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1. Outline of the study

In this paper, the authors examine the language perceptions of South Koreans, analyzing the differences among speakers from different regions. We focus on the perceptions of the pleasantness of speech, and draw some comparisons with the results of similar surveys conducted on Japanese and other languages.

The design of the questionnaire, the conducting of the surveys, and the data encoding were performed by Yim. The data input and calculations were performed by Long using custom-designed software. The analysis and interpretation of the results were performed by Long and Yim.

The methodology of the survey was based on that used in previous studies in Japan. 471 Korean university students were given a blank map of the Korean peninsula (including areas in both the southern

1) This research was supported by a Chung-Ang University Special Research Grant for 1997. We also wish to thank the two anonymous readers for their suggestions which helped to improve this paper.
Republic of Korea and in the northern Democratic People's Republic of Korea) with the do (province) boundaries shown. Informants were instructed to (1) draw lines to designate areas where speech differs, (2) write the names of those speech areas, (3) give characteristics of those speech areas, and (4) rank those speech areas in order of pleasantness. 372 of the informants completed the pleasantness task and it is these informants whom we shall focus on throughout most of this paper.

Let us now examine the results. We see in Table 1 that the overwhelming majority of the names given to the perceptual speech varieties correspond to political units, and also that there is very little variation in the number of informants who drew the various speech regions (286 for Kangwŏn, Ch'ungch'ŏng 287, Chŏlla 297, Kyŏngsang 297).

Furthermore, the informant whose map is shown in Figure 1 has generally (but, importantly, not always) followed provincial boundaries in drawing his or her speech regions. This tendency was typical of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Region drawn</th>
<th>Numbers of drawers</th>
<th>Percentage of all infs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangwŏn</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ungch'ŏng</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ch'ungch'ŏng</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ch'ungch'ŏng</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chŏlla</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Chŏlla</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Chŏlla</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyongsang</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kyŏngsang</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kyŏngsang</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheju</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Informants</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vast majority of our informants, and it may be due to our including province boundaries on the blank maps which we provided to informants.

It should be noted, however, that similarly constructed questionnaire maps used in Japan and the U.S. yielded quite different results. In studies performed in five different regions in the U.S., Preston (1989: 117) found the most commonly drawn speech regions to be “South” (94%), “Midwest” (55%), “New England / Northeast” (49%) “New York City” (44%) and “Texas” (43%). In a study of Japanese informants from eight regions, Long (1999b) found the most commonly indicated speech regions were “Tōhoku” (82%) and “Kansai” (77%), “Kyūshū” (49%), “Nagoya” (46%) and “Standard” (35%). While
informants' perceptions in these studies do seem to have been influenced by political boundaries to some extent, we see a variety in the dimensions of their perceived speech regions. The U.S. speech variety labels include one city, one state and three regions larger than states. The Japanese labels include one city, the standard variety and three regions larger than prefectures. Thus informants in both of these countries tended to draw dialect regions across state (prefectural) boundaries, unlike our Korean informants whose speech regions overwhelmingly corresponded to provinces. Another factor which has possibly contributed to these differences is the number of political entities in these countries; 50 U.S. states and 47 Japanese prefectures compared to 10 Korean provinces.

Amid this uniformity, one area in which we did find variation was in the perceptions of the six “North” and “South” provinces (North and South Ch’ungch’ŏng, Chŏlla and Kyŏngsang). Most informants combined these into one speech region; some informants, however, drew them separately.

Because informants’ perceived speech regions tended to follow provincial boundaries in this way, this paper will concentrate on other aspects of the data, namely the areas indicated as the “most pleasant” speech region, and on the areas designated as being “standard”. We will also examine the treatment of the speech varieties of North Korea.

Although provinces were often indicated by the informants, cities were ignored, with one important exception. Seoul dialect (or Seoul speech) was indicated by 254 informants. There were only 16 answers for “Pusan speech”, and none for any other major cities. These results are particularly surprising considering the “metropolitan area” status accorded to 5 cities (Pusan, Taegu, Inch’ŏn, Kwangju, Taejŏn), which places them (along with the “special city” of Seoul) on equal footing with the provinces under the central government. It may be that informants would have provided more information about cities if they had been indicated on the map. The fact remains, however, that Seoul was
referred to by numerous informants in our survey in spite of the fact that it had not been indicated on the survey map. This makes the references to Seoul even more noteworthy.

