Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics
Vol. 20, December 2020, 851−880
10.15738/kjell.20..202012.851

On the Source Words for Loanwords of the 2015 Revised National Curriculum of English

Jiyong Lee
(Konkuk University)

Lee, Jiyong. 2020. On the source words for loanwords of the 2015 Revised National Curriculum of English. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 20, 851−880. Previous research has shown that English loanwords that are true cognates can clearly be a valuable resource for Korean learners of English. This paper aimed to examine whether the 200 English source words in the 2015 RNCE and their Korean counterparts are true cognates, and whether the latter are in fact commonly used in everyday life. Careful scrutiny of the relationships to their Korean equivalents shows that some source words are phonologically or morphologically opaque and others fail to have a one−to−one correspondence in terms of meaning or usage. Moreover, the corpus−based investigation conducted in the present work shows that some of the 200 source words in the 2015 RNCE are ones whose Korean counterparts are not of high frequency and wide range. Because the selection of English source words listed in the RNCE has a substantial effect on English L2 learning, especially L2 vocabulary acquisition, more rigorous criteria must first be established on which the selection of such words can be based.

Keywords: 2015 RNCE, basic vocabulary, source word for loanword, true cognate

1. Introduction

This year is the first year in which the 2015 Revised National Curriculum of English (henceforth, the 2015 RNCE) has been fully implemented in every grade 3−to−grade 12 classroom in Korea. The 2015 RNCE bases the English Section of the College Scholastic Ability Test that is administered in November, 2020. Therefore, there is no doubt that the 2015 RNCE will play a pivotal role in teaching and learning in primary and secondary schools in Korea for several upcoming years.

With the aims to cultivate English communication skills, promote student−centered learning, encourage participation and cooperation among students, and facilitate cross−cultural understanding, the 2015 RNCE proposed a vocabulary guide, called Annex 3: Guide

on Basic Vocabulary (henceforth, Annex 3), for the optimization of grade-level learning standards. Annex 3 consists of a basic vocabulary list of 3000 word families and the general grade-level guidelines that must be met in the development and authorization of textbooks. Among the guidelines in Annex 3, the utilization of source words for loanwords from English is introduced.[1] This guideline dictates the following: 1) only up to 50 of the following 200 source words for English loanwords commonly used in everyday life (as shown in Table 1) can be used in each of the 20 grade-level textbooks[2], and 2) these 200 source words cannot be counted as new vocabulary items to learn (NVILs).

Table 1. The List of Source Words for Loanwords of the 2015 RNCE

alarm, album, alcohol, amateur, ambulance, apartment, arch, bacon, badminton, bag, banana, belt, bench, biscuit, bonus, box, bus, butter, cabinet, cake, calcium, camera, camp, campaign, campus, card, carol, carpet, catalogue, center, champion, channel, chart, cheese, chicken, chocolate, click, coat, coffee, comic, computer, course, court, crayon, cream, cup, data, diamond, diet, disc, doughnut, drama, dress, drill, drum, echo, elevator, elite, energy, essay, event, fashion, feminist, fence, festival, fiction, film, fork, gallery, game, gas, golf, gown, graph, guard, guitar, gum, hamburger, harmony, highlight, hint, hormone, hotel, image, interior, internet, interview, issue, jacket, jam, jazz, juice, jump, kangaroo, kiss, kiwi, laser, league, lemon, lobby, magic, manual, marathon, market, mask, medal, media, melon, member, menu, message, model, motor, mystery, news, notebook, okay, opera, orange, oven, page, panda, parade, partner, party, pen, percent, piano, pie, pilot, pipe, pizza, plastic, plug, program, project, quiz, radio, recreation, rehearsal, ribbon, robot, rocket, rugby, salad, sample, sandwich, sauce, scarf, scenario, schedule, section, seminar, service, set, shirt, skate, sketch, ski, snack, soup, spaghetti, sponsor, sport, spray, spy, staff, star, steak, stereo, studio, style, sweater, tank, taxi, team, technique, technology, television, tennis, tent, terror, ticket, toast, tomato, topic, towel, track, truck, vaccine, veil, video, villa, violin, virus, vision, waiter, website, wine, yacht (200 words)

As for the utilization of source words for English loanwords, the 2015 RNCE is in sharp contrast with the 2009 RNCE (see Appendix A), since the latter allowed only 78 source

[1] According to Haspelmath (2009), a loanword is defined as a word that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing, and the word that served as a model for a loanword is called its source word.

[2] The 20 grade-level textbooks are for four compulsory courses (Elementary School English 3-4, Elementary School English 5-6, Middle School English 1-3 and High School English) and 16 electives of high school (English Conversation, English Ⅰ, English Reading & Writing, English Ⅱ, Practical English, Culture of English-Speaking Countries, Career English, Reading British and American Literature, Advanced Conversation I, Advanced Conversation II, Advanced English I, Advanced English II, Advanced Reading I, Advanced Reading II, Advanced Writing I, and Advanced Writing II).

words for English loanwords to be exempt from the list of NVILs. Also, the two RNCEs differ concerning the way source words for English loanwords are not to be counted as NVILs. Unlike in the 2015 RNCE, none of the words in Table 1 could be counted as an NVIL in any of the textbooks based on the 2009 RNCE, which means that in principle, as many as 78 source words could be used in any textbook based on the 2009 RNCE without being counted as an NVIL.

The vastly expanded list of source words in the 2015 RNCE may be thought to reflect the integration of the ever-increasing number of English loanwords in Korean and research findings that loanwords contribute positively to second language (L2) learning (Ard and Homburg 1983, Banta 1981, Lee 1958, Palmberg 1985). According to Nation (2003), encouraging learners to notice this borrowing and to use the loanwords to help the learning of English is a very effective vocabulary expansion strategy. This view is supported by the well-known fact that adult L2 learners initially access meaning for L2 words through the first language (L1) and, as L2 learners become more proficient, they will be more likely to conceptually process L2 words (Talamas, Kroll and Dufour 1999). Inasmuch as the early reliance on lexical-level associations between the two languages lead to strong lexical links from L2 to L1, loanwords are particularly helpful.

The selection of source words to be listed in the RNCE has a substantial effect on English L2 learning, in particular L2 vocabulary acquisition. Nonetheless, the only criterion used for the selection is as follows: the loanwords derived from the English source words listed in the 2015 RNCE are those that are commonly used in everyday life. However, the answer to the question of 'how common is common enough' has yet to be found. It appears that the loanwords derived from the 200 English source words in the 2015 RNCE differ substantially in word frequency. It is imperative to have a corpus-based study of these loanwords in order to settle this matter.

In addition, theoretical considerations suggest that some of the 200 English source words in the 2015 RNCE do not qualify as such. These source words are those whose relationship to their Korean counterparts are difficult for Korean learners of English to recognize. It is well-known that loanwords commonly display linguistic changes that occurred during the process of borrowing. These linguistic changes include phonological, morphological and semantic changes, among others. As summarized by Min (1998), English loanwords in Korean are no exception, and they sometimes display phonological, morphological, or semantic changes that are too complex and inconsistent to understand fully (Lee 2001, No 2009, Tranter 2000, Tyson 1993). Given such state of affairs, one might wonder if the list of the 2015 RNCE includes any source word whose relationship to its Korean equivalent is

not transparent for Korean learners of English. A quick glance shows that the answer is in the affirmative. For instance, consider the pair of *apartment* and *apateu*. The loanword *apateu* is an example of back clipping, a word-formation process by which a new word is coined by omitting the last part of the form from which it is derived. The problem is that most native speakers of Korean are not aware of how *apateu* was derived from *apartment*. Furthermore, the latter is, in form, more similar to *apart*, another high frequency word that has a totally different grammatical function and meaning.

