view, dialect speakers should be forced to follow Seoul standard, fazing out their dialects. The majority of people want to keep their dialects and learn them, according to Kim Ju Sun\(^ {36}\), Im Chil Sung\(^ {37}\) and Shin Hee Sam\(^ {38}\).

especially in their personal and informal conversations. Min Hyun Shik\(^ {39}\) points out that the policy which heavily stresses learning the standard language in schools also causes conflict and resistance. So it is not sound to try to maintain unity by marginalising dialects. We can have unity and peace when we acknowledge different dialects, respect them and protect them as an important asset (Im Chil Sung\(^ {38}\); Min Hyun Shik\(^ {40}\)). This can be achieved by including dialects in the language curriculum.

Some scholars like Lee Hyun Bok\(^ {41}\) insist that learning the standard language and using it alone can solve regionalism. But regionalism is not caused by dialects, it is caused by political motivations\(^ {42}\). Conversely when we learn some local languages or important honorific forms in dialects of other areas through Korean language classes, we can have better interactions among speakers of different dialects.

Thirdly, another false concept of dialect acquisition is that students acquire/learn dialects automatically in their home or local community, so it is not necessary to teach dialects. If this is true, why do Seoul standard speakers learn Korean language in their school curriculum? Local dialect speakers need to learn their own dialects in the school curriculum. Yet this was ignored completely. According to George's\(^ {43}\) research regarding the Breton regional language, language fluency drops significantly from generation to generation when there is little support outside of family and local community. As an example, the grandparents' generation, fluent only in Breton, was followed by the parental generations, bilingual in French and Breton with the following generation of students non-mono-lingual in French. His research

---


\(^{30}\) Cho, Oh Hyun et al., op. cit., p. 148.

\(^{31}\) Ibid, p. 165.


\(^{34}\) Min Hyun Shik, 1980, op. cit., p.657.

\(^{35}\) Kim Ju Sun, op. cit., p.19.
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also shows that uneducated people living in rural areas retain their regional languages to a larger extent than the more educated people, who prefer to use French. This result indicates that official authorisation of one language as a standard and teaching it in schools exclusively, becomes a powerful tool to marginalise other opposing dialects or regional languages in schools. A similar result was found by Korean scholars, Moon Sung Sook et al., who argues that the more a student receives the formal school education, the less she/he can speak a dialect. This is because the Korean language curriculum, including textbooks, only encourages students to use and learn the standard. Language reproduction in family and local community is very limited nowadays. Mass media and films are largely presented in the standard language and people spend more time under the influence of such media. Thus dialects cannot be maintained and revived when excluded from the school curriculum.

Fourthly, it is argued that in order to expand the Korean language overseas, we need to adopt a strict standardisation policy. Such scholars use the case of English for illustrations. Because it was adopted as a standard language early, English became the global language. In the UK there are institutes which teach standard language, and in order to become politicians, candidates must learn to speak the standard language. It can be argued that the reason English became a global language is not because of the standard language policy; instead, English became a world language because of the power and influence of the United States and Britain. There are different types of English, the American style and the British style, but those who speak with American accents can communicate with British speakers and vice versa. Perhaps in the former British colonies there are more variations, such as in third world Africa or Asia and the Caribbean region. As English speakers have acknowledged these variations, English has become even more of an influence in the world. In order to increase the number of overseas Korean speakers, we need to acknowledge and teach provincial dialects in the school curriculum. There are about two million Koreans in China, half a million in former USSR nations and two million in the US. They have developed different vocabularies according to their local situations. We need to recognise those vocabularies as part of the Korean language, as in done in Australian English which has unique vocabularies not in existence in Britain or the USA, but are still contained in dictionaries. When we accept dialects as parts of the Korean language, and include them in the school curriculum and textbooks at least in their respective provincial areas, the Korean language will be developed further in the future because we are living in a mobile, dynamic and global society where people are on the move. In the future, as more people move from Korea, there will be more variations of the Korean language overseas. In order to accommodate them, it will be imperative to include and teach variations of dialects in their own provincial areas and teach them.

Fifthly, it is argued that we can prepare for the reunification of the two Koreas by teaching standard language strictly and exclusively. This statement implies that the Seoul Standard language should become the standard language in a unified Korea. We cannot achieve linguistic reunification by ignoring North Koreans. As a unified Germany acknowledges East German expression as an important variation, we also need to recognise the North Korean standard and dialects. If they accept as the two standard languages both the Seoul and Pyongyang languages, this will be against democratic principles. There are more Pyongyang dialect speakers in South Korea than Pyongyang dialect speakers in North Korea. Yet selecting the Pyongyang dialect as another form of the standard means ignoring the dialect population through policies. Thus in order to achieve unification peacefully, both

---

44) Moon Sung Sook et al., op. cit., p.110.
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countries need to respect other variations of the language.
So far I have discussed the problems surrounding the exclusion of dialects in Korean language curriculum. Now I will turn to the advantages of teaching and retaining the dialects in the Korean language curriculum.