Some terms for language varieties (variety descriptors) tended to be used in combination with some place names (locative descriptors) more than others. These combinations are seen in Table 2. (Numbers emphasized in the text are shown in bold.) The variety descriptors -mal, -bang’ön, and -sat’uri all appear on informants’ maps several hundred times, but there seems to be a difference in the kinds of linguistic varieties they are used to describe. Mal (translated here as “speech”) is used most commonly for Seoul (79.9) and North Korea (75.5), suggesting perhaps that -mal is used for language varieties associated with

Table 2. Combinations of locative descriptors and variety descriptors in speech variety labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locative descriptor</th>
<th>Variety descriptor</th>
<th>--mal (speech, words)</th>
<th>--sat’uri (accent)</th>
<th>--bang’ön (dialect)</th>
<th>Place name only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangwŏn</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ungch’ŏng</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chŏlla</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏngsang</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheju</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>616</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a greater sense of legitimacy\textsuperscript{2}). The descriptor -\textit{sat'uri} ("accent") is almost never used to describe these varieties (Seoul 0\%, North Korea 6.8\%), but is commonly applied to Kangwŏn (34.8), Ch'ungch'ŏng (33.9), Ch'ŏlla (32.2) and Kyŏngsang (38.0). Finally, the descriptor \textit{bang'on} ("-dialect") is used much more (57.9) in referring to Cheju than to the other dialects\textsuperscript{3}).

To the 2027 responses in Table 2 are added 70 answers for "Standard" (\textit{p'yojun-o}), 16 for "Pusan speech" and 11 miscellaneous variety labels with North Korean place names ("P'yŏngyang", etc.), or generic regional terms ("central dialect"), for a total of 2124 speech variety regions drawn.

2. Dialect divisions of Korea

Before we examine the actual geographical aspects of informants' language variety perceptions, let us get an overview of the dialect divisions of Korean. Figure 2 shows the dialect divisions proposed by Shimpei Ogura in 1940, based on his surveys of phonological, lexical and grammatical variants. Although other dialect divisions have been proposed since, this schema is still in common use (see Umeda 1989).

\textsuperscript{2}) Preston (1996) has suggested that (unlike the way in which linguists view language) everyday people see dialects as sub-varieties of some super variety. Perhaps the young informants have come to see North Korean speech as not a sub-variety of their language, but as a parallel variety, different but equal. Here again, the social (political, educational, orthographic) situation may have played a large role in forming this impression in their minds.

\textsuperscript{3}) Anonymous Reader E pointed out that most Koreans are exposed to the Kyŏngsang and Ch'ŏlla dialects on an everyday basis; they hear them on television or through personal contact. With the Cheju dialect, however, the Reader points out that it is quite possible for even a Korean with a fair amount of contact with people outside his region to go through life with virtually no exposure to the Cheju dialect. Furthermore, because of the great differences between this island dialect and those on the mainland, most Koreans would be unable to understand the Cheju variety anyway, precluding its use for comedic/dramatic effect. It is likely then this difference between comprehensible but odd-sounding -\textit{sat'uri}, and incomprehensible and foreign-sounding -\textit{bang'on} which we find revealed in Table 2.
There are six dialect divisions of Korean: **Northwest** (North and South P’yo’ng’an, P’yo’ngyang, most of Chagang), **Northeast** (North and most of South Hamgyŏng, Ryanggang, small part of Chagang), **Central** (North and South Hwanghae, Kyŏnggi, Seoul, Kangwŏn, North and South Ch’ungch’ŏng, and small areas of North Chŏlla and S. Hamgyŏng), **Southwest** (North and South Chŏlla), **Southeast** (North and South Kyŏngsang) and **Cheju** (Cheju Island).

A detailed discussion of the linguistic differences among Korean dialects is beyond the scope of this paper, but we can note the following characteristics. Geographical variation in consonants is rather limited and tends to be phonetic rather than phonemic. In Northwest dialects
and the Korean spoken in the Yanbian region of the People's Republic of China (Jilin Province), for example, the /tf/ /ʔtf/ /tfʰ/ consonants are pronounced [ts], [ʔts] and [tʃh] respectively.

Variation in vowels is more complex, with the number of contrasting vowel phonemes differing from one variety to the next. Standard Korean and more conservative central dialects have nine vowels (Umeda 1957), Seoul speakers middle-aged and younger tend to have eight or even seven, and some southern dialects (e.g. Kyŏngsang) have only six. This also affects the number of contrasting compound vowels. A phonemic contrast between long and short vowels exists in the standard(s), but is being lost in younger Seoul speakers (Nakamura et. al 1991), and has already disappeared in some dialects such as Hamgyŏng and North Chŏlla. There is regional variation in the phonemic significance of contrastive pitch between syllables, with pitch accent seen in the North and South Kyŏngsang and Hamgyŏng, and in a sense South Chŏlla, and some areas of Kangwŏn, but not in the Seoul dialect or in the spoken standards of North or South Korea (Hayata 1976; also W. -J. Kim 1983, S. -O. Yi 1983).