Given that only English loanwords that are true cognates can be a valuable resource for Korean learners of English, the 200 English source words in the 2015 RNCE must be true cognates. In other words, the correspondence to their Korean equivalent must be transparent in form (phonologically and morphologically) and virtually one-to-one in meaning (semantically and pragmatically). In addition, they must have Korean counterparts that are commonly used in everyday life, proven by a corpus-based investigation. This is what the present work aims to look into.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Loanwords and Cognates

When speakers of two different languages interact with each other, words are borrowed from one language to the other. As Thomason and Kaufman (1988) state, words are the first foreign elements to enter the borrowing language, and thus loanwords are the most commonly attested language contact phenomenon. Not surprisingly, Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) claim that "[n]o language in the sample— and probably no language in the world—is entirely devoid of loanwords."

Haugen (1950) classified types of borrowing, according to whether source language morphemes are imported into the recipient language, and whether they are substituted by the elements of the recipient. The English word *robot*, borrowed from Czech, is an example of morphemic importation without substitution. The word *angel*, borrowed from Latin *angelum*, is an example of morphemic importation and substitution. The term *loanword* is an example of morphemic substitution without importation; it was created by a loan translation from the German word *Lehnwort*. Loan translations may be (complex) single words or fixed phrasal expressions, coined by item-by-item translations of the (complex)

source units. The Korean compound word *bangeo unjeon* 'defensive driving' was from *bangeo-defensive* and *unjeon-driving*, and the English fixed phrasal expression *marriage of convenience* from French *marriage de convenance*. Another type of morphemic substitution without importation is loan meaning extension, whereby a polysemy pattern of a source language word is transferred to the recipient language. The Polish word *mysz*, used to mean a computer device, is an example of loan meaning extension (Otwinowska 2016).

As seen in the discussion above, loanwords come into the recipient language with morphemic importation with or without substitution, while loan translations and loan meaning extensions, sometimes grouped together as loanshifts, are outcomes of mere morphemic substitution, i.e., the copying of syntactic, morphological or semantic patterns (Haugen 1950). Besides loanwords and loanshifts, there is another type of borrowing called loanblends. A loanblend is a word that consists of partly borrowed material with partly native material. For example, the word *Afrikanerdom* combines *Afrikaner* from *Afrikaans* and the English suffix *–dom* as in *freedom*. Loanblends are not widely attested and are rare in English. The present work concerns only loanwords.

Closely related to the concept of loanwords are cognates. In the tradition of historical linguistics, cognates are defined as words that have the same etymological origin (Crystal 2011). Etymologically related by inheritance from a shared parent language or borrowing from other languages, they are, in most cases, similar in spelling, sound and meaning. In some cases, however, they do not have similar forms, such as English *father* and French *père*. Others have significantly different meanings: the word *sensible* means being reasonable in English, but means being sensitive in French, German and Spanish.[3]

In the fields of language processing and acquisition, cognates are defined quite differently. They are defined in terms of formal criteria, rather than etymology. They may be defined to include identical words that have the same form and meaning in two languages (Lemhöfer and Dijkstra 2004), translation equivalents similar in pronunciation and orthography (van Hell and Dijkstra 2002), or translation equivalents with high orthographic overlap with little phonetic similarity (Schepens, Dijkstra and Grootjen 2012). Such definitions may be said to reflect, in one way or another, Ringbom's (2007: 73) view on cognates, according to which, 'cognates in two languages can be defined as historically related, formally similar words, whose meanings may be identical, similar, partly different, or occasionally, even wholly different,' and cognates are found in 'related languages, and to

[3] Words in different languages that are similar in form but different in meaning are called false friends.

a minor extent also in unrelated languages because of possible loanwords'.

As noted by Jarvis (2009), language learners can hardly tell the difference between cognates of genetic origin, loanwords and accidentally similar words, and this may have similar effects on language learning. This may be evidence in favor of the approach that considers all these three to be in essentially the same category. Nonetheless, the present work makes a clear distinction between loanwords and cognates, especially because the Korean writing system has nothing in common with any of the Roman writing systems. The Korean alphabetic letters are written in syllabic blocks, not in a linear fashion, showing the features of alphabetic and syllabic writing systems. Thus, English loanwords in Korean are treated here as loanwords with cognacy characteristics.[4]

2.2 Loanwords and L2 Acquisition

It is widely acknowledged that L2 acquisition is different from L1 acquisition in several important aspects. L2 learners have already developed conceptual and semantic systems linked to the L1, and thus are more cognitively mature (Schmitt 2000, Takač 2008). This often enables L2 learners, especially in the early stages of learning, to map new L2 words to pre-existing concepts or L1 equivalents. However, the extent to which L1 plays a role in this process depends on the degree of similarity between the L1 and L2 (Jiang 2002, Nation 2001, Takač 2008). In other words, the degree of the burden of learning new L2 words depends on the extent of overlap with pre-existing L1 vocabulary knowledge. The greater the similarity between L1 and L2 vocabulary, the less burdensome L2 vocabulary learning is. In this respect, loanwords have been at the center of debate, whether they are part of broadly defined cognates or whether the two are distinct.

Previous research on L2 learning found that similarities between the L1 and L2 result in positive cross-linguistic transfer, while discrepancies between the two lead to negative transfer in L2 acquisition. Thus, some researchers, assuming that loanwords or cognates make the L2 more similar to the L1, count them as a useful linguistic resource available for L2 acquisition (Ard and Homburg 1983, Banta 1981, Daulton 1998, Lee 1958, Palmberg 1985). But others, paying more attention to the difference between loanwords and their source words, consider them a hindrance to L2 learning (Kent 1999, Martin 2004, Sheperd 1996, Simon-Maeda 1995).

[4] This in fact means that cognates only exist between two languages that have the same or similar writing systems.

Lee (1958) was among the first who explored the utilization of English loanwords in Korean in English learning. She claims that the cognacy characteristics of the English loanwords help Korean students "learn English more quickly and with more facility, in other words, help with [their] motivation". Daulton (1998), estimating that approximately half of the high-frequency 3000 words of English have loanword counterparts in Japanese, claimed that these English loanwords in Japanese greatly facilitate the acquisition of the English source words from which they originate. In his study of using cognates to teach English to native Spanish-speakers, Rodriguez (2001) found that loanwords were an effective tool for teachers to take advantage of what speakers already knew.

In the context of Japanese, Simon-Maeda (1995) views the misuse of English loanwords in Japanese as "another vexing problem for both the native English speaker studying Japanese and the native Japanese speaker studying English." Sheperd (1996) argues that loanwords "can cause no end of trouble for Japanese students struggling to master English." Similarly, Kent (1999) notes that English loanwords in Chinese, Japanese and Korean may be an additional source of the comprehension problem a native speaker of English encounters, since they sometimes take on a form different from that of their source words. Along with the ever-increasing use of English loanwords in these languages, this poses a problem for EFL students.

