English Teaching, Vol. 66 No. 4 Winter 2011

Konglish Phenomenon: L1 Activation in L2

Hyun-Jeong Nam
(Daegu Haany University)

Nam, Hyun-Jeong. (2011). Konglish phenomenon: L1 activation in L2. *English Teaching*, *66*(4), 191-211.

The study is a full-scale investigation of the presence of the activation of L1 in L2. In order to portray a more holistic picture of Korean L2 learner's lexical processing, the present study addresses variation in relation to stimuli and tasks both written and oral type in both L2 comprehension and production. The results show the evidence of the activation of non-target language (L1) as a form of Konglish in L2 (English). The factors affecting L1 activation in L2 were proficiency, the quantity and quality of English exposure, Korean-medium learning context. If Korean learners of English are exposed to an L1-inducing learning environment in Korea, they may not be able to develop an adequate lexical network in respect of English. In addition, if their exposure to English is sparse in quantity and of poor quality, thus not providing a very promising basis for the restructuring of their explicit knowledge of English learned through Korean, the activation of non-target language (L1) may be inevitable. Therefore, the development of L2 knowledge in the learner's mental lexicon, through the quantity and quality of target language exposure and L2-promoting learning process, should be carefully considered in English teaching in Korea.

I. INTRODUCTION

The characteristic of the English learning situation in Korea which is most relevant to the present study is that the learner's first language mediates the learning process. L2 vocabulary learning in Korea is predominantly based on the lexical level and the syntactic rules of the new words are chiefly memorized without meaning negotiation in context in the Korean EFL classroom. English-language teaching and learning in Korea are often aimed at preparation for tests such as the CSAT (College Scholastic Ability Test) and the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication). In the test-oriented learning environment in Korea where a learning goal is often set based on the

design of the tests, integrated language learning as well as balanced development of lexicon cannot be expected in this test-oriented learning approach.

Given that a bilingual's knowledge seems to reflect the way knowledge is acquired (Kolers & Gonzalez, 1980, p.53), it seems likely to be problematic for the Korean L2 learner's lexicon when L2 knowledge is learned via the activation of L1 lemmas rather than via the L2. If L2 knowledge is provided as metalinguistic knowledge in class and the L1 is the favoured medium in the learning process, L2 learning will be geared neither towards forming L2 networks nor developing conceptual representations of the target language. Consequently the Korean L2 learners' L1 may be activated in L2 access as they have been trained in a manner which may lead to the Konglish phenomenon.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Literature Review

1) L1 Activation in L2

It has long been suggested that the lemma is tagged with a language label and that, therefore, the target lemma in the intended language can be selectively chosen (e.g., Green, 1986; Poulisse & Bongaerts, 1994). According to Green's Inhibitory Control model (1986, 1993, 1998), although L1 words which are closely associated with the relevant concept become more activated in L2 access, they are more strongly suppressed. However, further discussion is necessary with reference to the activation of Konglish (the unique interlanguage of Korean learners of English arising from their impoverished knowledge of English and influence from Korean; see more discussions in Hyunjeong Nam, 2010) in English at this point. In Green's Inhibitory Control Model, the control device, the "specifier", lowers the activation of the word in the non-target language so that the activation of the word in the target language can be higher. With this in mind, it is either the speaker's intention in the preverbal message in the semantic system or the external controlling device that lowers the activation of the non-target word and raises the activation of the target language word to be selected. This explains the successful case where the speaker selects the intended word in the target language. However it does not address the problem of the use of Konglish words in English. As has been pointed out (Schreuder & Hermans, 1998, p. 96), Green's Inhibitory Control Model considers one-to-one mappings between lemmas of different languages, but not "one to many, or many to one, or even many to many". Different from English loanwords with one-to-one

mapping (e.g., *커피*-to-*coffee* mapping), in the case of the Konglish word *기브스 gibŭsŭ / 깁스 gipsŭ* ("[plaster-] cast"), deriving from German *Gips*, there is one-to-*none* mapping between the L1 and L2 in the Konglish users' lexicon, where the English word [*plaster-*] *cast* is not yet incorporated in their L2 lexicon. In this instance there would be no competition between the L1 candidate (*기브스 gibŭsŭ / 깁스 gipsŭ*) and English candidate ([*plaster-*] *cast*). In other words, since the Konglish word would be the only option available for the Konglish user in this case, there would be no competitors to suppress. In this regard, the selection of the Konglish word in L2 can be clarified in a connectionist point of view, in terms of "first reached, first selected", rather than in the inhibitory control model.

There may be some doubts that Konglish words (e.g., *원피스 one piece*) are English loanwords and thus stored as L2 entries but that in the midst of accessing a target L2 word (e.g., *dress*) an L2 competitor (e.g., *one piece*) is accidentally selected. One also might assume the possibility that the use of Konglish words in English might be simply attributable to learners' insufficient practice, rather than a matter raising the issue of the origin of the accessed lexical item. This may pose a question as to whether Konglish may be a valid tool for exploring whether/how L1 resource is activated in L2 access. However the result that Konglish words are stored as L1 lexical items and accessed via L1 entries for L2 production (Hyunjeong Nam, 2010) may resolve the doubts.

Given that Konglish phenomenon lies in grammatical, semantic, phonological, collocational, intercultural, conceptual, metaphorical, and, pragmatic aspects (see more discussions in Hyunjeong Nam, 2010), *Konglish word* refers to the Konglish phenomenon at a word level and *Konglish* covers a broader range extending to pragmatic aspects in the present study.