Some morphophonemic sound changes vary between the standards of South and North Korea. A good degree of lexical and grammatical variation has been documented as well, especially for the Kyŏngsang and Cheju dialects.

3. Perceptions of North Korean speech

Phonologically, the standard languages of North and South Korea are very similar. According to generally accepted dialect divisions (Umeda 1989), the Seoul dialect belongs to the Central dialect region, while that of P'yŏngyang belongs to the Northwest dialect region. While the spoken standard of the south is based on the speech of Seoul, the northern standard functions as a super-regional variety there because it is based neither on the dialect of P'yŏngyang nor any other regional dialect of the north. There are pronunciation differences be-
tween the two standards which are linked to slight orthographic dis-
parities between the two standards.

The South Korean standard is referred to as *p’yojun-ŏ*, lit. ‘standard
language’. In order to distance themselves from the spoken standard of
the south, the North Koreans began referring to their spoken standard

As we saw in Figure 2, the central part of the Korean peninsula
comprises a single, dominant dialect region that straddles the current
North-South national border. In fact, the border cuts through the
middle of two Korean provinces (Kyŏnggi and Kangwŏn) as well. The
overwhelming majority of informants’ responses indicated, however,
that they did not perceive this central dialect region as a single speech
variety.

65% of the total of 471 informants who participated in the survey
completely ignored the northern part of the peninsula. The remaining
35% (166 people) includes those who provided any information what-
soever regarding North Korea. This includes those 44 informants who
used speech variety labels such as “North Korean speech”, those who
listed some sort of traits for the north, and those who included the north
in their ranks of “pleasantness”.

Informants’ comments did not necessarily reveal their knowledge of
North Korean speech; some indicated their ignorance with comments
such as “I don’t know”. Of those who did offer information, the com-
ments were often less than positive. These included “funny” or “stilt-
ed”, as well as a very common comment which seems to indicate the
speakers themselves rather than the speech varieties, “pitiful”.

However, simply because most informants did not supply specific
information about North Korea speech varieties, this does not mean that
they ignored the border. On the contrary, most informants provided
detailed information about the South, but abruptly ceased their
descriptions at the demarcation line, ample evidence of the role that the
border plays in their perceptions of language variety.
Why do our informants perceive this dialectal boundary between the north and the south, one which was not said to exist in dialect maps half a century ago? There are three possible explanations.

The first is that informants were simply ignorant of anything about the language north of the border; they did not know whether it was similar to their own or not. This ignorance could result simply from the geographical distance between many regions of the north and many regions in the south. It is only logical (all other factors being equal) that people are more familiar with regions close to their own that with those further away. This relationship between distance and knowledge (or information) is shown in Gould and White (1986). Thus it could be that most people (and not just the younger people who were raised after the political division) in the southern regions have little knowledge of the dialects in the northern areas far from themselves. The ignorance could also be the result of the information blackout between the two countries.

A second possibility is that, in the half century since the political division took place, the speech on either side of the borderline has indeed split up into two different “political dialects” (as C.-W. Kim 1978 suggested two decades ago they might), and that our informants were aware of this divergence, even though few provided specific details of it.

A third possibility is that South Koreans perceive the speech of the north to be more different from their own than it actually is, because of their strong perceptions of political and social differences with the north. This is what Dailey-O’Cain (1999), in reference to the reunified East and West Germany, has termed the “wall in the mind”4). King has written of this perceived difference in the north and south language

4) Anonymous Reader J has pointed out that the names that South Koreans use to refer to the northern and southern states are slowly changing. South Korea has traditionally referred to itself as Nam Han (South Han), in contrast to Puk Han (North Han), but the former term is increasingly being replace by Hanguk (Han Nation), perhaps revealing an underlying perceptual divergence.
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varieties, stating, "There is growing concern in both North and South Korea about 'linguistic divergence' between the official languages of the North and South, but the differences are linguistically insignificant and will be easily overcome with unification" (King 1994: 1869). This would seem to negate our second possibility.