Empirical studies such as Uchida (2001), Daulton (2008) and Masson (2013) have recognized different types of English loanwords in Japanese and noted differential effects that they have on L1 Japanese learners of L2 English. More specifically, Uchida (2001) classified English loanwords in Japanese and their source words into five types: true cognates, convergent/divergent cognates and close/distant false friends. True cognates are words that have the same primary meaning in the L1 and L2. Convergent cognates are words whose L1 forms have a more restricted meaning than their L2 counterparts. The Japanese loanword *baiku* only refers to a motorbike, but its source word *bike* means a motorbike or bicycle. Divergent cognates are words whose L1 forms have a more extended meaning than their L2 counterparts. The Japanese loanword *feminisuto* can not only mean a feminist, but also a gentleman. Close false friends are words that share a certain conceptual similarity, but have clearly different meanings in the L1 and L2. The Japanese loanword *masutaa* from the English *master* means an owner of a shop in English. Distant false friends are words that have completely different meanings in the L1 and L2. The Japanese loanword *sumaato* from the English *smart* means 'slim'. Based on these five types, Uchida (2001) found that true cognates are among the easiest to learn, with false friends being among the most challenging, and divergent/convergent cognates in between. This finding is

generally in line with Lado's (1955), as false friends and divergent/convergent cognates are simply subtypes of Lado's deceptive cognates.

Loanwords are never of one and only one type. They differ, first of all, in the way they were coined. They also differ in how close they are to their source words in pronunciation, meaning and usage. Moreover, they differ in how easily L2 learners perceive their relationship to their origin. The differences in these respects determine the degree of cognacy of a loanword and its source word. The higher the degree of cognacy, the easier it is to learn the source word; the lower the degree of cognacy, the more difficult, as confirmed by Uchida (2001), Masson (2013) and Shaffer (2014). In the same vein, Swan (1997:16−7) states the following:

> Mapping second−language vocabulary onto the mother tongue is a basic and indispensable learning strategy, but also inevitably leads to error How much the mother tongue helps and how much it hinders learning depends, among other things, on language distance and on the realism of the learner's hypothesis about transferability.

The general consensus on loanwords as a tool of acquisition is that true cognate loanwords can facilitate L2 learning, but nontrue cognate loanwords have a varying beneficial effect, or even an adverse effect. In this regard, it is worth noting that while the form−meaning connection for cognates is easier to learn than for noncognates, the former may be more difficult to use in context than the latter (Rogers, Webb and Nakata 2015).

2.3 English Loanwords in Korean

Since the end of the Second World War and the following independence of Korea, the Korean language has adopted thousands of loanwords, the vast majority of which are English in origin. According to Sohn (1994: 528), loanwords are estimated to account for approximately 5% of the total vocabulary of modern Korean. As English has become a lingua franca, with technological advances being so rapid, the number of English loanwords entering Korean has increased in an unprecedented rate and scale. English loanwords are now an integral component of the modern Korean lexicon.

As with loanwords in other languages, English loanwords in Korean show a variety of changes which have led them to conform to the Korean grammar and enabled them to be more easily incorporated into the Korean lexicon (Min 1998, No 2009). Typically, these linguistic changes involve one, or a combination, of these basic processes: orthographical,

phonological, morphological or semantic integration. As a result, some English loanwords have been integrated into Korean so naturally that they are used as commonly as any other Korean word.

Since the focus of the present work is whether the 200 source words listed in the 2015 RNCE and their Korean equivalents are true cognates, orthographical and phonological changes will not be discussed. This is because the spelling and pronunciation of the loanwords in question are not problematic. Only morphological and semantic alterations are a matter of importance here.

Morphological changes found in English loanwords are largely results of various types of clipping, a word-formation process by which a word of more than one syllable is reduced to a shorter form (Min 1998, No 2009, Tyson 1993). The following illustrates several types of clipping:

(1) a. Back clipping: the clipping of the last syllable or syllables of a word
ad < advertisement; info < information; gas < gasoline
b. Fore-clipping: the clipping of the initial part of a word
bot < robot; chute < parachute; phone < telephone
c. Middle clipping: the clipping of all but the middle part of a word
flu < influenza; fridge < refrigerator
d. Complex clipping: the shortening of a compound word by preserving and combining its initial parts
sci-fi < science fiction; sitcom < situation comedy

As pointed out by No (2009), back clipping is the most productive morphological change found in English loanwords, and examples of the other types of clipping are rare.

(2) a. Back clipping
dakyu < documentary; mello < melodrama; syupeo < supermarket
b. Fore-clipping
menteu < comment
c. Complex clipping
rimokon < remote control; eeokeon < air conditioner

Note that no source words except *documentary* in (2) allow clipping, and even *docu* is a slang word.

As illustrated below, semantic changes found in English loanwords are largely classified into five types (Min 1998).[5]

(3) a. Substitution: replacement of meaning
reseun: an act of being taught privately
obaiteu: vomiting
b. Pejoration: association of a term with negative meaning
madam: a woman who manages a bar
seil: an offer or arrangement in which goods are sold at a discount
c. Amelioration: association of a term with positive meaning
naibeu: simple and guileless
reseutorang: a decent western-style restaurant
d. Narrowing: restriction of meaning
paencheu: underwear, shorts
geseuteu: visiting performer, speaker, or contestant, as on a radio or television program
e. Generalization: extension of meaning
seobiseu: anything additionally offered free of charge

The loanwords *reseun* and *obaiteu*, examples of substitution, have meanings that their respective source words *lesson* and *overeat* do not have. Likewise, *seobiseu*, an example of generalization, has a meaning that its source word *service* does not have.

Following Lado (1955), Uchida (2001) and Shaffer (2014), English loanwords in Korean differ in their cognacy. While some of the source words in Table 1 are easy to acquire, others are difficult. For example, *calcium*, *guitar* and *tomato* and their Korean counterparts, *kalsyum*, *gita* and *tomato*, are true cognates because they are true translation equivalents of each other. However, *interior*, *terror*, *interview*, *schedule* and their Korean counterparts are deceptive cognates. The primary meanings of *interior* and *terror* are not just those in which *interieo* and *tereo* are used. The English word *interior* is used to primarily mean 'the inner part of inside of something' or 'inside or indoors', but the Korean equivalent is primarily used to mean 'interior decorating' or 'interior decoration'. The primary meaning of *terror* is 'a feeling of extreme fear', but that of *tereo* is 'violent action for political

[5] Except for substitution, the following taxonomy of semantic change is based on Traugott (2017). Substitution includes metaphorization and metonymization.

purposes' or 'terrorism'. In a similar fashion, *interview*–*inteobyu* and *schedule*–*seukejul* are not true translation equivalents to each other. The English words are used not only as nouns but also as verbs, but the Korean words are used only as nouns.

3. Method

The goal of the paper is to answer the question of whether the English source words in the 2015 RNCE and their Korean equivalents are true cognates, and whether the latter are in fact commonly used in everyday life. To this end, the 200 English loanwords are scrutinized to see that they involved any of the linguistic changes discussed in (2) and (3), which is followed by a corpus-based investigation of their frequency, range and dispersion.