2) Variables of the Experiments in Bilingual Lexical Processing

It has been suggested by many researchers (e.g., de Groot, 1995; Kroll, Bobb & Wodniecka, 2006) that experimental variation may induce different paths of lexical access and thus may differently reflect bilingual lexical processing. The variables of the experiments in bilingual lexical processing should be taken into consideration in this regard.

(1) Subjects

It may be hard to obtain clearly interpretable results when the subjects employed in a study are not rigorously divided on the basis of their proficiency level. For example, de

Groot (1995, p. 159) points out that the proficiency of the subjects should be carefully considered for a study, because the results from a study which fails clearly to differentiate between the subject groups' proficiency levels will not be amenable to interpretation.

The method used to assess subjects' proficiency may also be problematic. Either the self-evaluation type of assessment, or a type of assessment of proficiency irrelevant to the aims of the study, may not identify correctly the relevant extent of subjects' L2 development. For example, if tests prevalent in Korea, such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) are used to gauge the proficiency of Korean L2 learners, the results from the study may not be reliable for two reasons. First, the focus of the tests is only limited to the academic (TOEFL) or business (TOEIC) aspects of L2 knowledge, and, second, it may also reflect Korean L2 learners' strategic knowledge only. Given that strategic training to select the answer in multiple choice questions with regard to these tests is widespread in Korea, the score obtained in this mechanical way will not necessarily represent the participants' genuine proficiency. The present study therefore deploys a simulated oral proficiency interview type of test, which does not reflect any test strategies in this holistic assessment.

Length of residence in English-speaking countries has often been taken as reflecting participants' proficiency. However, it should be noted that it is not rare for Korean L2 learners to be involved in the Korean-speaking community rather than in the target culture community, owing to the collectivist nature of Korean culture, and this may result in sparse contact with native speakers of English. Considering the quality of the language exposure in such circumstances, a lengthy residence in an English-speaking country may not be a guarantee of proficiency. The present study therefore takes not only the quantity but also the quality of language exposure in English-speaking countries into consideration.

In addition, participants' language learning history and techniques should also be taken seriously into consideration in most studies. If it is the case that only lexical connections between translation-equivalents are developed, problems may arise in the construction of the learners' L2 lexicon (de Groot & Nas, 1991, p. 116; Silverberg & Samuel, 2004, p. 392). One-to-one translation practice strengthens the connection to the L1 rather than direct links between the L2 and concepts (Kroll & Tokowicz, 2001, p. 63). if the meanings of L2 items are acquired through their L1 translations, L2 contextual cues for meaning may be disregarded and this approach to L2 vocabulary learning may cause learners to refer primarily or solely to the contextual cues relating their native language (Jiang, 2000, p. 50). The issue will be also investigated in the present study.

(2) Materials and Methodological Differences

Different word-types of stimuli employed in many studies may have been attributed to the inconsistent results of the studies in that the extent of overlapping conceptual features between translation-equivalents may vary according to the word-type (e.g., De Groot & Nas, 1991; Kroll & De Groot, 1997; Sánchez-Casas, Davis & García-Albea, 1992). For example, noun translation pairs tend to have more shared conceptual representations than verbs (van Hell & De Groot, 1998). In order to circumvent this problem, the present study is not limited to any particular word-type but contains various types of words: concrete words, abstract words, cognates and non-cognates, and also various grammatical categories - noun, verb, etc. In addition, no stimuli in Korean were provided, in order to minimize unnecessary influence from the L1.

Given that different tasks undoubtedly engage different processes of L2 access (Durgunoğlu & Roediger, 1987; Kim & Davis, 2003; Kolers & Gonzalez, 1980), task difference should be taken seriously in studies. The experiment by Kim and Davis (2003) shows this influence of task difference. The participants were found to rely on an orthographic–semantic path in the lexical decision task (LDT) and phonological activation in naming task. This indicates that LDT may be more responsive to semantic processing, but the naming task may induce phonological processing more. In picture-naming tasks, on the other hand, activation from pictures may be more semantically oriented (Kroll, Bobb & Wodniecka, 2006, pp. 129-130). In addition to the above-mentioned variables, a question may arise as to whether some of the decontextualized tasks deployed in an experiment are able to sufficiently reflect the language processing characteristic of normal language use.

Taking all the possible variables into account, conclusions should not thus be drawn on the basis of only one or two factors. This leads the present study to employ various materials and tasks requiring both semantic and phonological processing focusing on the outcome of subjects' actual language production as well as language reception in various contexts.

2. Research Questions

The present study seeks to investigate how Korean L2 learners' mental lexicon is organized. It focuses on how resources required to comprehend and produce L2 are stored and accessed in their mental lexicon, and in particular on whether the L1 mediates the process. The Konglish phenomenon is drawn into the picture as a means of reflecting whether/how L1 knowledge is involved in the process of the organization of their mental lexicon. Discussion will also address possible factors which may affect the lexical

organization and will aspire to providing Korean learners of English and English teachers in Korea with some clues as to the right approach to adopt in their learning/teaching. The research questions to be examined in the present study include;

1. L1 activation in L2 occurs both in language reception and in language production.
2. The Konglish phenomenon is discernible at syntactic, semantic, conceptual and pragmatic levels.
3. The greater the amount of lexical knowledge stored in the learners' English mental lexicon, the less Konglish will be activated in place of English lexis.