Finally, on a related topic, we find that not one of our 471 informants made any mention of the speakers of Korean across the North Korean border in the People's Republic of China. This is in spite of the fact that the North Korea-PRC border was shown on the informant questionnaire, with sufficient space for comments. The presence of speakers of Korean in the PRC is far from an obscure bit of trivia; Rim (1988) estimates their numbers at 1.7 million, and maps of Korean-speaking regions in Korean-Japanese dictionaries include an inset just to highlight the Korean areas of China. Whether this indicates that the informants were unaware of the speakers of Korean in the PRC, or simply that their perceptions of language regions are dominated by political boundaries is unclear. However, the latter explanation is feasible when we recall that provincial boundaries within South Korea as well as the border with North Korea dominated informants' perceptions of speech divisions.

4. Perceptions of the Area of "Standard"

The spoken standard language of South Korea has been characterized as not clearly delineated. C.-W. Kim says, "At present, the standard language is vaguely defined as that of educated speakers in Seoul. This is a definition of principle, not of practice. With the social upheaval that the Korean War and mass mobility have brought, genuine Seoul dialect speakers, if they still exist at all, are a minority" (C.-W. Kim 1978: 256)

Previous studies of the perceptions of other languages have concentrated on the geographical location of speech varieties identified as "standard" or "correct". This topic proved to be far less interesting in the case of Korea, however, as almost all those who indicated a standard
region located it in the province of Kyŏnggi, the area surrounding Seoul (Figure 3). The more the interesting topic was whether informants of a certain region had labeled a region as standard or not.

Data in Table 3 from the current survey shows the number of people, according to informant region, who drew a region that they labeled “Standard”. Overall, we see that “Standard” was drawn by 17.9% of the informants. We find that informants drew over three times as many “Seoul” speech variety maps (either “Seoul speech” or “Seoul dialect”), with these maps accounting for 64.8% of the total.

The total number of “Standard” drawers was only 70, so the small differences in the percentages among the informant groups should not be overemphasized. Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning that Kyŏnggsang informants are among the least likely to label a speech region

![Figure 3. “Standard ( userEmail-eyu)” region](image-url)

All informants, n=70
Table 3. Frequency of "Standard" and "Seoul" maps by informant region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants' home region</th>
<th>Percentage who drew &quot;Standard&quot; maps</th>
<th>Percentage who drew &quot;Seoul&quot; maps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangwŏn</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Ch'ungch'ŏng</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Chŏlla</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Kyŏngsang</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheju</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"standard" and the most likely to label one "Seoul". It would seem that Kyŏngsang informants are more reluctant than their counterparts to bestow the honor of "standard" on a specific region, preferring instead to think of a Seoul dialect. Although the differences among informant groups here are small and the results thus inconclusive, we should keep them in mind, because we will see other unique tendencies among Kyŏngsang informants below in our data for "most pleasant" speech region, as well in data presented below from previous studies by Yim.

5. Korean Dialect Attitudes

Before we examine the results from the current study for "most pleasant" speech regions, let us examine some data on dialect attitudes obtained from a previous large-scale study conducted on Korean speakers from various regions. These data provide us with an insight into the dialect consciousness situation in Korea.

In a large-scale survey by Yim (1993; Sanada and Yim 1993), 11.4% (155 respondents of the total 1365 informants in this survey) responded that there were places in Korea where their dialects would not be understood. The percentages varied from one informant region to another, however (Table 4, second column). With the Cheju informants, over a third replied in this way. The percentage of Cheju
speakers who said their dialects would not be understood if they went to other regions was double or triple that of informants from other regions.

We find this perception of mutual intelligibility with Cheju when we examine the data from the opposite perspective as well. When these 155 informants were asked to specify the regions in which their dialects would not be understood, about half of the informants named Cheju. The percentages of the responses to this sub-question were as follows: Cheju (49.4), Cholla (19.5), Kyongsang (16.2), Seoul (2.6), Ch'ungch'ong (2.6), North Korea (2.6), Kyonggi (1.3), Kangwön (0.7).

We see from these results that Cheju occupies a unique position in Korea in that it is widely regarded as lacking mutual intelligibility with other dialects. We shall see later in this paper some data for "most pleasant" in which Cheju informants themselves displayed unique tendencies in their perceptions of their own dialects.

Other survey results prove enlightening as well. In response to a question about pride in their native dialects, about twice as many Kyongsang informants gave negative answers as did informants from other regions (Table 4, third column). As is typical in dialect attitude questions, not all responses were affirmative or negative; some informants responded neutrally. For this reason, we have given the per-
percentages for the affirmative answers in the “Proud of my dialect” column in the table. Here again Kyŏngsang informants are the most negative about their dialect.

