

Positioning of Discourse in Korean Education

Heo, Seonik Changwon Science High School

- I. Introduction
- II. Raising Issues and Goals of the study
- III. Concept of Discourse and Contents of Discourse teaching
- IV. Practice of Discourse Teaching
- V. Conclusion

I. Introduction

As widely acknowledged, language is a vehicle for man's thoughts and feelings. Especially discourse¹ as language use is not only the performance of a task but also the construction and reproduction of social relation, social identity and power relations. In this respect, discourse as a product of social activity is a significant concept of the individual and societal level. It is all the better for the students because they will get along with others who communicate with them. For them, at the same time, it is learning media to see how it does, how it works effectively and how it has to be used. In Korean² education(Korean as native language), we should teach them.

- 1 In this article discourse is used to embrace the concept of text which is part of language use or written language. This terminology reflects the fact that discourse as a social practice has been regarded as a critical discourse analysis. And it is a theoretical concept which has the denotation of language use, that is, written language and spoken language.
- 2 According to the phrase of National Language Curriculum, common course subject *national language* as a English subject name might be used. However, the term 'national language' is not widely accepted except in Korea and Japan (in this country as a result of militarism). So, this term is not used obstinately and the term Korean education is used to refer to native language education in this article.

Owing an awareness to the crisis of grammar education, studies on identity and position of school grammar have increased in Korean education (Heo Seonik, 2009). The contents, goal and various teaching methods of grammar education have been proposed. In those proposals, the contents of discourse education or discourse grammar have been constructed. It is not clear where discourse education is and what we should teach, however. That being said, appropriateness of doing discourse education has been made known, there is still a lack of concreteness about how and what we should do. Sources of this defect would be many. First of all, what is discourse and what functions of introducing it is in Korean education not have been clear.³ It could be noted that there is deficiency of concreteness of contents and the role of discourse in Korean curriculum and textbooks. And there is ignorance of the social function of language at the base of this. The latter means that discourse that might cover realm in Korean education is narrow. That is, the thought that discourse is a social practice is not reflected in Korean education curriculum properly. The role of discourse is only another level of explanation about language use. Disorder of terminology, between discourse and text, is likely to work as a secondary factor that causes discourse education to be insufficient. So, the concept of discourse to which corresponds with the goal of Korean education should be established. And the contents of discourse competence should be constructed by it. To do so, the position of discourse in Korean education should be clear.

3 Actually, textbook, published according to the 2009 revision curriculum, *Korean I* for highschool, includes a composition lesson which is composed of concepts like cohesion and coherence. These are concepts of discourse. This fact reflects that composition and discourse are not strictly discernible in the textbook writer's intention or curriculum designer's mind.

II. Raising Issues and Goals of the Study

The term discourse was first introduced in the 7th Korean curriculum (henceforth KC).⁴ As an ‘object of understanding Korean’, discourse is one of the elements of grammar such as the following: phoneme, word, vocabulary, and meaning. Though it has a narrow⁵ role, discourse has a part in grammar education. In the 2009 revision of KC, discourse referred to spoken language data which show its use.^{6·7} There are not any expression about discourse except addressing genre.⁸ In this case it is always contrast to the term text.⁹ If we take into consideration this situation, the reason for introducing discourse into Korean education is not clear.¹⁰

If the reason for this is an economic one, it would not be the case. If so, spoken data which corresponds to written data would be more

4 More accurately it appears as *iyagi* (or discourse) in the 4th KC. It's in the 6th KC that the concept of discourse has a role in units of communication.

5 It is narrow in that discourse is limited to the part of grammar. So to speak, as objects of inquiry, structure, conception, and meaning of discourse are presented. It is irony that the concept of discourse is being taught but we are not teaching of its practice.

6 In KC, *Korean* used data that have been composed of three parts; discourse, writing and literature work. There is a general tendency to refer written language to text, and spoken language to discourse. But in this article, as pointed out before, discourse is used to indicate written and spoken language. The reason will be addressed below.

7 In Heo Jaeyoung and Seong Heuiyoung (2013: 62~63), the transition of the usage of text and discourse is scrutinized in domestic and overseas studies (Goffman, 1981; Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Widdowson, 1979; van Dijk, 1977). They point out disorder of the usage, and also refer discourse to spoken language (in *speech*). On the other hand, Lim Gyuhong (2012) points out that scholars have their own extensions according to their disciplines.