III. METHOD

The present study seeks to investigate how resources required to comprehend and produce L2 are accessed in Korean L2 learner' mental lexicon, in particular whether the L1 mediates the process. The Konglish phenomenon is drawn into the picture as a means of reflecting whether/how L1 knowledge is involved in the process. It will also address possible factors which may affect the extent of Konglish use in L2.

1. Subjects

Apart from the control group (20 English native speakers without any knowledge of Korean), 100 Korean participants were recruited for the study through on-campus posters. Subjects assigned to Group A were 40 low-proficient Korean-dominant L2 learners who had obtained the "Moderate" level[1] of the Multimedia Assisted Test of English (MATE, 2010). The other 40 participants, allotted to Group B, were proficient Korean-dominant bilinguals, who had attained the "Commanding[2]" level of the test. According to Grosjean's distinction between "language learners" and "bilinguals" (1998, p. 136), subjects in Group A who do not speak the L2 on a regular basis were L2 "learners", whereas those in Group B who use the L2 on a regular basis were

[1] According to the rating scale of the test, "Moderate" level is broadly defined as "the ability to create with language [produce language creatively], start, maintain, and end a simple conversation by asking and answering simple questions".

[2] Given that the "Commanding Mid" level was the minimum requirement for the TESOL MA program on which the participants assigned to Group B were enrolled, their proficiency was above the minimum level for inclusion in this group. According to the test criterion, "Commanding Mid" speakers are able to "fully control their speech while narrating and describing in the past, present, and future tense".

"bilinguals". The 20 participants allocated to Group C were English-dominant Korean-Americans who were taking a summer course at a university in Korea when the study was carried out. While the subjects in Group A and Group B were late L2 learners, most of the participants in Group C were early bilinguals[3]. The mean length of residence in Korea of the Group C participants was 10.18 months (SD 21.11) and the percentage of use of Korean language in daily life in America was 27.35% (SD 20.49).

2. Materials

Pictures and realia were prepared for the oral interview. The pictures were obtained from internet search engines and magazines. The realia, such as a band aid and soft drinks, were purchased, any labels on the products being removed.

3. Procedure

The interviewers had in no case resided in Korea for longer than 3 months and had no command of Korean beyond simple greetings and names. To keep the interviewees in monolingual mode, the interviewers were instructed not to speak or respond in Korean and not even to use Korean greetings during the interview. The sound recognition test was conducted after the oral interview. The subjects were informed that a code was assigned to each of them for the sake of data filing. All the subjects, however, were given "5 /faiv/ 2 /tu:/ 1 /wʌn/ O /ou/ E /i:/" and a random number for the last digit. For example, one subject might hear "521OE3" from the interviewer, while another subject might hear "521OE4". What was examined in this test were the sound-shapes of the numbers "5" and "2" and English letters "O" and "E", since the sound-shapes of "5" and "2" in Korean resemble the pronunciation of "O" and "E" respectively. The subjects were informed that the code would not be repeated, and they were asked to listen carefully and handwrite what they heard when the interviewer uttered it. It was spoken at a rate which native speakers of English would normally expect. The written test was presented as a seven-page-long pen and paper test. The rubrics of this test were entirely in English.

[3] Thirteen subjects were born in an English-speaking country, four subjects have lived in an English-speaking country since the age of one, and one subject from the age of five. Two participants had moved to America when they were ten years old.

IV. RESULTS

TABLE 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of L1 Activation in L2

	Group	N	Mean[4]	Std[5]	Std error[6]	Confidence interval[7] lower	Confidence interval[7] upper	Min score	Max score
Total I	A	40	0.642	0.075	0.012	0.618	0.666	0.488	0.800
	B	40	0.507	0.123	0.019	0.467	0.546	0.226	0.709
	C	20	0.147	0.105	0.023	0.098	0.196	0.000	0.418
	Total	100	0.489	0.209	0.021	0.447	0.530	0.000	0.800
Total II	A	40	0.492	0.203	0.032	0.427	0.557	0.000	0.917
	B	40	0.242	0.155	0.025	0.192	0.291	0.000	0.667
	C	20	0.092	0.066	0.015	0.061	0.122	0.000	0.167
	Total	100	0.312	0.227	0.023	0.267	0.357	0.000	0.917
Total III	A	40	0.050	0.152	0.024	0.001	0.099	0.000	0.500
	B	40	0.088	0.192	0.030	0.026	0.149	0.000	0.500
	C	20	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Total	100	0.055	0.157	0.016	0.024	0.086	0.000	0.500
Sum Total	A	40	0.395	0.095	0.015	0.364	0.425	0.193	0.641
	B	40	0.279	0.087	0.014	0.251	0.306	0.146	0.507
	C	20	0.079	0.038	0.008	0.062	0.097	0.033	0.167
	Total	100	0.285	0.142	0.014	0.257	0.313	0.033	0.641

Note. Total I: written test Total II: oral interview Total III: sound recognition test

Overall Konglish use (Group A: 0.395, Group B: 0.279, Group C: 0.079) supports the hypothesis that L1 activation is present in the process of accessing English amongst these subjects. It is interesting to observe that L1 activation in accessing English did not completely disappear even in the case of the English-dominant bilinguals (Group C). Not only in the written and oral test, but also in the sound recognition task, L1 action was observed. Cases where the English sounds "O" and "E" were identified as "5" and

[4] The full scores for each test -Total I (39), Total II (12), and Total III (2)- were rendered into scores out of 100 for the sake of comparison across the different type of tests and then divided by the number of the subjects in the respective groups.