With the question of attachment towards informants home dialects, we find the same tendency appears for Kyŏngsang informants to respond negatively towards their own dialect (columns five and six). On the other hand, Kyŏngsang informants’ results for a question regarding their desire to speak the standard variety showed a tendency very similar to that of informants from other regions (columns seven and eight).

Yim (1993: 119-120) interprets these unexpected results as evidence of a “dialect (inferiority) complex” on the part of the Kyŏngsang informants. This “dialect complex” is difficult to explain in light of all the successful people that this area has produced. What is more, North and South Kyŏngsang, are the locations of Taegu and Pusan, respectively, among the largest urban centers in the country.

In spite of the fact that these data are from various age groups (unlike the present study which focuses on college students) there are nonetheless some striking similarities in the results of the two studies. We shall see below, in the “most pleasant” speech region responses from the present survey, data which further illustrates this dialect complex.

6. The “Most Pleasant” speech region

Let us now look at the areas indicated by informants as having the “most pleasant” speech. Of the 471 informants, 371 completed the “most pleasant” task on the survey. In Table 5, we see that Seoul informants tended to choose their home dialect or the standard (but not a region called “Seoul dialect”) as the most pleasant speech region. 65.7% of the Kyŏnggi informants who completed this task indicated the region they had labeled “Seoul” as the most pleasant speech region. The percentage of Kyŏnggi and Kangwŏn informants who picked their
home dialects as most pleasant was comparatively low. With informants from Ch'ungch'ŏng, Chŏlla and Cheju, however, we see a very large portion choosing the home dialect. A notable exception to this tendency is Kyŏngsang, where less than 14% of the informants chose their home dialect as most pleasant.

As seen in Table 5, some informants labeled their "most pleasant" region as "standard" while others labeled it as "Seoul", but when looking at the hand-drawn maps, we see that, in many cases, these referred to the same geographical areas. Thus, it is necessary to examine the actual areas designated as "most pleasant".

Figure 4 differs from the map of all 70 informants' perception of the area of "standard Korean" which was seen in Figure 3. It is created from the mean figures of the seven informant groups. We chose this method of representation to compensate for the fact that our 7 informant groups had differing numbers. We will refer to these values as the "national average". (The small number of informants [70] who had drawn "standard" made this technique impractical for that map.) Overall we see that the Kyŏnggi region was chosen most often (at the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant Region</th>
<th>Seoul as &quot;most pleasant&quot;</th>
<th>Standard as &quot;most pleasant&quot;</th>
<th>Home Dialect as &quot;most pleasant&quot;</th>
<th>Other as &quot;most pleasant&quot;</th>
<th>Total no. of Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangwŏn</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Ch'ungch'ŏng</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Chŏlla</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. and S. Cheju</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure 5 we see that the Seoul informants overwhelmingly agreed that their own region (Kyōnggi-do) had the most pleasant speech. This level of agreement (over 80%) is not seen in the “most pleasant” maps for any of the other regions. It is a bit intriguing to see the Seoul metropolitan area (which lies more or less in the center of Kyōnggi) excluded from the highest level here. This may just be a fluke of the composite map-drawing technique (i.e., 79% and 80% would be shaded differently on this map). On the other hand, this may represent a preference on the part of urban Seoul informants for the speech of the surrounding hinterlands.
Figure 6 shows that this high opinion of the home region was shared somewhat by informants from Kyŏnggi, the region surrounding Seoul. There is a striking drop from the 80–100% level of agreement seen in the Seoul informants’ map to the 40–60% level. This of course results from a greater disparity in the regions that each individual informant from this region chose as most pleasant.

In Figure 7, the greatest number of informants from Kangwŏn chose the Kyŏnggi region as most pleasant. Interestingly, the preference for Kyŏnggi speech is even more pronounced here among Kangwŏn informants than it was among the Kyŏnggi informants themselves. The faint, but obvious, shading of their own province indicates that their own region’s speech occupies a respectable second place on

Figure 6. “Most Pleasant” region of Kyŏnggi informants, Figure 7. “Most Pleasant” region of Kangwŏn informants, n=22
the pleasantness scale.

In Figures 8 and 9, informants from Ch’ungch’ŏng and Chŏlla show results very similar to each other (and to the Kangwŏn informants). The majority of informants in these regions indicated that the speech of the area around Seoul is the most pleasant, with their own respective regions showing a close second.