3.1 A Preliminary: Theoretical Scrutiny

Before laying out the list of English loanwords thought to be derived by a morphological or semantic change, two points need to be mentioned. First, in carrying out the present research, the *Standard Korean Language Dictionary* 'Pyojungugeodaesajeon', published online by the National Institute of Korean Language, was consulted. Second, there is one mismatched pair of loanword and source word. It seems that *sport* was intended to be the source word for *seupocheu*. But it is clear that it was derived from *sports*, so the pair of *sport*– *seupocheu* will not be considered.

Out of the 199 pairs, only six show that back clipping or fore-clipping were involved in the derivation of loanwords, as shown below:

(4) a. Back clipping
apateu < apartment; interieo < interior decorating; maejik < Magic Marker (a felt-tip pen);
noteu < notebook
b. Fore-clipping
chikin < fried chicken; seupeurei < hairspray

None of the pairs show that semantic substitution, pejoration, or amelioration were involved in the derivation of the loanword. However, there are three cases in which the

meanings of the loanwords were extended.

(5) seobiseu, peminiseuteu, topik

The extended meaning of *seobiseu* was already given above, and *peminiseuteu* is exactly like the Japanese *feministo*: they are both used to mean a gentleman who is nice to a woman. The loanword *topik* can mean not only a subject of a speech, essay, book, but also a title of a story.

Out of the 190 remaining pairs, as many as 66 pairs show that semantic narrowing occurred to the loanwords. As seen below, these pairs can be classified into three groups:

(6) achi < arch; belteu < belt; benchi < bench; bijeon < vision; billa < villa; daieoteu < diet; esei < essay; gaelleori < gallery; hamoni < harmony; ibenteu < event; kkeom < gum; komik < comic; koseu < course; koteu < court; membeo < member; moteo < motor; okei < okay; paipeu < pipe; penseu < fence; piksyeon < fiction; rigeu < league; tereo < terror

(7) beil < veil; chaeneol < channel; chateu < chart; deureseu < dress; eko < echo; golpeu < golf; hairaiteu < highlight; jeompeu < jump; kaempeu < camp; katallogeu < catalogue; keullik < click; kiseu < kiss; koteu < coat; inteobyu < interview; maseukeu < mask; pailleot < pilot; pati < party; peoreideu < parade; peulleogeu < plug; pilleum < film; pokeu < fork; roket < rocket; seukechi < sketch; seukeiteu < skate; seukejul < schedule; seuki < ski; seupai < spy; seuponseo < sponsor; tenteu < tent

(8) allam < alarm; bakseu < box; deuril < drill; gadeu < guard; hinteu < hint; isyu < issue; jaem < jam; kaempein < campaign; maenyueol < manual; model < model; peurojekteu < project; saempeul < sample; seteu < set; seuta < star; teuraek < track

The pairs in (6) are those in which the loanwords have a more restricted range of meanings than their source words, though both are predominantly used as nouns. For example, *bijeon* has one single meaning of foresight, but *vision* has an additional meaning of sight. The pair of *okei* and *okay* is more decisive. According to the *Standard Korean Language Dictionary*, the loanword is only used to mean approval with proofreading or editing a manuscript. The pairs in (7) are those in which the loanwords and their source words have virtually the same primary meanings, but the source words are used not only as nouns, but also as verbs or adjectives. Whereas *channel* is a verb as well as a noun,

chaeneol is used only as a noun. Names of sports like *golf* and *skate* belong to this group. The pairs in (8) have the characteristics of the previous two groups. For example, not only does *alarm* refer to any device that transmits a noise, signal, warning of danger, etc., but it also means fear or terror aroused by awareness of danger. Furthermore, it can also be used as a verb describing an activity of filling with anxious concern or giving warning. However, *allam* is used in a restricted sense as it only refers to any device that transmits a noise, signal, warning of danger, etc.

Thus far, it has been shown that out of the 200 pairs of loanwords and their source words, 76 pairs can hardly be considered true cognates. This means that only the 124 remaining pairs are true cognates. In what follows, the distributional properties of the loanwords of these pairs will be discussed. Before doing this, however, it would be helpful to first mention the corpus and corpus utility program on which the present work relies.

3.2 The Sejong Corpora and the KKMA Sejong Corpus Utility Program

In 1998, the 21st Century Sejong Project was launched to build the Korean national corpora comparable to the British National Corpus of the U.K, and to provide Korean language resources for research, education and information technology. The project was named after Sejong the Great, who has been credited with creating the Korean alphabet Hangul. The corpora, called the 21st Century Sejong Corpora, were first released in 2003 and continually updated until 2011. The corpora consist of raw and tagged (annotated for morphology) corpora, representing varieties of Korean: Modern Korean (written and spoken), North Korean, Korean used abroad, Old Korean. According to Kim, Kang and Hong (2007), written Modern Korean corpora include a raw corpus of 62 million words, a tagged corpus of 15 million words, a word-disambiguated corpus of 12.5 million words and a treebank of 0.8 million words, while spoken Modern Korean corpora include a raw corpus of 4.2 million words and a tagged corpus of 1 million words.

The Sejong Corpora are available through the website of the National Institute of Korean Language, where many useful search tools can be found. Among these search tools is the KKMA Sejong Corpus Utility Program (KSCUP). This software was developed by Lee, Yeon, Hwang and Lee (2010). They designed the relational database scheme to organize and store a corpus and implemented a Web-based application, which enables researchers to easily access and utilize the Sejong tagged corpora. The KSCUP is based on 447 written texts and 200 spoken texts in the Sejong tagged corpora. In total, the written texts include 1,323,068 sentences and 34,446,300 tokens of morphemes, while the spoken texts include

216,718 sentences and 1,618,529 tokens of morphemes. The written texts are divided into six genres: newspapers, magazines, books, other publications (brochures, booklets, government documents), private writings (diaries, letters, essays) and electronic publications. The spoken texts are divided into 3 genres: TV transcripts, radio transcripts, transcripts of private communication).

3.3 Data Analysis

Recent research on the selection of high frequency word lists shows that they could not be developed solely on the basis of frequency. Range of occurrence, and ease or difficulty of learning, etc. are factors that also need to be taken into consideration (Coaxhead 2000, Leech, Rayson and Wilson 2001, Nation and Waring 1997, West 1953). For example, Nation (2006) developed fourteen 1000 word lists on the basis of frequency, range, and dispersion from the British National Corpus, a 100 million word corpus consisting of 90% written text and 10% spoken text. Although these word lists are 1000 word-family lists, the frequency, range, and dispersion data used to classify words into the lists were not based on word families but on lemmas, as in Leech, Rayson and Wilson (2001). A lemma represents a headword and its inflected forms of the same part of speech. For example, *speak, speaks*, *speaking*, *spoke*, and *spoken* belong to the same lemma *speak*. For each lemma, the following were used: 1) the frequency data of how often the lemma occurred in the whole corpus, 2) the range data of how many of the subdivisions of the corpus the lemma occurred in, and 3) the dispersion data of how evenly the lemma occurred across the subdivisions. The more similar the frequencies were across the subdivisions, the closer to 1 the dispersion figure is. The more different they were, the closer to 0 the dispersion figure is.[6]

The approach taken by Leech, Rayson and Wilson (2001) and Nation (2006) helps reveal the frequency, range, and dispersion information on the 124 remaining loanwords. Out of these loanwords, however, the following five have not yet been registered in the *Standard Korean Language Dictionary*:

[6] The dispersion figure in question is Juilland's *D*, developed by Juilland and Chang-Rodriguez(1964). This measure is calculated by the following formula:

Juilland's $D = 1 - (\text{coefficient of variation} / \sqrt{\text{number of corpus parts} - 1})$

(9) tekeunolloji < technology; maket < market; seunaek < snack; seksyeon < section; wepsaiteu < website

The fact that the words in (9) are not entries of the dictionary indicates that they are not commonly used loanwords. Setting these five loanwords aside, Table 2 summarizes all the information needed to finalize the ideal true cognates that should be included in the RNCE.