[5] The standard deviation indicates how widely spread the values in a data set are. For example, the smaller std is, the closer the data are to the mean, while the larger std is, the farther the data are from the mean.

[6] The standard error refers to the estimated standard deviation of the error in that method, which indicates the standard deviation of the difference between the estimated and the true values.

[7] Confidence intervals indicate the reliability of an estimate and are often stated at the 95% level in statistics.

"2" respectively were found in the sound recognition task. Given the fact that in Korean the word for the number 5 is pronounced as closed /o/ (not /ou/) and the word for the number 2 as a high front unrounded vowel /i/, with different phonetic features from English "O" and "E", L1 activation at a phonological level was also evident.

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations with respect to Syntactic, Semantic, Pragmatic, and Conceptual Categories

	Group	N	Mean	Std	Std error	95% Confidence interval		min	max
						lower limit	upper limit		
Syn	A	40	0.6275	0.1228	0.0194	0.5882	0.6668	0.2233	0.8333
	B	40	0.5186	0.1762	0.0279	0.4622	0.5749	0.1100	0.7500
	C	20	0.0597	0.1366	0.0305	0.0043	0.1236	0.0000	0.4433
	Total	100	0.4704	0.2583	0.0258	0.4191	0.5216	0.0000	0.8333
Sem	A	40	0.6820	0.1278	0.0202	0.6411	0.7229	0.4400	1.0000
	B	40	0.4936	0.1746	0.0276	0.4378	0.5495	0.1250	0.7750
	C	20	0.1940	0.1362	0.0305	0.1303	0.2577	0.0000	0.4800
	Total	100	0.5091	0.2329	0.0233	0.4628	0.5553	0.0000	1.0000
Prag	A	40	0.5292	0.2229	0.0352	0.4579	0.6005	0.1667	1.0000
	B	40	0.4125	0.2032	0.0321	0.3475	0.4775	0.0000	1.0000
	C	20	0.1250	0.1311	0.0293	0.0637	0.1863	0.0000	0.3333
	Total	100	0.4017	0.2474	0.0247	0.3526	0.4508	0.0000	1.0000
Con	A	40	0.3913	0.1839	0.0291	0.3324	0.4501	0.0000	0.7500
	B	40	0.3100	0.2039	0.0322	0.2448	0.3752	0.0000	0.7500
	C	20	0.2350	0.1886	0.0422	0.1468	0.3232	0.0000	0.6500
	Total	100	0.3275	0.2001	0.0200	0.2878	0.3672	0.0000	0.7500

Note. Syn: syntactic Knowledge, Sem: semantic knowledge, Prag: Pragmatic Knowledge, Con :conceptual representations

As shown in the Table 2, Konglish was most observed in the sections concerning semantic knowledge (see the category "Sem" in Table 2; mean 0.5091, SD. 0.2329). For the least proficient Group A, Korean-based data were most observed in the category of semantic knowledge (mean 0.6820, SD. 0.1278). The Korean-driven data of the most proficient Group C were most observed in the conceptual knowledge-related sections, as shown in the category of "Con" in Table 2 (mean 0.2350, SD. 0.1886). This suggests that the conceptual representations of the L1 are difficult to eliminate, even for proficient L2-dominant bilinguals.

TABLE 3

ANOVA Results Referring to Table 2

	Group	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Mean square	F	P value
Syn	between	4.454	2	2.227	100.338	.000
	within	2.153	97	.022		
	TOTAL	6.607	99			
Sem	between	3.191	2	1.596	71.037	.000
	within	2.179	97	.022		
	TOTAL	5.370	99			
Pra	between	2.186	2	1.093	27.358	.000
	within	3.875	97	.040		
	TOTAL	6.061	99			
Con	between	.346	2	.173	4.640	.012
	within	3.616	97	.037		
	TOTAL	3.962	99			
Total	between	1.327	2	.663	96.132	.000
	within	.669	97	.007		
	TOTAL	1.996	99			

Note. Between: between the group, Within: within the group

Table 3 shows that the amount of Konglish use varies among the groups in all the categories[8]. This suggests that there are significant relations between subjects' proficiency and the activation of L1-based syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and conceptual representations.

[8] Since the p-value of all categories is lower than the significance level (5% in this case), the differences among the groups can be interpreted as "statistically significant".

TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations Relative to Subjects' Background

Group		Exposure in L2 Country	Exposure in L1 Country	K Use (%)	Trans in Class	Trans in Self-study	Gram
A	Mean	.01	.03	83.82	.90	.80	.48
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std	.014	.16	18.22	.30	.41	.51
B	Mean	.05	.53	85.38	.87	.70	.55
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std	.070	.51	25.05	.34	.46	.50
C	Mean	.79	0	0	0	0	0
	N	20	0	0	0	0	0
	Std	.124	0	0	0	0	0

Note. Exposure in L2 Country: the length of the stay in English-speaking countries, Exposure in L1 Country: Exposure to English in non-instructional setting in Korea, K Use: L1 use in class, Trans in Class: translation based vocabulary test in class, Trans in Self-study: translation based vocabulary self-learning, Gram: Rule-based grammar learning.