Figure 10 represents a dramatic departure from the results we have seen for Kangwŏn, Ch’ungch’ŏng and Chŏlla, in that the speech of the Kyŏngsang informants’ own region has an extremely poor showing. At the same time, there is a higher level of agreement on the supremacy of Seoul speech than was seen among either the Ch’ungch’ŏng or the Chŏlla region informants. In fact, the percentage of Kyŏngsang infor-
mants who rate Kyŏnggi-do as most pleasant (60–80%) exceeds the level (40–60%) observed even among Kyŏnggi informants themselves. Moreover, although the levels for the Chŏlla region intensify to the 20–40% level only in the map by Chŏlla informants themselves (an easily explainable result), at least some informants in the other informant groups have chosen the Chŏlla dialect as “most pleasant” (as evidenced by the 1–20% levels in Figures 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11). The sole exception is Kyŏngsang, where not a single one of the 51 informants indicated a preference for the speech of Chŏlla

5) Anonymous Reader E has suggested that this may be symptomatic of the fierce rivalry often cited between the two regions.
Results of the informants from the island of Cheju (Figure 11) are also strikingly different from those seen thus far. Although both the Kyŏnggi and home regions are positively rated, the order is the opposite of that seen in the Kangwŏn, Ch'ungch'ŏng or Chŏlla informants, with the home region being the most commonly chosen (40-60%), and the Kyŏnggi area coming in second (20-40%). As we see in Table 6, Cheju stands out as being the only region in which more people choose the home region’s speech as most pleasant than choose the Kyŏnggi area.

7. Standardized score maps of "pleasantness"

We have shown thus far that the informants of many regions perceived Seoul speech as the most pleasant, but what does this tell us about the peculiarities of each informant region? The majority of informants from Chŏlla, for example, chose Seoul, but so did the informants of other regions as well. Our next task is to discover what is unique about the answers of the Chŏlla informants. Tabulating standardized scores for all the points on the map allows us to find this. In essence, these scores allow us to compare the Chŏlla informants’ answers to the “national average” (Figure 7), and discover what is unique about the Chŏlla informants’ perceptions. Long 1997 (following Gould and White 1986) refers to the area of the national averages (i.e. those traits common to the maps of all regions) as the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home region of Informants</th>
<th>Top choice for “most pleasant”</th>
<th>Second most common choice for “most pleasant”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏnggi</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangwŏn</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td>home region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch’ungch’ŏng</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td>home region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chŏlla</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td>home region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyŏngsang</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheju</td>
<td>Home region</td>
<td>Kyŏnggi (Seoul)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"national surface". Another way to look at standardizing the values is that we are scraping away the "national surface" to reveal the "true surface" of each individual informant group. Next, we will analyze the standardized score maps for each informant region.

Because Seoul was chosen by informants from all over the country as most pleasant, it does not make a particularly strong showing on the standardized score maps for informants from Seoul and Kyŏnggi (Figures 12 and 13). The Kyŏnggi region appears slightly above average (55-69.6) in Figure 12 and slightly below average (30.4-45) in Figure 13, but in neither case are these statistically significant values. The results for the other five informant regions are strikingly different.

Figure 12. Standardized Scores for "Most Pleasant" region of Seoul inf. Figure 13. Standardized Scores for "Most Pleasant" region of Kyŏnggi inf.
With the national surface scraped away, we see that informants of Kangwŏn, Ch'ungch'ŏng, Chŏlla and Cheju have a quite favorable impression of their home dialects. In Figures 14, 15, 16 and 18, areas in the home region appear in the darkest shade, indicating scores higher

6) On the Ch'ungch'ŏng informants' map, the Hamgyŏng region in North Korea is shown as having been chosen more often by these informants to a statistically significant degree (under 69.6). In reality, only two informants from this region chose the area as most pleasant, but since the number of informants from other regions who chose Hamgyŏng was zero, the area where these two informants overlapped shows up as significantly high. Incidentally, one of these informants commented that Hamgyong speech was "strong, masculine". The other (who indicated all of North Korea as most pleasant) commented that the North was "country (bumpkin)" and "comical".
than 69.6. These levels are sufficiently greater than the national mean to statistically significant degree (p > .05).