Table 2. Distributional Properties of the True Cognates of the 2015 RNCE

Rank	Source word	Loanword	Frequency	Range	Dispersion
1	computer	keompyuteo	4471	6	.498
2	program	peurogeuraem	4160	6	.507
3	team	tim	3794	6	.333
6	internet	inteonet	2893	4	.456
7	bus	beoseu	2710	7	.377
8	news	nyuseu	2644	6	.200
9	image	imiji	2456	6	.391
10	television	tellebijeon	2282	7	.187
11	card	kadeu	1862	6	.476
13	game	geim	1694	6	.449
14	hotel	hotel	1637	6	.406
15	coffee	keopi	1587	6	.227
17	energy	eneoji	1487	6	.441
18	video	bidio	1476	6	.537
19	taxi	taeksi	1381	6	.305
20	drama	deurama	1364	5	.489
21	center	senteo	1208	6	.358
22	gas	gaseu	1011	5	.437
24	radio	radio	969	6	.280
25	camera	kamera	910	6	.470
26	style	seutail	875	7	.541
27	media	midieo	842	6	.309
29	truck	teureok	752	6	.256
30	message	mesiji	724	7	.390
32	lobby	robi	629	6	.402
36	cup	keop	582	6	.513

37	scenario	sinario	535	4	.460
38	piano	piano	513	6	.469
40	fashion	paesyeon	502	6	.402
42	page	peiji	485	6	.486
43	elevator	ellibeite	479	5	.170
44	seminar	semina	470	6	.399
46	hormone	horeumon	450	5	.293
47	guitar	gita	448	6	.220
48	elite	elliteu	439	6	.292
50	opera	opera	431	6	.435
51	percent	peosenteu	414	5	.016
56	virus	baireoseu	374	5	.411
57	alcohol	alkool	350	4	.303
58	data	deiteo	344	5	.509
62	jazz	jaejeu	310	5	.404
63	menu	menyu	303	6	.495
64	plastic	peullaseutik	300	5	.364
65	studio	seutyudio	299	6	.455
66	shirt	syeocheu	288	5	.278
67	cheese	chijeu	284	6	.428
68	partner	pateuneo	275	5	.360
69	cream	keurim	269	5	.469
70	violin	baiollin	268	5	.275
71	tank	taengkeu	254	5	.391
72	disc	diseukeu	253	6	.435
75	marathon	maraton	239	6	.516
80	orange	orenji	227	5	.473
81	wine	wain	224	6	.494
82	tomato	tomato	222	6	.493
84	album	aelbeom	214	5	.483
86	campus	kaempeoseu	213	5	.477
87	robot	robot	208	6	.437
88	tennis	teniseu	202	5	.496
89	pen	pen	199	6	.487
90	pizza	pija	199	7	.500

93	calcium	kalsyum	188	4	.356
95	banana	banana	186	6	.467
96	chocolate	chokollit	186	4	.321
98	sweater	seuweteo	176	5	.174
100	sauce	soseu	174	5	.435
102	amateur	amachueo	164	4	.439
103	ticket	tiket	162	4	.370
104	hamburger	haembeogeo	160	5	.487
105	medal	medal	159	5	.387
106	staff	seutaepeu	159	5	.457
109	bonus	boneoseu	148	5	.455
111	laser	reijeo	146	6	.253
113	festival	peseutibeol	140	4	.324
115	butter	beoteo	138	5	.413
116	sandwich	saendeuwichi	138	5	.362
117	champion	chaempieon	131	5	.364
118	diamond	daiamondeu	124	5	.335
119	vaccine	baeksin	119	4	.443
120	quiz	kwijeu	118	6	.571
121	gown	gaun	114	6	.133
122	waiter	weiteo	113	4	.163
123	salad	saelleodeu	111	7	.492
125	scarf	seukapeu	107	4	.413
127	ribbon	ribon	106	5	.419
131	jacket	jaekit	101	3	.325
134	technique	tekeunik	93	4	.492
135	lemon	remon	92	4	.413
136	graph	geuraepeu	87	4	.550
137	soup	supeu	81	4	.125
138	steak	seuteikeu	77	4	.384
143	badminton	baedeuminteon	71	5	.387
144	drum	deureom	69	5	.496
146	yacht	yoteu	66	4	.457
147	towel	tawol	64	3	.355
152	melon	mellon	61	4	.355

153	mystery	miseuteori	60	3	.326
154	carpet	kapet	59	4	.365
155	pie	pai	59	4	.212
157	spaghetti	seupageti	57	6	.417
160	recreation	rekeurieisyeon	47	3	.387
161	biscuit	biseukit	45	3	.069
165	bag	baek	43	4	.125
169	oven	obeun	41	5	.419
170	stereo	seutereo	38	5	.532
171	kiwi	kiwi	37	4	.218
172	toast	toseuteu	37	4	.215
173	cabinet	kaebinit	36	3	.349
175	rehearsal	riheoseol	34	5	.490
176	doughnut	doneot	33	3	.045
178	ambulance	aembyulleonseu	29	3	.307
179	kangaroo	kaenggeoru	29	5	.501
181	juice	jyuseu	25	5	.450
184	carol	kaereol	23	4	.417
185	crayon	keureyong	23	2	.167
186	cake	keik	21	5	.497
191	bacon	beikeon	18	4	.492
193	rugby	reokbi	15	4	.391
200	panda	panda	0	0	

As seen above, *keompyuteo* was the most frequently used word in the entire corpus. It appeared 4,471 times, which was followed by *peurogeuram* (4160) and *tim* (3,794 times). At the other extreme, however, *panda* was never used in any of the eight divisions of the corpus. In addition to *panda*, 32 loanwords appeared less than 100 times. Very interestingly, none of the 200 loanwords appeared in the division of other publications (brochures, booklets, government documents). In fact, the highest range figure was 7. The loanwords whose range figure was less than 4 are the following:

(10) jaekit < jacket; tawol < towel; miseuteori < mystery; rekeurieisyeon < recreation; biseukit < biscuit; kaebinit < cabinet; doneot < doughnut; aembyulleonseu < ambulance; keureyong < crayon; panda < panda

The dispersion figures range from .016 to .571, which are generally low. This is because the frequency figures of the loanwords are relatively low and no loanwords whatsoever were used in brochures, booklets or government documents. The loanwords whose dispersion figure was less than .2 are the following:

(11) tellebijeon < television; ellibeite < elevator; peosenteu < percent; seuweteo < sweater; gaun < gown; weiteo < waiter; supeu < soup; biseukit < biscuit; baeg < bag; doneot < doughnut; keureyong < crayon

To sum up, if the criteria for the inclusion of loanwords and their source words in the RNCE is that the frequency figure must be higher than 100, the range figure higher than 3, and the dispersion figure higher than or equal to .2, then only the following 80 are legitimate.