This information on the subjects' learning history in Table 4 is to investigate how different kinds of L2 input the subjects had received and also how Korean had been involved in their English learning. The participants in Group C who are English-dominant bilinguals, received official schooling in English-speaking countries, while Group A and Group B who are Korean-dominant late bilinguals received official schooling through the medium of Korean language in Korea. Among the Korean-dominant late bilinguals in Group A and B, L2 exposure in L2 speaking countries and in Korea was found more in the more proficient Group B.

TABLE 5

Pearson's Correlation Coefficient with respect to Overall Konglish Use

		Exposure in L2 Countries	Exposure in L1 Country
Total Konglish Use	*r*	-.746**	-.300**
	P value	.000	.007
	N	100	80

Note. Planned comparisons: $^{**}p$, .01; $^{*}p$, .05.

As shown in Table 5, the (negative) correlation between Konglish use and exposure to English is statistically significant. The negative correlation between Total Konglish Use and exposure to English in English-speaking countries, r=-.746 was significant at the

1% level, which indicates that the more exposure to English in English speaking countries the subjects have, the less Korean-driven data they yield. The negative correlation between overall Konglish use and exposure to English outside of class in Korea, r=-.300 was significant at the 1% level, which shows that the subjects with more exposure to English in a non-instructional setting in Korea produced less Korean-driven data. The results indicate that Konglish use decreases as the exposure to English increases either in a country using the target language or in a non-instructional setting in Korea.

TABLE 6

Pearson's Correlation Coefficient with respect to Overall Konglish Use

		L1-promoting Learning Environment
Total Konglish Use	r	.644(**)
	P value	.000
	N	100

Note. Planned comparisons: **p , .01; *p , .05.

As shown in Table 6, a statistically significant correlation between overall Konglish use and a Korean-promoting learning environment was found. L1-promoting learning environments in Table 6 subsume use of Korean in class (marked as "K Use" in Table 4), translation-based vocabulary testing in class (marked as "Trans in Class" in Table 4), translation-based self-instructional vocabulary learning (marked as "Trans in Self-study" in Table 4), and rule-based grammar learning (marked as "Gram" in Table 4). The resulting positive correlation between total Konglish use and the Korean-promoting learning environment, r=.644, is statistically significant at the 1% level, which indicates that the more of a Korean-promoting learning environment the subjects were exposed to, the more Korean-driven Konglish data they produced.

V. DISCUSSION

1. Evidence of L1 Activation in L2

A type of data supporting L1 activation is the "blends" found in the oral interview. Nine cases were observed in the least proficient Group A (40 participants). Examples are *blind-meeting* ("blind date") and *soap-drama* ("soap opera"). These examples seem to derive from two English words being blended. It should be noted, however, that the Korean translation-equivalent of the English word *blind date* is 미팅 *miting*

("meeting"), which is commonly used by monolingual Koreans, and *soap opera* is 드라마 *dŭrama* ("drama") in Korean, which is also fully incorporated into the Korean lexicon. It is plausible to assume, therefore, that in each case a Korean element is blended with an L2 word. Similar examples can be found in other research such as *springling* blended from *spring* and *Frühling* (Green, 1986, p. 213) and *he cwame* (Du. *kwam* and Eng. *came*) (Poulisse & Bongaerts, 1994, p. 41). The above authors suggest that in such instances two lexical items reach the activation threshold simultaneously (Green, 1986, p. 214; Poulisse & Bongaerts, 1994, p. 42). In relation to the case of the blend, *blind-meeting*, observed in the interview, it can be speculated that the concept triggered the English entry, *blind*, but that the information stored in the entry did not contain the wherewithal for the retrieval of the second part of the target item, *date*. It may also be speculated that the target item *blind date* was present in their lexicon, but that the connection between *blind* and *date* was not strongly developed in their mental lexicon, possibly owing to insufficient practice. When the accessing of the target English item was delayed for these possible reasons, the Korean translation equivalent 미팅 *miting* ("meeting") also possibly reached the threshold. This may explain the fact that three participants in Group A self-corrected their unintended Konglish word *meeting* into the target item *blind date*. It may be worth taking into account that in the oral interview, where written forms of morphological information were absent, and accordingly the phonological overlap between the Konglish word and English might have been relied on more, the language cue might have been less efficacious in inhibiting the Korean competitor.

In the interview, when the participants referred to the # button ("pound/hash" key) on the telephone, the Konglish word was pronounced as either /ʃap/ or /ʃarp/, or self-corrected from /ʃap/ to /ʃarp/. /ʃap/is based on L1 phonological features and /ʃarp/ is phonologically modified in the direction of the L2 (American English that they had learned). This phonologically modified case is similar to the case "this special sort of rock, of, dress (pronounced with an English /r/ sound. Du. rok = skirt)" (Poulisse & Bongaerts, 1994, p. 52). It can be assumed in both cases that the L1 lemma was accidentally accessed and underwent L2 phonological conversion.

As for "noises" transferred from "highly automatized L1 elements" (Færch & Kasper, 1983, p. 220), Korean pause fillers, exclamations, and monologues were observed in the interview with the Korean learners of English. When the native English interviewer did not understand what the interviewees meant, some of the frustrated participants inserted these Korean elements. As noted in other studies (Costa & Santesteban, 2004; Poulisse & Bongaerts, 1994), incidences of such L1 lexical intrusions decreased in the more proficient subjects.