Kyŏngsang, in Figure 17, is the sole exception to this general trend. Most informants from this region have not rated their home dialect highly. This trend reinforces the evidence of a “dialect inferiority complex” among Kyŏngsang speakers cited in Yim (1993). One young male informant from the South Kyŏngsang city of Pusan explains, “The accent of the region is strong and speakers attract attention when they converse in public. They cannot alter their speech and this leads to their complex... But, along with Cheju, the Kyŏngsang dialect is a well-liked one, because men’s speech sounds macho and the women’s
In Figure 18, we see that the home province stands out among the Cheju informants. We also see that the number of Cheju informants who have included South Kyŏngsang on the mainland in their “most pleasant” speech area is significantly higher than the national average. The comments made by the Cheju informants who chose Kyŏngsang as most pleasant were generally positive traits such as “amiable” and engaging, but also included characteristics such as “rough and tough”, giving us some insight into the complex attitudes behind this choice.

8. Summary

We can summarize the main trends found in our Korean perceptual
dialect map data as follow: (1) single-province dialect regions, (2) the overbearing role of the North-South political border, (3) the absence of a geographical location for "standard", (4) Seoul speech as "most pleasant", (5) each home regions' speech as "pleasant", (6) Kyŏngsang informants' dialect inferiority complex.

Unlike Japan and the U.S. where there were regional dialects, most Korean informants drew each province as a separate dialect. This tendency probably relates to a high degree of regional consciousness, and a comparatively small number of administrative units in Korea. With the exception of Seoul, practically no cities were indicated as dialect regions. This is surprising in the light of similar German and French studies in which perceptions of urban speech varieties figured prominently. (Dailey-O'Cain 1999, Kuiper 1999). One possible reason for this difference is the difference in the nature of our Korean questionnaires; informants might have provided more information about Korean cities if they had been indicated on the map. Another possibility is that since Korea is more recently industrialized, the urban/rural dialect dichotomy perceived in these Western European countries has yet to develop there.

Most informants did not provide details for the North, but this fact in itself illustrates the importance of the political boundary in the perceptions of the informants.

In the Japanese perceptual dialects surveys, there was a strong overall tendency for informants to draw a region they labeled "standard". On the average 40% of the Japanese informants drew a standard region, while only half of that number (20%) drew a region they labeled "Kanto dialect" (Long 1997). With the Korean data, we saw an extremely strong trend in the opposite direction, with only 18% indicating a "standard" region, and 65% drawing a "Seoul dialect" region. Korean informants were less inclined to think of the standard variety as the speech of a certain region than their Japanese counterparts were. Furthermore, in studies of Japanese dialects, Long found interesting
regional variation in informants’ perception of where the standard was spoken. In particular, there was a strong (and statistically significant) tendency for informants from Kansai to be more reluctant to grant the special status of “standard” to the Tokyo region; they were more likely to give this honor to the newly-settled island of Hokkaido instead (Long 1997). In contrast, of those Korean informants who did indicate a standard region, most located it in the province of Kyŏnggi.

In almost all informant regions the Kyŏnggi (Seoul) area was the first choice for “most pleasant”, followed by the home dialect in second place. Notable exceptions to this were the Kyŏngsang informants among whom the home dialect was hardly ever chosen. Also of note were the Cheju informants who chose their home dialect over Kyŏnggi’s as “most pleasant”. This type of tendency (more people rating the home dialect as “most pleasant” than the standard) was very rare even in the Japanese data in which home dialects enjoyed a reasonably favor pleasantness rating.

When the national surface, consisting of Kyŏnggi, was stripped away from the “most pleasant” maps, the unique characteristics of each informant region were revealed. For Kangwŏn, Ch’ungch’ŏng, Chŏlla and Cheju, the home region appeared so strongly that the differences from the “national average” were statistically significant.

Kyŏngsang was the exception to a general trend for home regions to be indicated as pleasant, a fact which is amplified in the standardized value maps. These results support evidence from previous surveys which suggest that many Kyŏngsang informants suffer from a “dialect inferiority complex”, a severe form of what Labov has termed “linguistic insecurity”. Although Kyŏngsang informants show signs of linguistic insecurity in their low self-evaluations of their own dialects, they also do not appear very eager to bestow the honor of “Standard Korean” on a particular region, namely Seoul. They prefer rather to think of that region’s language variety as “Seoul speech” or “Seoul dialect”.
In the results of a similar survey conducted in Japan on informants from Tokyo and 7 regions in Western Japan, we found a very clear tendency for informants to give favorable “pleasantness” ratings to (1) the Kansai area, (2) the Kanto area (location of Tokyo which is often regarded as the Standard speech), and (3) their own home regions (Long 1999a).