Advantages of including dialects in the school curriculum

Many scholars insist that we do not need to teach dialects and that we should extinguish them. Yet there are many advantages of keeping dialects alive. If we maintain our local dialects and conduct research by comparing them or the dialects of other nations to the standard, we can trace back our cultural contact with other countries such as Japan, China, Taiwan, Mongolia and other neighbours. For this reason, it is historically important to consider dialects. In addition, keeping and studying local dialects can contribute to the finding of the cultural and historical connections amongst different regions and will allow the historical changes of the Korean language to be traced back. This is because old forms of Korean language are often kept in the regional dialects.  

Secondly, by maintaining or promoting dialects in the school curriculum, we can enrich the Korean standard vocabularies. In cases where the standard language cannot express certain concepts, there could be dialectal alternatives which are more relevant. Such words could be included and used in the standard (Kim Ju san, Min Hyun Shik, Pang Oon Kyu). In North Korea, about 3,100 vocabularies from dialects were designated as standard vocabularies during 1945-1980.

Thirdly, keeping dialects in the local language curriculum helps to achieve local autonomy and to preserve Korean cultural heritage. Since local governments are elected directly by the people, local autonomy is also stressed and in such an environment, local cultures are encouraged to continue. In this sense, teaching local dialects is also part of keeping a local unique culture and identity. As argued by Fishman, the importance of preserving the native tongue exceeds the importance of keeping a territory. It cannot be claimed that Korean local cultures are well preserved if the local dialect is not also preserved and maintained through schooling.

Fourthly, teaching dialects in the school curriculum helps Korean citizens to communicate better. Communicative competence includes the ability to understand varieties of the language the student has available to them. Thus in order to communicate in a better way students need to learn not only the standard language but also the dialects as well. He suggests that school curricula and textbooks must include dialects. If a school teaches dialects of different areas, it will help students to communicate with speakers of other dialects. In particular, if curricula include the taboo and honorific expressions of other dialects, speakers of one dialect can better communicate with speakers of other dialects. Besides this, there is clear research evidence that same dialect speakers prefer to use dialects in their personal talk, intimate and private interactions or when they want to express their deep emotions and feelings. Therefore, the students' right to learn their own dialects must be promoted through schooling.

Fifthly, teaching dialects helps Korean citizens to achieve linguistic democracy and prepare for reunification. In achieving linguistic democracy it is important to respect other dialects and to teach them in the schools rather than ignoring and attempting to eradicate them. In Korea, currently many scholars such as Park Gap Soo, Kim Min Soo, Chou So Young, and Park Yang Kyu are researching and discussing the Korean language policy in

50) Kim Ju Sun, op. cit., p.15.
52) Pang Oon Kyu, op. cit., p.127.
53) Cho, Oh Hyun et al., op. cit., p.185.
54) Kim Ju Sun, op. cit., p.17.
55) Fishman, op. cit., p.49.
57) Shin Bok S., op. cit., p.275.
58) Kim Ju Sun, op. cit., p.17.
60) Rosenberg, op. cit., p.77.
61) 한국은행, 한국은행 보고서 2007.
preparation for the reunification of North and South Korea. In particular, Park Yang Kyun has argued that a unified Korea needs to designate and teach the Seoul and Pyongyang dialects. However, his suggestion also excludes all other dialects except for the two. Peaceful linguistic reunification cannot be achieved politically without consideration for the desire of local people. When the South Korean school curriculum formally recognises dialects with the effect that citizens learn to respect other dialects, it will be easier to achieve unity and communication between North and South Korea and their peoples.

So far I have discussed the advantage of keeping dialects. In the following section, I would like to discuss dialect policies and practices in Europe and Asia in order to gain an objective view of Korean language policy.

When the modern nations arose nationalism burgeoned. Newly industrialised societies needed literacy skill and a widespread mass media to train and coordinate their skilled labour forces. Thus language curriculum changed to accommodate new demands and nationalism. When Japan and China began to modernise in the 19th centuries, their language curriculum and its policy changed too. I will now consider the language policies of two neighbouring nations, Japan and Taiwan and in the European context, the United Kingdom and Germany.