8 In *Reading and Grammar*, it is used partially (cf. footnote 4).

9 It is rarely possible for everyone to use terminology unanimously at one time, but it need be suitable to achieve an educational goal.

10 Although there are contents for discourse teaching in a selective subject in *Reading and Grammar* partly, those who don't select it can't have the opportunity to understand them. In this case, the reason for determining selective subjects should be transparent. The core or common contents of discourse teaching should be established and its rationale should be validated.

proper because it is more noticeable and economic. When we take into consideration that the term text¹¹ · ¹² has not been used, using the term would not be more equitable.

I suspect this problem might result from the presupposition that written language and spoken language are strictly different.¹³ These have more common things than discrete things in language usage. For example, the presentation of a report after writing on some films: what is it? Is it spoken or written language? In Korean education, it is natural that we focus not on difference but on similarity.¹⁴ A way to teach and treat them is that we could constitute the contents of teaching focused on features of them respectively in the elementary school. We could also center around contents consolidating them to develop communication competence in upper middle school. When we do that, the way of consolidation between different media would be open.

The more important thing we need to attention to is that there have been no relations between 『*Reading and Grammar*』, 『*Speech and Composition*』, and high school 『*Korean I*』 or 『*Korean II*』. In a view of logic of the curriculum, the contents of discourse teaching in these textbooks should be related to spoken language. But there isn't any correlation between them.

Eventually the concept of discourse is limited to the conception, structure and meaning of it. If the content of textbooks have been constructed like this, it might be impossible to teach students discourse as a language use. So we needs to establish the concept and a

11 In the 2009 revision KC, the term *geul* (or writing) is used. Rather, it is more proper to use *deongi-s-geul* (or text) which corresponds to text rather than to use *geul*. *Geul* is not addressed in a grammar area, as Lim Gyuhong (2010) pointed out.

12 In Korean education studies, it is practice to consider that production is related to discourse, whereas expression occasionally corresponds to text.

13 This means written language and spoken language only have something in common.

14 As have been pointed out by Chafe (1982), Ong (1982), Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are distinguishable differences between written language and spoken language. What is more important feature should be determined in teaching. It is register that would be one of them.

new realm of discourse. And we need to widen its scope.¹⁵

To achieve this goal, it needs to identify the concept of discourse. First of all, discrimination of the concept between grammar and discourse will be made in this paper. To identify the concept of discourse, I distinguish discourse and grammar which confines object of study to under sentence. And then, because the term discourse and text have been widely used in the studies of communication and language, it is useful to make use of them for further discussion about discourse. Through this argument, the level of addressing discourse is plain in discourse education. Then we can establish the contents of discourse education. Finally, it is reasonable to present the practices of applying what has been discussed in this paper. Doing so, the discussion of this paper would have concreteness and justification.

III. Concept of Discourse and Contents of Discourse Teaching

1. Concept of discourse vs grammar

Discourse consists of written language and spoken language. These are divided into subparts according to the activity in which they are used: reading, writing, listening and speaking. So, learning to use Korean means discourse learning. Language use itself would be impossible with isolated sentence in a sense. For example, a one-line advertisement, on the assumption of having internal linguistic knowledge of the mother tongue inherently, might be possible to understand wholly when we realize when it is used, where it is, and

15 This paper is different from that of Lim Gyuhong (2007) in that this paper insists on the demanding of teaching discourse in grammar and communication widely, while Lim Gyuhong (2007) argues the necessity of teaching it in grammar. That is to say, owing to achievements so far (cf. Lim Gyuhong, 2007) and to the 2009 revision KC, it is ready to support the logical need to teach discourse grammar to some degree.

what comes together.