2. Variables Affecting L1 Activation in L2

1) Proficiency

The highest proportion of Konglish was observed in the data of the least proficient group in the study. The L1 activation in L2 was found to decrease as proficiency increased. In the cases where the lexical link between Korean items and English items seemed not to exist because the subjects had not yet learned the target English word, and thus the English lemma was empty, the only links available to them were the false connections between Konglish words in Korean lexical form and the Konglish words in English lexical form. As the Korean L2 learners become more proficient, the English lemma is equipped with English knowledge and thus the reliance on the link to Konglish decreases.

A considerable amount of Konglish, however, was also found in the English production of Group B, most of whom are pre- or in-service English teachers in Korea with relatively high proficiency (see the description of the subjects above). Moreover, a small but non-negligible amount of L1 activation was also observed in Group C, whose dominant language is English. This indicates that the activation from either language is hard to suppress completely.

2) The Quantity and Quality of Target Language Exposure

Although there have been suggestions that additional factors besides proficiency may affect the activation of the L1 in L2 production (e.g., Bialystok, 1983; Chen & Leung, 1989), not many researchers have included all factors in their studies. Not only the quantity, but also the quality of target language exposure needs to be involved in the discussion of the factors affecting the L1 activation in this regard.

Silverberg and Samuel (2004) suggest that late L2 learners encode the new L2 words into the L1 representation system and therefore have shared representations at the lexical level, but not at the semantic/conceptual level (pp. 391-392). In the present study, Group A and Group B (except one subject[9]) in which L1 activation was prevalent are late bilinguals, but Group C (except two subjects[10]) are early bilinguals. It is interesting to note that two subjects (hereafter P and L) in Group B yielded data similar to those of

[9] Most of the subjects started learning English from the age of 13, except for the subject L (age 3). The subject, however, is Korean dominant bilinguals.

[10] The two subjects started learning English from the age of 10. However they are English dominant bilinguals.

most subjects in Group C. The age of L2 onset for the two subjects was as follows: 10 for subject P, and 3 for subject L - much earlier in both cases than for the rest of the subjects in Group B.

Apart from the age factor which concerns merely the starting point of second language learning, it is essential to consider the findings from all angles to understand the whole. To start with the quantity of the target language exposure, the findings of the present study reveal a significant negative correlation coefficient between amount of Konglish used and length of stay in an English-speaking environment, r= -.746 ($p<.01$), which indicates that the longer the subjects stayed in English-speaking countries the less Konglish they produced. The amount of Konglish used by the subjects considerably decreased after a minimum of 90 months' stay in the L2-speaking country. This length of stay seems to have enabled the learners to receive sufficient input to circumvent L1 activation and successfully access the L2. The more English-rich input the learners received, the less assistance they appeared to need from their Korean lexicon. It is interesting to note that the length of residence in an English-speaking country of the two subjects in Group B who yielded data similar to those of the most proficient Group C was 102 months for subject L, and 80 months for subject P. This is highly divergent from the Group B mean, 13.76 months (SD 20.95).

Although the extent of Konglish use observed in the most proficient group seems trivial (Group C: 0.079) compared to other groups (Group A: 0.395, Group B: 0.279), activation of Korean was nevertheless evident. To explain Group C's case in terms of the quantity of exposure to English, it is necessary to compare their exposure to English with that of monolingual English speakers. Whereas the percentage of language exposure a monolingual has per day is 100% hypothetically, in the case of bilinguals the exposure to one or other language will be less than that of monolinguals. Given the mean of Group C's use of Korean in their daily lives in America was 27.35%, it can be taken that they were exposed to English only 72.65% of the time, which means a lower amount of English than in the case of English-speaking monolinguals, unless they interacted more linguistically across the board than the monolinguals. An interesting finding was that a subject Y in this group who started L2 acquisition at the age of 1 produced more Konglish than most of the subjects in Group C. It was found that the percentage of use of Korean in his life was significantly higher (85%) than the group mean (27.35%). Consequently, he would have had relatively less input from the interaction with native English speakers, and also comparatively fewer opportunities to access English than English-speaking monolinguals. Owing to this relatively limited English exposure, the access to the language would undoubtedly have been less efficient than monolingual access (see also Allen, Crago & Pesco, 2006; Bedore & Pena, 2008; De Houwer, 2007; Hulk & Cornips, 2006).

Consideration of the quality of exposure may also provide revealing sidelights on language access of the early bilinguals in Group C. Given that Korean immigrants in North America tend to be involved with the Korean-speaking community owing to the collectivist complexion of Korean society, it is therefore plausible to assume that the subjects' parents may not be fully proficient bilinguals and that they use Konglish in their English. Thus, if subjects had been exposed to English at home in interaction with their Korean parents, the quality of the English exposure would not have been the same as the nature of English exposure provided by English monolingual parents. It is likely that their parents' English containing Konglish influenced their own English. The findings of Paradis and Navarro (2003) may be relevant in this regard. In data from a Spanish-English bilingual child, they found a larger quantity of subjects and subject pronouns deployed in Spanish than in the case of a Spanish-speaking monolingual child (pp. 377-388). From the observation of her parents' speech data, they also found a higher proportion of overt subjects in her British mother's Spanish and a large quantity of pronoun subjects in her Cuban father's Spanish. They suggest the particular nature of the input from her parents' utterances as one of the reasons for what looked like cross-linguistic influence (*ibid.*).