(12) keompyuteo < computer; peurogeuraem < program; tim < team; inteonet < Internet; beoseu < bus; nyuseu < news; imiji < image; kadeu < card; geim < game; hotel < hotel; keopi < coffee; eneoji < energy; bidio < video; taeksi < taxi; deurama < drama; senteo < center; gaseu < gas; radio < radio; kamera < camera; seutail < style; midieo < media; teureok < truck; mesiji < message; robi < lobby; keop < cup; sinario < scenario; piano < piano; paesyeon < fashion < peiji; page < semina; seminar < horeumon; hormone; gita < guitar; elliteu < elite; opera < opera; baireoseu < virus; alkool < alcohol; deiteo < data; jaejeu < jazz; menyu < menu; peullaseutik < plastic; seutyudio < studio; syeocheu < shirt; chijeu < cheese; pateuneo < partner; keurim < cream; baiollin < violin; taengkeu < tank; diseukeu < disc; maraton < marathon; orenji < orange; wain < wine; tomato < tomato; aelbeom < album; kaempeoseu < campus; robot < robot; teniseu < tennis; pen < pen; pija < pizza; kalsyum < calcium; banana < banana; chokollit < chocolate < soseu < sauce; amachueo < amateur; tiket < ticket; haembeogeo < hamburger; medal < medal; seutaepeu < staff; boneoseu < bonus; reijeo < laser; peseutibeol < festival; beoteo < butter; saendeuwichi < sandwich; chaempieon < champion; daiamondeu < diamond; baeksin < vaccine; kwijeu < quiz; saelleodeu < salad; seukapeu < scarf; ribon < ribbon

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Because the general consensus of previous L2 research is that source words facilitative of L2 learning (especially L2 vocabulary learning) are those that are true cognates with their L1 counterparts, the goal of the present study was twofold: 1) to see whether the 200 English source words in the 2015 RNCE and their Korean counterparts are true cognates, and 2) to find out of the Korean counterparts are in fact commonly used in everyday life. Based on theoretical scrutiny, it was found that out of the 200 pairs in the list, as many as 76 pairs were not found to be true cognates, due to morphological or phonological opaqueness, or failure to have a one-to-one correspondence in terms of meaning and usage. When looking into the frequency, range, and dispersion information on the remaining 124 loanwords, it was found that only 80 loanwords could be considered as commonly used words in everyday life.

As mentioned earlier, seven pairs of loanwords and their source words are cases of morphological opaqueness; the pair of *seupocheu-sport* is simply a mismatched pair and the others involve back clipping or fore-clipping. The *seupocheu-sport* pair is problematic. The English word *sport* is a countable noun, which means that Korean learners of English who are influenced by their L1 may incorrectly use *sport* where in fact its plural form is needed. The pairs involving clipping also cause various kinds of problems for Korean learners of English, since it is highly likely that they will fail to perceive the similarities between the loanwords and their source words. For example, when they hear a native speaker of English say 'The interior of the house is considered to be a safe haven,' they may be confused, as decorating or decoration cannot refer to a place. Conversely, L2 learners may puzzle native English speakers by saying 'Interior is more difficult than it appears on television programs.' Without knowing that Korean has the loanword *interieo* derived from *interior decorating*, they may experience difficulty in figuring out the meaning of the utterance.

Out of the 200 pairs of loanwords and their source words, three pairs showed semantic generalization, and sixty-six pairs showed semantic narrowing. In Uchida's (2001) terms, the former are divergent cognates and the latter are convergent ones. Divergent cognates are generally known to be easier to learn than convergent ones. In addition, these two types of cognates cause a problem for L2 learners in quite different ways. Divergent cognates are most likely to lead to productive errors. On the other hand, convergent cognates are likely to cause receptive errors. Thus, driven by the three pairs of divergent

cognates, Korean learners of English may commit a productive error in an utterance such as '*A Rose for Amy* is the topic of the story,' where *topic* should read *title*. On the other hand, the sixty-six convergent cognates may hinder the processing of sentences such as 'Most had stay-at-home wives and manual jobs,' where manual means working with the hands rather than a handbook of technical information about a machine, etc.

Five more source words were identified to be problematic because their loanword counterparts have not yet been registered in the *Standard Korean Language Dictionary*. These include *market*, *section*, *snack*, *technology* and *website*. When adding these source words and *sport*, *apartment*, *notebook* and *hairspray* to the 69 source words whose loanwords underwent semantic generalization or narrowing, a total of 78 sources words have found to be 'defective'. As shown below, however, 62 of these words belong to Nation's (2006) 1st, 2nd or 3rd 1K wordlist.

(10) 1st 1K Wordlist
box, course, court, dress, film, issue, jump, market, member, okay, party, project, section, service, set
2nd 1K Wordlist
alarm, belt, camp, campaign, channel, coat, diet, event, fence, golf, guard, highlight, interview, jam, league, model, motor, pipe, plug, sample, schedule, sponsor, sports, star, technology, topic, track
3rd 1K Wordlist
apartment, bench, catalogue, chart, click, drill, echo, essay, fiction, fork, gallery, hint, manual, mask, parade, pilot, rocket, sketch, tent, vision
Not Found in Any Wordlist
arch, comic, feminist, gum, hairspray, harmony, kiss, notebook, skate, ski, snack, spy, terror, veil, villa, website

It seems imperative that all of the words belonging to the 1st, 2nd or 3rd 1000 wordlist be included in the basic vocabulary list of RNCE, and not in the list of source words. In other words, they should be studied as NVILs.

Masson (2013) made a very interesting point in relation to word usage. Although familiarity of the meanings of true and convergent cognates facilitates the learning of L2 word meanings, these types of cognates can give students a false sense of familiarity and dissuade them from studying the usage of L2 words beyond word-to-word meaning. This could result in ungrammatical use of the L2 words. In consideration of pedagogical

implications, Masson suggests that educators shouldn't downplay instruction on L2 forms of true cognates just because students understand their meaning, when in fact these forms remain a challenge to them.

This is particularly important from the point of view of the present study. If instruction on some L2 forms of true cognates is necessary, one may naturally ask if students should be instructed in the use of any source word listed in the 2015 RNCE. An examination of the words listed in Table 1 shows that there is indeed such a word. The English loanword *maraton* and its source word *marathon* have the same primary meanings, and as such, can be considered as true cognates. However, they differ in their collocation patterns. As a modifier, *marathon* is used in a much wider context than *maraton*. In understanding or producing expressions like *dance marathon*, *marathon journey*, *marathon effort*, Korean students of English may experience difficulty learning or using the word despite their familiarity with expressions like *maraton hyeopsang*. They should be taught the collocation pattern of *marathon*. However, the inclusion of *marathon* in the list of the 2015 RNCE gives students and teachers a false sense that students are aware of its usage, even when they are not.