Lessons from other countries

The Japanese language curriculum is very similar to that of South Korea. The language of the province of Tokyo has been the ‘hijyōgō’ (standard language) since 1916. Since then school textbooks have been disseminating the written form of the standard and broadcasting stations like NHK spreading it as the standard language. This became a very powerful and effective tool because the Japanese spend a significant amount of time watching television.

The exclusion of dialects was very strong with significant repression in schools. As a result, dialects like Okinawan may become extinct as a living language within the next few decades. However, resulting from a recent political emphasis on regionalism, there has been an attempt to maintain dialects along with the standard as they are viewed as an important asset for autonomy. By illustrating the liveliness of the people and cultures of local areas of Japan, the National Language Council has emphasised that dialects play a valued part in creating an image of a rich and beautiful national language.

The revival of dialects in Japan is also owing to the ‘Furusato’ boom: the revitalisation of depopulated old villages and native communities. The emotional and cultural appeal attached to rural dialects has made them attractive to those that are visiting the areas. In Okinawa a broadcasting station now uses Okinawan. In addition, an active promotion of a regional language is also seen in respect of the Ainu language. Traditionally the Ainu language was suppressed and assimilated with the Japanese standard. However, with the recognition of the Ainu as an ethnic minority as a result of the 1997 ‘Ainu New Law’, the Japanese Government has undertaken to promote Ainu language in the school curriculum by training teachers and conducting classes.

Additionally, some rural dialects like the dialects of the Kansai area around Kyoto, Osaka and Kobe have become more popular. This recent popularity can be attributed to the fact that many celebrities are from these areas. The Osaka dialect has more power commercially and in the mass media and as a result the language has developed positively with the usage of the Kansai dialect increasing from the late 1970s to 1980s. However, rural dialects continue to lose ground and are disappearing. In Japan dialects were repressed and marginalised by the exclusion policy, yet now

64) Carroll, T. Language planning and language change in Japan. In: p. 201.
65) Gottlieb, op. cit. p. 29.
67) Kim Ju Sun, op. cit., p. 18.
69) Carroll, op. cit. p. 191.
dialects around major cities are regaining their influence and Japanese governments are endeavouring to revive or maintain minor languages such as Ainu and Okinawan.

Like Koreans, Taiwanese were forced to learn Japanese and use it during the Japanese era. After 1945, local residents in Taiwan were forced to learn Guoyu, which is like Northern Mandarin. Unlike Taiwan, Guoyu was promoted in mainland China as the standard spoken language without intention to replace the local dialects, but to encourage a bilingual society. In Taiwan, however, leaders pursued a monolingual policy with the objective that Guoyu dominate the public sector and eventually replace local dialects completely. Aboriginal and local dialects such as Hakka, the major mother tongue of the islanders, were repressed. The language policy was pushed with the belief that it would facilitate the reunification of China as one country. This undemocratic policy marginalised dialect speakers in the school curriculum, and the criminalisation of dialect study suppressed resurgence of regional identity through dialect usage. As a result, dialect proficiency has dropped significantly among the younger generation.

Mainly composed of indigenous citizens, the Democratic Progress Party, which was formed in 1987, requested the abolition of laws banning the use of dialects in 1993. In the same year the government abolished the restriction of dialect usage in the mass media and the Ministry of Education introduced the instruction of dialects into the school curriculum.

Currently there has been significant increased use of local dialects, particularly Southern Min, which was inspired by, and contributed to, a heightened awareness of Taiwanese identity in contrast to mainland China. Now Taiwanese citizens highlight their unique differentiation from mainlanders and use Taiwanese on all occasions including political activities in congress. Election campaigns and daily administration are now conducted in Taiwanese local dialects not Mandarin. The promotion of Guoyu has now lost political support though the language still remains because children and adults learned it at schools. This means a language curriculum which ignores the interests and needs of real people cannot gain lasting support and momentum. In the Taiwanese case, there were two different policies which compelled citizens to learn Japanese and Guoyu, yet they both failed when they ignored the interests and desire of Taiwanese citizens and tried to promote such languages for political reasons. In the following section 1 will discuss the language curriculum of Germany because the German situation was similar to the situation Korea is in presently. Through analysis of Germany’s reunification, Koreans can learn how to prepare for their own linguistic reunification.

The language curriculum in Germany is tolerant to an extent. Dialects and teaching materials about dialects are included in language education in the upper secondary schools (Rosenberg: Clyne). Thus dialects have been included as part of the subject-matter of in-service training courses. Dialect teaching in Germany includes testing materials and exercises have been developed for use in German lessons and also in remedial lessons in primary schools. Dialects are exposed and practiced in preschool projects with songs and role plays as part of the curriculum. Apart from language curriculum, teaching interdisciplinary subjects such as social work and psychology in dialects has engendered significant positive results. Dialect resurgence in literature like poetry appears as a rediscovery of dialect.