What we say one can understand an utterance or a text whatever the length of it may be, we mean that one primarily has knowledge of a language. It also means that one has the knowledge of its usage. Knowledge of language has been called grammar. Knowledge of given language or grammar is, currently assumed to be innate in humans (cf. Kim Jeehong 2010) and important to be obedient to rules which are inherent in a language. That is to say, it is more important to consider rules than interlocutor and context or situation. Complying to rules or parameters¹⁶ of grammar determines the acceptability of expressions. Grammar in this dimension focuses on explaining and identifying particular grammar rules and units which belong to a sentence. Hierarchy of language units (1) represent the objects of traditional school grammar, and each unit has been treated roughly under the name of phonology, morphology, semantics, syntax, etc.¹⁷ These are subcategories of grammar,¹⁸ and each member is devoted to discover and search rules which work on units to construct a sentence.

(1) hierarchy of language units

sound ≤ syllable ≤ [phoneme] ≤ morpheme ≤ word ≤ word cluster ≤ phrase ≤ sentence

When we consider aspects of language use, grammar in this case, they are not sufficient for explaining other parts of units of grammar. In other words, hierarchy has been shown in (1) is needed to lengthen to encompass language use as in (2).

16 For example, there is an honorific system in Korean.

17 Morris (1938) has classified semiotics into syntax, semantics and pragmatics (recite in Song Kyongsook, 2003: 17). Song (2003) has introduced the methodology of discourse study: pragmatics, speech act theory, conversational analysis, variation analysis, interactional sociolinguistic and ethnography of communication.

18 The term grammar fluctuates to indicate parts of studies on language from all of the given studies to only syntax. For the sake of explanation, in this context, it indicates all of the inquiries into language except for discourse.

(2) prolonged hierarchy of language units
 sound ≤ syllable ≤ [phoneme] ≤ morpheme ≤ word ≤ word cluster ≤ phrase ≤ sentence ≤ paragraph ≤ text or discourse

If we consider the prolonged hierarchy of language units in (2), it would be transparent that traditional school grammar units is insufficient. Because these aspects of language units go beyond the boundaries of a sentence. Actually sentences' sequence compose discourse: classroom discourse (among others, Baek Jeong-i, 2010), dealing discourse (Seo Yugyeong 2004), etc.

In discourse as language use, it is important to consider interlocutor, context and situation for communicating smoothly. This point may be well explained by considering a situation of a conversation.¹⁹ Conversation between interlocutors will progress differently according to the interlocutors.²⁰ For example, student-student dialogue and student-teacher dialogue are different from each other because of the change in participants. Even in a student-student one that has same characters, the conversation will be different due to where and when it takes place. Place and time always change and they alter situations, for the better or worse. Even in a single sentence, the meaning of a sentence fluctuates according to context.²¹

A summary of the discussion so far will be shown in table 1.

Table 1. differences between grammar and discourse

Level	Language units	Acceptability	
		Criterion	Element or rationale
grammatical	from sound/alphabet to sentence	grammaticality	grammar
discursive	from sentence to text or discourse	relevance	interlocutor, context or situation

19 Conversation is basal communication as indicated in Heo Seonik (2013: 13).

20 It indicate both speaker-hearer and writer-reader.

21 For example, “I’ll come tomorrow.” has several meanings: a promise, threat and willingness.

In table 1, relevance is a concept from an application of Wilson and Sperber (1986). It's a byproduct of humanity that appears in the process of communication. Man has a tendency to give one's attention to something related to himself. It affects the context of communication which makes possible trade-off for information at the least cost and lessens the cognitive load of interlocutors. It also makes the situation or context concrete afterwards successively.

So far I have discussed the need for the concept of discourse in contrast to grammar. This argument will be requisite for a proposal to educate discourse. This implies not that grammar education doesn't need to be done but that discourse education should be executed more actively and different from grammar.²² This implies that discourse is not only a part of an object of grammar but also an independent realm of communication.

2. Dimension of discourse: internal vs external

I will use the term discourse as a metalanguage to cover written language (=text) and spoken language (=discourse) in this article. It is assumed that discourse as a language use has two aspects in this article.

These aspects are divided into two dimensions: internal and external. Internal means the elements which exist in discourse interrelate and work to form self-contained discourse. Sources which are in discourse are utilized, for participants in order to construct and form, information and interaction between interlocutors in discourse. External means that the constituents of discourse contribute so that participants can integrate and generate information and interaction^{23 · 24}

22 The idea that grammar treats the order of words seems incompatible with this proposal because discourse is a kind of word. That is not the case. I only stress the necessity of discourse education.