The discussions above all point to one very important consideration. The expansion of source words in the 2015 RNCE list may do more harm than good. This is especially so when source words with a high frequency and wide range in the L2 are included in the list, but are not to be treated as NVILs. For instance, the source words *interview* and *schedule* are among high frequency words. According to *Longman Communication 3000*, *interview* as a noun is a 2K word in spoken as well as written English, and *interview* as a verb, is a 2K word in spoken English. Likewise, *schedule* as a noun is a 2K word in spoken English but a 3K word in written English, and *schedule* as a verb is a 3K word in spoken English. Despite the high frequency and wide range of these words, neither is included as an NVIL in the basic vocabulary list of 3000 word families in the 2015 RNCE. When used as a verb, they present Korean learners of English with a number of difficulties, in particular regarding argument structure, choice of voices, and collocation. These learning difficulties can be overcome more effectively by attentive vocabulary learning through explicit instruction in various contexts. Such words need to be listed as a NVIL in the RNCE for this to be possible.

In deciding how commonly used loanwords are admissible for their source words to be listed in the RNCE, the cut-off value of 100 was set for frequency, and .2 for dispersion. Compared with the values usually used in academic wordlist research, these values are far lower. The typical cut-off point for dispersion is .60 (Dang, Coxhead and Webb 2017) or .80 (Gardner and Davies 2014). Given this state of affairs, one can consider an alternative method taken by Davies and Gardner (2010). To determine which words are

included in their frequency dictionary, a straightforward simple formula was used:

score = frequency * dispersion

The output values obtained from applying this formula range from 2,226.6 to 0. As in Table 2, *keompyuteo*, *peurogeuraem*, *inteonet*, *tim* and *beoseu* are the top five-ranked entries. At the opposite extreme are *baek*, *keureyong*, *biseukit*, *doneot* and *panda*. Based on this calculation, 81 entries, not 80, must be included in the source word list of the RNCE. The 80th-ranked entry is *ribon*, which is followed by *seukapeu*. Their respective points are 44.4 and 44.2 with a mere .2 difference in points. The two methods point to the same direction regarding the following source words:

(11) ambulance, bacon, badminton, bag, biscuit, cabinet, cake, carol, carpet, crayon, doughnut, drum, gown, jacket, juice, kangaroo, kiwi, lemon, melon, mystery, oven, panda, percent, pie, recreation, rehearsal, rugby, soup, spaghetti, steak, stereo, sweater, toast, towel, waiter, yacht

These words should not be included in the source word list of the RNCE. The two methods, however, make different predictions regarding the following six source words:

laser (84th), diamond (82th), elevator(59th), graph (76th), technique (78th), television (18th)

The criteria-based method allows the first two words to be listed in the RNCE, but disallows the others. On the other hand, the formula-based method disallows the first two, but allows the others. At this point, it is not yet clear which method is better in determining the loanwords that should be included in the list of the RNCE. More research on this issue is therefore needed.

The findings of the study are quite surprising. Because the 2015 RNCE is an authoritative directive that plays a crucial role in curriculum/textbook design for primary and secondary schools in Korea, all guidelines that are proposed should have undergone careful scrutiny. While the 2015 RNCE seems to place more importance on the essential vocabulary and grammatical features of English, less attention appears to have been paid to loanwords and their impacts on L2 learning, most likely due to the relatively small amount of research on them compared to that on other aspects of the L2. As stated earlier, the guidelines state that

no more than 50 of the 200 source words for English loanwords can be used in each of the 20 grade-level textbooks, and that the 200 source words should not be counted as NVILs. However, the present study revealed that this restriction is problematic, as 38% of the source words included in the list were not true cognates with their Korean counterparts, and the latter contained only a handful of commonly used words in everyday life. If English L2 learners are not exposed to such source words because of such guidelines in Annex 3, it is highly likely that learners will face difficulty when comprehending and/or producing such vocabulary in a wide range of contexts. In order to avoid such potential problems in the future, more meticulous and intensive research on various aspects of English loanwords and their effects on L2 learning must be conducted before the Ministry of Education announces another revised national curriculum. That is, pedagogical decisions on the selection of true cognate loanwords commonly used in daily life must be made based on individual empirical evidence obtained from scientific investigations.

References

Ard, J. and T. Homburg. 1983. Verification of language transfer. In S. M. Gass and L. Selinker, eds., *Language Transfer in Language Learning*, 157-176. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Banta, F. G. 1981. Teaching German vocabulary: The use of English cognates and common loan words. *Modern Language Journal* 65(2), 129-136.

Coxhead, A. 2000. A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(2), 213-238.

Daulton, F. E. 1998. Japanese loanword cognates and the acquisition of English vocabulary. *The Language Teacher* 22(1), 17-25.

Dang, T. N. Y., A. Coxhead and S. Webb. 2017. The academic spoken word list. *Language Learning* 67(4), 959-997.

Daulton, F. E. 2008. *Japan's Built-in Lexicon of English-based Loanwords*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Davis, M. and D. Gardner. 2010. *A Frequency Dictionary of Contemporary English: Word Sketches, Collocates and Thematic Lists*. New York: Routledge.

Gardner, D. and M. Davies. 2014. A new academic vocabulary list. *Applied Linguistics* 35(3), 305-327.

Haspelmath, M. 2009. Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath and U.

Tadmor, eds., *Loanwords in the World's Language: A Comparative Handbook*, 35−54. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haspelmath, M. and U. Tadmor, eds. 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26(2), 210−331.

Jarvis, S. 2009. Lexical transfer. In A. Pavlenko, ed., *The Bilingual Mental Lexicon: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, 99−124. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Jiang, N. 2002. Form−meaning mapping in vocabulary acquisition in a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 617−637.

Juilland, A. G. and E. Chang−Rodriguez. 1964. *Frequency Dictionary of Spanish Words*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Kent, D. B. 1999. Speaking in tongues: Chinglish, Japlish and Konglish. In Korea TESOL, ed., *Proceedings of the Second Pan Asian Conference*, 197-209. Seoul: Korea TESOL.

Kim, H, B. Kang and J. Hong. 2007. 21st Century Sejong Corpora (to be) completed. *The Korean Language in America* 12, 31−42.

Lado, R. 1955. Patterns of difficulty in Vocabulary. *Language Learning* 6(1−2), 23−41.

Lee, H. 2001. English loanword phonology in Korean. *Language Research* 37(1), 177−200.

Lee, H. S. 1958. English−Korean cognates. *Language Learning* 8(3−4), 57−72.

Lee, D. J., J. Yeon, I. Hwang and S. Lee. 2010. KKMA: A tool for utilizing Sejong Corpus based on relational database. *Journal of KIISE: Computing Practices and Letters* 16(11), 1046−1050.

Leech, G., P. Rayson and A. Wilson. 2001. *Word Frequencies in Written and Spoken English.* Harlow, UK: Longman.

Lemhöfer, K. and T. Dijkstra. 2004. Recognizing cognates and interlexical homographs: Effects of code similarity in language specific and generalized lexical decision. *Memory and Cognition* 32, 533−550.

Masson M.−E. 2013. How L1 loanwords can create a false sense of familiarity with L2 vocabulary meaning and usage. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction* 2(1), 8−14.

Min, H. 1998. A study on the foreign words of Korean language. *Korean Semantics* 2, 91−132.

Nation, I. S. P. 2001. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. 2003. The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal* 5(2), 1-8.

Nation, I. S. P. 2006. How large a vocabulary is needed for reading. *The Canadian Modern*

Language Review 63(1), 59-82.

Nation, I. S. P. and R. Waring. 1997. Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. In N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy, eds., *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*, 6-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

No, M.-H. 2009. The word-formation of borrowed words in Korean. *The Korean Language and Literature* 153, 5-30.