English language exposure experienced in Korea is twofold: Korean-medium English education in formal schooling, and non-instructional settings in Korea. For the interesting cases of the subjects P and L in Group B who produced data closer to those of the most proficient Group C than Group B, in addition to their relatively greater exposure to English, the length of Korean-medium English education in formal schooling in Korea (before college) was much shorter than that experienced by the rest of the group B. The group mean in this case was 6 years (middle and high school), whereas subject P[11] had received 0 years of formal instruction, and subject L[12] 2.5 years in Korea.

For the exposure in non-instructional settings in Korea, Group A consisted of college students based in Korea and, except for one subject (out of 40), none of the subjects in the group had opportunities to be involved in interaction with native English speakers in Korea. Group B were current or potential English teachers, and 15 subjects (out of 40) responded that they had occasional interactions with other English teachers at work. Only 5 subjects in Group B said they had friends who were native English speakers. Considering the fact that occasional interaction with co-professionals at work may be qualitatively different from casual interaction with friends, exposure to English in non-

[11] Subject P moved to America after 2nd year of elementary school and came back to Korea for college education.

[12] Subject L moved to America and came back to Korea frequently. She received English education in Korea for 3semesters in middle school and last year of high school before college.

instructional settings must also be limited for them compared to Group C. The results of the present study suggest that the more English exposure the Korean L2 learners had in non-instructional settings in Korea, the less Konglish they produced. However, given that the way in which words are actually used in communication clearly impacts on the way in which their representations are organized (Votaw, 1992, p. 302), the quality of the exposure the subjects in Group B had does not seem comparable to that of the exposure the subjects in Group C.

3) Learning Process

Formal instructional settings in Korea may also affect the learning process and further the language access. The subjects responded that Korean was used as the medium of instruction in their English classes (reported by 83.82 % of Group A and 85.38 % of Group B). Korean translation-based vocabulary tests were taken (reported by 90% of Group A and 87% of Group B – an extremely high percentage). According to a wide consensus, a bilingual's intention is encoded in "the earliest perceptually driven processes" through the different tasks, such as retrieving abstract concepts and translating a word, which accordingly determine language selective processing (Kroll, Bobb & Wodniecka, 2006, p. 129). It can be plausibly posited that since these Korean learners have learned the L2 via its translation-equivalents in their English classes, their intentions have been encoded in a process whereby the L1 translation-equivalents initiate their intentions rather than the concepts themselves. This L2 learning process might have induced the activation of their L1 in the form of Konglish in L2 access.

Among the subjects in Group A and Group B who both had formal instruction in Korea, L1 access in the form of Konglish was observed less than Group A, yet was still significant in this group (Group B). It can be said that the L1-rich learning environment in Korea played a role in Korean L2 learners' reliance on Konglish use. Given that the L2 acquisition based on L1 causes learners to ignore the possibility that the L2 may have different semantic boundaries and a different conceptual classification (Ijaz, 1986, p. 443), the involvement of L1 representations in the process of L2 learning may be too intensive to allow for resistance to L1 influence. The case of the subject L in Group B implies the importance of learning context. Although she started learning English at the age of 3 and had 102 months of exposure in an English speaking county, she reported that her learning goal was set for school tests and college entrance exam in Korea. It may accordingly be seemingly impossible for the proficient subject to be free from significant L1 influence and to become an English dominant bilingual.

The structure of Korean learners' mental lexicon seems to be significantly influenced by their learning experience and target language exposure. If we accept that the strength

of the connection between a word node and its language node is formed by "Hebbian learning" (Thomas, 2002, p. 217), it follows that the frequency of accessing a target L2 word determines the quality and the quantity of activation. The more the L2 learner accesses target L2 words through L1 semantic representations, the higher the probability of activation of Konglish words. If the L2 learner successfully maps L2 items directly to relevant conceptual features, the target L2 word will receive more activation than the Konglish word, and thus it will be selected for the actual use in L2. As the Korean learner receives more and better exposure to the target language, activation may be directed more to the English, and accessibility to English may improve. In such a case, even if the target L2 word is absent from the learner's lexicon, other L2 candidates activated in the same semantic network may be able to be employed to meet the learner's linguistic needs via paraphrase or circumlocution.

VI. CONCLUSION

The activation of non-target language (L1) as a form of Konglish in L2 (English) was evident in Korean-English bilinguals in the present study. The factors affecting L1 activation in L2 were proficiency, the quantity and quality of English exposure, Korean-medium learning context.

If Korean learners of English are exposed to the L1-inducing learning environment in Korea, they may not be able to develop an adequate lexical network in respect of English. In addition, if their exposure to English is sparse in quantity and of poor quality, thus not providing a very promising basis for the restructuring of their explicit knowledge of English learned through Korean, the activation of non-target language (L1) may be inevitable. Therefore the development of L2 knowledge in the learner's mental lexicon, through the quantity and quality of target language exposure and L2-promoting learning process, in particular, should be carefully considered in English teaching in Korea.

The phenomenon of Konglish in L2 may be a natural process of language learning and also be understood in the realm of "Lingua franca". What the present study suggests is, however, how this phenomenon mirrors the organization of the lexicon of Korean learners of English, and how the learning methods affect the process of the formation of such learners' lexicon. In this regard, the results of Korean L2 learners' Konglish production in L2 will give English educators in Korea time to reflect on what they do in their classrooms. What the results of the present study suggest is that L2 lexical knowledge learned via the activation of L1 lemmas, and grammar learning conducted by means of explicit L1 explanations in a decontextualized way are not helpful for the

Korean L2 learners. The Konglish use in L2 may be a good indication showing that the learner is suffering from restructuring the explicit knowledge the learners have learnt in an L1-mediated manner, and requires sufficient L2 knowledge so that he/she is not stuck at the L1 mediation stage.