After reunification, linguistic conflicts have risen between the former West and East Germans. Chung Dong Gyoo erroneously insists that German governments have accepted all East German citizens as equal to West Germans, that they have received similar linguistic status to West Germans and this has contributed to the development of the national languages. But
there is strong resistance to this argument amongst former East Germans. The majority of the population continue to use East German words. One of the main reasons is that they have not been offered new national identity after they losing their former identity and collective spirit. When former East Germans attempt to accommodate the new norms and vocabularies, they are often criticized for failing to abandon their old speech habits. Former East Germans face linguistic frustrations and attempt to keep their own dialects in order to keep their own identity and resist West Germans’ dominance. The West German example is a significant lesson for Koreans who want to reunite in the future. When South Korean scholars plan language policy which includes the standard and dialect, it is wise to respect the current linguistic variations of South Korea as well as North Korea and integrate them in the school curriculum.

Attitudes toward dialects in the UK are beginning to alter. The BBC for example, particularly in local stations, employed some newscasters and programme presenters with regional accents, albeit relatively slight ones. Scottish and its dialects have experienced resurgence since the late 1970s and MA dissertations can be written in Scottish at Glasgow University. Scottish is integrated in the school curriculum and teaching materials are available.

In the above examples, we see that there is significant tolerance towards dialects in the UK and Germany. The German school curriculum even incorporates dialects and those dialects are included as part of the assessment. Taiwan abolished the strict Gwoyu policy which was based on political motives rather than consideration for the people. In Japan minority languages like Ainu are attempting to revive and Okinawa has a broadcasting channel which broadcasts in the local language. In general, as regionalism resurges, the dialects around major cities are regaining their power such as the Kansai dialect. In the UK, students can write their MA in Scottish. There is little evidence that the exclusion of local dialects is as strong in Europe and Asia as in Korea. Although many countries in the above examples used to have strict language policies towards dialect education, there has been a great change in attitude towards dialects. It is timely to begin to include dialects in the school curriculum in South Korea.

Suggestions and conclusion

As we have seen above, the South Korean language curriculum is too centralised and stresses the spreading of the standard language to an unjustifiable excess. The South Korean Government has encouraged all citizens to speak the standard language and has actively discouraged them from speaking dialects. Dialect speakers need to learn not only standard language but also their own dialects. Yet the opportunities for learning dialects are blocked and discouraged systematically and educationally. This is in Bourdieu’s term ‘invisible and silent violence’, and in effect is against the wishes of local people. It is hard to claim that there exists linguistic democracy in South Korea now. Thus I would like to suggest several points:

Firstly, in order to revive and promote dialects, there needs to be official support or authorisation for the promotion of dialects. Just as education now promotes the standard language significantly, the Korean Government needs to promote dialects through the school curriculum. The dialects must be included in teaching materials and taught and assessed in schools (in Chil Sung; Shin Hye Sun). This will help students to overcome

81) Clyne, op. cit, p.84.
84) Carroll, op. cit, p.188.
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86) Carroll, op. cit, p.194.
88) Chil Sung, op. cit, p.51.
negative impressions of dialect usage. Assessment is a very important way to encourage students to study and remember. Revival of dialects will then follow in the future.

Secondly, there must be structural equality by way of a system for decision making in which individuals who are affected by policies have a major role in formulating policies. Language curriculum in regional provinces must be designed and conducted by regional government not central government. At the moment, local people are not given the opportunity to contribute in this area. When important decisions are made, representatives of local dialect speakers must be present. Without local dialect speakers playing a major role, such structural inequality is not democratic.

Thirdly, a natural environment must be fostered where dialects can revive and be promoted at a grass roots level surrounding the regional capitals (major cities of dialect speaking areas) in all spheres of social life such as schools and media and drama. Unlike other cultural heritage, languages need a natural environment for them to survive and revive without discrimination and discouragement. This implies that schools teach dialects and, in addition dialect speakers need to have dialectal TV channels and radio channels to revive their own dialectal mother tongue. This is because many modern people are exposed to mass media and are significantly affected by it.

We also need to provide an environment where people recognise linguistic plurality (local dialect speakers learn the standard as well as dialects) and break down the hierarchical relationship between dialects and standard or among dialects. Dialects in South Korea will then revive naturally. This does not mean just preservation of dialects, but revitalisation.