In various parts of the U.S., informants have displayed tendencies to rate their home regions as “most pleasant” (Preston 1997). Unlike Korea and Japan, Americans from different regions do not seem to agree on the supremacy of a single dialect region when it comes to pleasantness (Table 7). Korea differs from Japan in that it is perceived to have only one linguistic center, unlike Japan with two (Kansai and Kanto).

What factors may account for these differences? There is more regional variation among the dialects of Korea and Japan because (in spite of their relatively small geographical sizes) the languages have longer histories than does U.S. English. Thus, it would seem at first that people in Korea and Japan should have chosen their home dialects even more than they did, i.e. that their results should have more closely mirrored the U.S. survey results. However, it is because of this dialectal variation that standardization has been such an important issue in these countries. And in both of these countries, “standardization” basically means learning the speech of the nation’s largest city.

The results indicate that Korea and Japan are more “linguistically centralized” than the U.S., in that speakers throughout both countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most common pleasantness ranking</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kansai</td>
<td>Kyōnggi (Seoul)</td>
<td>Home dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kanto</td>
<td>home dialect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>home dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic centers</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highly evaluate the speech of the capital not only as being “standard” (something which is much easier to account for) but also as pleasant.

What does this imply? It is plausible that the speech of Seoul and Tokyo has spread throughout these countries to the extent that speakers accept those varieties not only as intellectually attractive (i.e. correct or standard), but as appealing on an emotional level as well (i.e. pleasant). On the other hand, these positive images of Seoul and Tokyo speech may well reduce negative reactions of regional speakers towards these language varieties and facilitate their continued diffusion into outlying dialect areas. Moreover, these factors could be cyclical, with these positive perceptions of the capital regions being both a cause of (further) standardization, as well as an effect of the standardization that has occurred thus far.

In discussing this centralization and the perceived pleasantness of Seoul and Tokyo speech in the two countries, however, it is important **not** to forget the perceptions observed in the standardized values maps, i.e. that when these overall tendencies (the “national surface”) are stripped away, a clear tendency to the rate the home regions highly is revealed. This tendency was found in all eight informant regions surveyed in Japan, and in almost all of the seven regions surveyed in Korea.

In all three societies discussed here, Korea, Japan and the U.S., the necessity of having a command of the spoken standard for societal advancement, and indeed the seeming inevitability of increased linguistic leveling (to a degree, but not totally) as a result of the increasing mobility of speakers are important topics both to the average citizen and to those dealing with various aspects of language policy (school teachers, speech coaches, bureaucrats, politicians).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, another similarity in these three societies is the increasing importance being placed on the conservation of traditional language varieties in the name of cultural preservation, and the growing realization of the serious psychological and educational consequences of dialect inferiority complexes.
Moreover, there is an increasing emphasis on respecting the linguistic identity and first-language rights of individuals who have grown up speaking varieties that differ from the standard.

Yim (1994) has shown that almost half of the sociolinguistic research on the Korean language falls under the heading of language planning, i.e. research relating to solving practical problems.

Groups and individuals on both sides of the demarcation line publicly express their wish for the reunification of their land. Germany's example has shown that reunification is not merely a problem of political structures, but of people's mindsets as well. It is hoped that techniques for the analysis of language perceptions such as those outlined here will shed light on the intricacies of language attitudes and facilitate the alleviation of problems related to them.
References
Nakamura, Tamotsu, Tong-Jun Kim and Hiroyuki Umeda 1991
Kankokugo Seoul hōgen no sedaisa ni tsuite. *Gakujutsu Geppo* 44.4: 348-354.


韓国語の地域変種に対する認識
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本論では、「方言認知地図」という手法を用い、韓国の大学生400人余りを対象にしたアンケート調査から、韓国語の地理的変種に対する使用者の認識を追究する。結果としては、まず、方言の認知領域が行政区画である「道」と一致する傾向の強いことがわかった。そして、韓国人は、北部諸方言の詳細な特徴がわからないけれども「北のことばは自分たちとは違う」と意識しており、朝鮮半島を南北に分断する政治的境界線がインフォーマントの言語変種意識に強く反映されている。また、ソウルで話されていることばが「最も快適なことば」として全国的に高い支持を得ているものの、それが「標準語」ではなく、「ソウル方言」と認識されているという興味深い結果も得られた。さらに、偏差値を算出すると、それぞれの地方の話者が母方言への愛着を持っている様子が浮き彫りになった。なお、各地で地元の方言が好意的に捉えられている中で、慶尚道だけに「方言コンプレックス」の傾向が現れるという特徴的な現象も見られた。

（受理日 1999年11月24日）