The current study has some limitations. In order to render possible the recruitment of sufficient numbers of subjects in the present investigation, the study was conducted in Korea. Although the language mode in the present experiments was controlled so that no Korean was used during the tests, it should be borne in mind that Korean was the language of participants' everyday lives and thus no doubt retained a high level of activation from daily interactions with Korean monolinguals. Accordingly it may be possible that their language mode may have resulted in more activation of Korean than would have obtained in the case of ESL learners in an English-speaking environment.

REFERENCES

Allen, S., Crago, M., & Pesco, D. (2006). The effect of majority language exposure on minority language skills: The case of Inuktitut. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *9*(5), 578-596.

Bedore, L. M., & Pena, E. D. (2008). Assessment of bilingual children for identification of language impairment: Current findings and implications for practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*(1), 1-29.

Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 100-118). New York: Longman.

Chen, H-C., & Leung, Y-S. (1989). Patterns of lexical processing in a nonnative language. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning and Memory and Cognition*, *15*(2), 316-325.

Costa, A., & Santesteban, M. (2004). Lexical access in bilingual speech production: Evidence from language switching in highly proficient bilinguals and L2 learners. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *50* (4), 491-511.

De Groot, A. M. B., & Nas, G. (1991). Lexical representation of cognates and noncognates in compound Bilinguals. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *30*, 90-123.

De Groot, A. M. B. (1995). Determinants of bilingual lexicosemantic organization. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *8*, 151-180.

De Houwer, A. (2007). Parental language input patterns and children's bilingual use. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *28*, 411-424.

Durgunoğlu, A., & Roediger, H. (1987). Test differences in accessing bilingual memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *26*, 377-391.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 210-238). New York: Longman.

Green, D. W. (1986). Control, activation, and resource: A framework and a model for the control of speech in bilinguals. *Brain and Language*, *27*, 210-223.

Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *1*, 131-149.

Hulk, A., & Cornips, L. (2006). The acquisition of definite determiners in child L2 Dutch: Problems with neuter gender nouns. In S. Unsworth, T. Parodi, A. Sorace, & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *Paths of development in L1 and L2 acquisition* (pp. 107-134). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ijaz, H. (1986). Linguistic and cognitive determinants of lexical acquisition in a second language. *Language Learning*, *36*, 401-451.

Jiang, N. (2000). Lexical representation and development in a second language. *Applied linguistics*, *21*(1), 47-77.

Kim J-S., & Davis, C. (2003). Korean cognate phonological activation task effects in masked cross-script translation and phonological priming. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *49*, 484-499.

Kolers, P., & Gonzalez, E. (1980). Memory for words, synonyms and translations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, *6*(1), 53-65.

Kroll, J. F., & de Groot, A. M. B. (1997). Lexical and conceptual memory in the bilingual: Mapping from to meaning in two languages. In A. M. B. de Groot & J. F. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism* (pp. 169-199). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Kroll, J. F., & Tokowicz, N. (2001). The development of conceptual representations for words in a second language. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages* (pp. 49-71). Oxford: Blackwell.

Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S., & Wodniecka, Z. (2006). Language selectivity is the exception, not the rule: Arguments against a fixed locus of language selection in bilingual speech. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *9*(2), 119-135.

MATE (2010). *Multimedia assisted test of English*. Retrieved December 31, 2010, from the World Wide Web: http://www.mate.or.kr/user/about/capabilityS.do.

Nam, H. J. (2010). Konglish, Korean L2 learners' unique interlanguage: Its definition, categories and lexical entries. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *26*(4), 275-308.

Paradis, J., & Navarro, S. (2003). Subject realization and crosslinguistic interference in

the bilingual acquisition of Spanish and English: What is the role of the input?. *Journal of Child Language*, *30*, 371-393.

Poulisse, N., & Bongaerts, T. (1994). First language use in second language production. *Applied Linguistics*, *15*, 36-57.

Sánchez-Casas, R., Davis, C., & García-Albea, J. (1992). Bilingual lexical processing: Exploring the cognate/non-cognate distinction. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *4*(4), 293-310.

Schreuder, R., & Hermans, D. (1998). Mental control and language selection. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *1*, 96-97.

Silverberg, S., & Samuel, A. G. (2004). The effect of age of second language acquisition on the representation and processing of second language words. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *51*, 381-398.

Thomas, M. (2002). Theories that develop, *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *5* (3), 216-217.

Van Hell, J. G., & de Groot, A. M. B. (1998). Conceptual representation in bilingual memory: Effects of concreteness and cognate status in word association. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *1*(3), 193-211.

Votaw, M. C. (1992). A functional view of bilingual lexicosemantic organization. In R. J. Harris (Ed.), *Cognitive processing in bilinguals* (pp. 299-321). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Applicable levels: secondary, tertiary, adult
Key words: Konglish, L1 activation, English education, Language exposure

Hyunjeong Nam
Department of English & TESOL, Daegu Haany University, Korea
Yugok-dong, Hanny daero 1, GyeongSan-Si, Gyeongsangbuk-Do, South Korea, (712-715)
Phone: 053-819-1365 (office),
E-mail: namh@tcd.ie, namh@dhu.ac.kr

Received in September, 2011
Reviewed in October, 2011
Revised version received in November, 2011