So far I have discussed the problems of the exclusion of dialects in the school curriculum and the advantages of keeping dialects. In order to get some objective views, I also looked at the examples from other countries.

I suggested several points.

Keeping dialects is not dreadful and unsophisticated or deleterious to achieving the unity of Korea. Instead, keeping dialects is keeping our unique cultural heritage. There are invaluable assets in dialects which cannot be bought such as cultural norms, history, and diplomatic relationships. In spite of this, not many Korean local citizens have protested against the exclusion of dialects in the language curriculum. This is because there has been too strong a hegemony placed on the Seoul standard language in developing the language curriculum. If any one expresses dissatisfaction, they are considered a traitor or lacking patriotism. Now times have changed. Korean language is not facing extinction because of foreign invasion. Now, rather, we face challenges from the importation of foreign words from languages like English. In order to keep and develop Korean language as well as unique aspects of Korean culture, we need to develop an effective harmonious language curriculum under which no one can be discriminated against and robbed of equal opportunities.

President Roh's Government is named Chaenwo joongun, which means that people participate. It is timely to allow local people to participate in correcting the currently biased language curriculum and allow them to have real autonomy. Citizens need the right to create an environment where dialects revive naturally without any discrimination and discouragement.
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Abstract

A Consideration of the Exclusion of Dialects in the South Korean School Curriculum through Language Policy

Lee, Dong bae

이 논문에서는 지난 60년간 국어 교육에서 방언을 제외했던 한국의 표준어 중심의 언어 정책의 문제점을 그 방향에 대해 논의하였다. 먼저 일본의 식민지를 벗어난 후에 한국의 언어 발전 과정을 설명하고 우리 국민들에게 적대한 영향을 미친 한국의 표준어 중심의 언어 정책의 문제점과 그 결과에 대해 분석하였다. 그리고 방언 교육은 반대하면서 일반적인 표준어 교육만을 주장하는 학자들의 이론의 허구성과 비철학적 지적사항으로 표준어 중심의 교육이 얼마나 비민주적이며, 방언을 배우고 유지하고 새로운 방언화자의 의사와 상반되는지 검증하였다.

그 다음에 방언을 교과서나 국어 교육의 교과과정에 포함시키는 경우에 있을 때, 즉 전통적으로 내려오는 지역의 교육과 독특한 문화를 보존하는 것이며, 다른 방언화자들 사이의 언어 문화를 존중하며 이해하는 데 도움을 주고 난아가 의사소통을 더 원활하게 해주며 표준어 학습 이외에 방언에서 사용되는 단어를 포함시킬 경우 오히려 표준어 발전에 도움을 주고 도입 후에 난겨 씁니다. 또한 그와 비교하여 서로의 다른 언어적 표현들을 알고 이해하는데 도움이 되는 것을 제시하고 설명하였다.

마지막으로 국어 교육과정에서 미치는 언어 정책에 대해 주의 깊게 분석을 도출하기 위해 다른 나라의 경우에는 살펴보았다. 우리와 같이 다양한 방언을 갖고 있는 나라 영국, 일본, 독일과 대만의 경우를 살펴보고 실기 우리의 현재 방언 정책과 비교하였다. 그리고 결론에서와 같이 방언을 국어 교육에 포함시킬 것임이 아닌가 생각했을 때는 당사자인 방언화자들이 합리화해 집필한 책을 해야 하며, 방언이 더 이상 소방되지 않고 자연적으로 발전할 수 있는 자연적인 토탈을 제공하는 것이 중요함을 알았다.
This paper discusses the problems and implementation of standardised Korean language policy in respect of the exclusion of dialects in the school curriculum and textbooks. Starting with the brief post-colonial history of modern Korean language development, this article analyses the problems and impact of the strict standard language policy which has been affecting Korean citizens for nearly sixty years. It shows how this policy of exclusion has significant flaws in theory and in practice and provides a critique of several theories which erroneously oppose the inclusion of dialects in the school curriculum.

This research demonstrates that the exclusion of dialects is against linguistic democracy because most Koreans wish to preserve their mother dialects. This paper lists the advantages of the inclusion of dialects in the school curriculum, including benefits such as the maintenance of unique local culture, helping communication of Koreans who use different dialects, enriching standard vocabularies, and preparing peaceful reunification.

In order to provide an objective view of language policies in respect of dialects, this paper discusses the language policy on the school curriculum in Japan, Taiwan, Germany and the United Kingdom. It ends with some suggestions including the conferring of autonomy on locals to develop their own language curriculum in provincial areas and allowing provincial representatives to participate in making language curriculum decisions.

[Key Words] Korean language policy, dialects in the school curriculum and textbooks, dialects