Otwinowska, A. 2016. *Cognate Vocabulary in Loanword Acquisition and Use: Attitudes, Awareness, Activation*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Palmberg, R. 1987. On lexical inferencing and the young foreign-language learner. *System* 15(1), 69-76.

Pearson Longman, 2007. *Longman Communication 3000*. Pearson Longman.

Ringbom, H. 2007. *Cross-linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rodriguez, T. A. 2001. From the known to the unknown: Using cognates to teach English to Spanish-speaking literates. *The Reading Teacher* 54(8), 744-746.

Rogers, J., S. Webb and T. Nakata. 2015. Do the cognacy characteristics of loanwords make them more easily learned than noncognates? *Language Teaching Research* 19(1), 9-27.

Schepens, J., T. Dijkstra and F. Grootjen. 2012. Distribution of cognates in Europe as based on Levenshtein distance. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 15(1), 157-166.

Schmitt, N. 2000. *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaffer, D. E. 2014. English-based loanwords: Characteristics, learner preferences, and pedagogical potential. *Journal of International Culture* 7(2), 1-40.

Sheperd, J. 1996. Loanwords: A pitfall for all students. *The Internet TESL Journal* 2(2). Retrieved from iteslj.org/Articles/Shepherd-Loanwords.html.

Simon-Maeda, A. 1995. Language awareness: Use/misuse of loan-words in the English language in Japan. *The Internet TESL Journal* 1(2). Retrieved from iteslj.org/Articles/Maeda-Loanwords.html.

Sohn, H-M. 1994. *Korean*. New York: Routledge.

Swan, M. 1997. The influence of the mother tongue on second language acquisition and use. In N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy, eds., *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*, 156-180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takač, V. P. (2008). *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Talamas, A., J. F. Kroll and R. Dufour. 1999. From form to meaning: Stages in the

acquisition of second language vocabulary. *Bilingualism*: *Language and Cognition* 2, 45−58.

Thomason, S. G. and T. Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tranter, N. 2000. The phonology of English loan−words in Korean. *Word* 51(3), 377−404.

Traugott, E. C. 2017. Semantic Change. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics.* Retrieved 11 Dec. 2020, from https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/ acrefore−9780199384655−e−323.

Tyson, R. 1993. English loanwords in Korean: Patterns of borrowing and semantic change. *El Two Talk* 1(1), 29−36.

Uchida, E. 2001. *The Use of Cognate Inferencing Strategies by Japanese Learners of English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex, Colchester, UK.

van Hell, J. and T. Dijkstra. 2002. Foreign language knowledge can influence native language performance in exclusively native context. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 9, 780−789.

West, M. 1953. *A General Service List of English Words*. London: Longman, Green & Co.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Lee, Jiyong
Postdoctoral researcher, Department of English Education
Konkuk University
120 Neungdong−ro, Gwangjin−gu
Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02) 450−3906
Email: jiyonglee0123@gmail.com

Received: December 13, 2020
Revised: December 20, 2020
Accepted: December 23, 2020

Appendix A

The List of Source Words for Loanwords of the 2009 RNCE

album, apartment, badminton, banana, bench, bus, cake, card, cheese, chess, chocolate, coat, coffee, computer, crayon, cream, cup, curry, dollar, doughnut, elevator, film, fork, game, graph, guitar, gum, hamburger, hockey, iguana, Internet, jacket, jam, jean, juice, kangaroo, kiwi, lemon, marathon, melon, notebook, orange, pajama, panda, party, pen, piano, pie, pizza, plastic, pool, program (BE programme), quiz, racket, ribbon, robot, rocket, salad, sandwich, scarf, shirt, skate, ski, snack, soup, spaghetti, steak, sweater, taxi, television/TV, tennis, tomato, truck, T-shirt, violin, website, X-ray, zipper (78 words)

Appendix B

Distributional Properties of the Defective or Nontrue Cognates of the 2015 RNCE

Rank	Source word	Loanword	Frequency	Range	Dispersion
4	service	seobiseu	3554	6	.486
5	apartment	apateu	3420	7	.379
12	model	model	1851	6	.330
16	sport	seupocheu	1502	6	.532
23	star	seuta	993	5	.492
28	interview	inteobyu	810	6	.510
31	vision	bijeon	699	6	.267
33	terror	tereo	617	5	.249
34	channel	chaeneol	597	5	.495
35	campaign	kaempein	586	5	.366
39	golf	golpeu	509	6	.348
41	course	koseu	491	6	.459
45	project	peurojekteu	454	5	.449
49	league	rigeu	432	5	.035
52	set	seteu	409	6	.443
53	film	pilleum	406	5	.381
54	kiss	kiseu	401	6	.237
55	issue	isyu	380	5	.428

59	party	pati	331	6	.530
60	notebook	noteu	325	5	.274
61	event	ibenteu	310	6	.440
73	pipe	paipeu	249	5	.324
74	ski	seuki	243	5	.373
76	box	bakseu	238	4	.402
77	belt	belteu	230	4	.402
78	bench	benchi	229	5	.311
79	member	membeo	228	5	.487
83	camp	kaempeu	218	6	.396
85	essay	esei	214	6	.462
91	veil	beil	195	3	.245
92	gum	kkeom	192	6	.298
94	coat	koteu	188	5	.178
97	diet	daieoteu	183	6	.563
99	tent	tenteu	175	4	.388
101	technology	tekeunolloji	172	4	.121
107	mask	maseukeu	154	5	.318
108	schedule	seukejul	154	4	.472
110	dress	deureseu	146	5	.292
112	fiction	piksyeon	144	4	.128
114	interior	interieo	140	3	.426
124	skate	seukeiteu	109	6	.602
126	spy	seupai	107	4	.507
128	fork	pokeu	105	5	.193
129	comic	komik	103	4	.541
130	sketch	seukechi	103	4	.382
132	click	keullik	98	4	.562
133	rocket	roket	93	4	.272
139	feminist	peminiseuteu	76	6	.258
140	gallery	gaelleori	76	3	.269
141	manual	maenyueol	74	4	.502

142	sample	saempeul	73	5	.540
145	motor	moteo	68	6	.409
148	track	teuraek	64	5	.617
149	chicken	chikin	63	5	.452
150	sponsor	seuponseo	63	5	.387
151	court	koteu	61	5	.441
156	villa	billa	59	3	.280
158	spray	seupeurei	56	3	.353
159	highlight	hairaiteu	53	5	.420
162	hint	hinteu	45	5	.311
163	parade	peoreideu	45	4	.356
164	jump	jeompeu	44	5	.444
166	arch	achi	42	3	.254
167	chart	chateu	42	4	.458
168	market	maket	42	4	.434
174	catalogue	katallogeu	34	3	.381
177	snack	seunaek	30	5	.355
180	alarm	allam	25	4	.397
182	jam	jaem	24	5	.224
183	pilot	pailleot	24	4	.457
187	fence	penseu	21	1	−.061
188	section	seksyeon	21	4	.399
189	harmony	hamoni	20	3	.380
190	topic	topik	20	5	.285
192	plug	peulleogeu	18	3	.245
194	guard	gadeu	13	1	−.061
195	magic	maejik	13	3	.275
196	drill	deuril	11	3	.463
197	website	wepsaiteu	6	2	.250
198	echo	eko	3	2	.250
199	okay	okei	0	0	