23 Kintsch (1998), proposing a comprehension model as a comprehender's reading process, consider comprehension as a construct-integration process of information.

between interlocutors can happen beyond a discourse. Such a distinction may require not so much for discourse study itself but for discourse education because it needs to consider the phase and easiness²⁵ of teaching in preparation and design of contents of education.

The difference of these dimensions will be shown in table 2.1 and continued in table 2.2 which is devoted to the application of these dimensions. This distinction will help us design the contents of discourse education. On the other hand, it will bring to us what should be taught in both dimensions.

Table 2.1. contrast between dimensions: internal and external

Dimension	Range	Discursive Factors		
		Elements	Activity	Required sources
internal	in a discourse	cohesion	construction and formation of information or interaction	basal literacy and oracy ↓↑↓↑↓↑↓↑↓↑
		coherence		
external	beyond a discourse	Strategies of communication	integration and generation of information or interaction	knowledge of practice of communication, world knowledge

I borrowed from his concept. To integrate information which exists in discourse, it needs to use resources which are in a comprehender's mind. These resources include background knowledge and world knowledge.

24 In KC (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2012), the purpose of communication is divided into three subsets: conveyance of information, persuasive writing/speaking and the expression of friendship and emotion. I suggest that these are classified into roughly two subparts: trading-off information and interaction. They are centered around the goal of the speaker and hearer according to focus. Such a distinction is more explanatory in that genres of discourse have a tendency to have a fuzziness about them. This fuzziness will be shown as follows:

←	More informative	informative+interactive	more interactive	→
expository lectures	text - report	essay - miscellany	- private intimate	letters dialogue

25 It means that the presentation of content and method of teaching should be constructed in order of level. the low level of learning is more familiar, more frequent, easier and more contactable.

of discourse nature in the internal dimension first. First of all, it is important to identify whether a sequence of utterances or clusters of a sentence is discourse in the internal approach of discourse. It is textuality that could be used as the criterion. Textuality has been discussed widely. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) have indicated seven criteria of textuality: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability,²⁶ informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality. Though we could consider all these criteria, we can't consider all of them in detail, especially under middle school, in an educational context because there is variation between them in the scope of application and the importance of them.²⁷ Cohesion has been taken as capital criteria in the study of textuality. Cohesion indicates linkage relation which results from a dependence on individual elements which constitute a discourse. It has been identified more clearly and works on more elements of discourse more frequently and consistently than other criteria. Therefore, it is the primary content of teaching of the internal dimension in discourse education. Focus of teaching consist of the recognition of types of cohesion in this dimension.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are five types of cohesion: substitution, ellipsis, reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. These cohesive devices make a discourse more clear and concise, which in turn contributes positively to meaning construction and interaction with hearers and readers. The devices, also, help interlocutors more effectively acquire information²⁸ and interact with each other relevantly.

Construction and formation of interaction are taken into account property of discourse activity in this dimension.²⁹ Discourse is self-

26 It is not identical to that of table 1. In table 1 it is a superordinate concept which encompasses grammaticality and relevance.

27 Even Beaugrande and Dressler, the first proposers of these criteria, have pointed out its variability. For other additory explanations, see Renkema (1992: 63).

28 Information covers meaning, idea and feeling which would appear in a discourse.

29 Kintsch (1998) addressed construction as a process of comprehension. Here I propose

contained and an object of construction and formation in a given discourse for smooth communication in the dimension. Therefore a speaker or writer who can't construct and form discourse could not be a competent speaker. What is worse is that he could not be an interactive community member. Construction and formation of discourse is necessitated to both expression and understanding. Awareness of cohesion keeps the relevance of production and make the comprehender's records memorable. So the internal dimension of discourse, especially cohesion, should be the basic content of teaching.

There is a constitution of micro-proposition (≒micro-theme) in discourse. This micro-proposition is not a stable proposition, but a temporal one. That is to say, it has a text or discourse base and it is easy to vary through the process of dialogue or reading in the process of the constitution of theme, especially like this kind of micro-theme, coherence would occur in a range and it would be often judged that coherence doesn't exist when a range of micro-proposition goes over a given discourse.³⁰ It is well explained with the following example.³¹

(3) Jeongrae Jo wrote more than 20 novels. Will you have dinner with me tonight?

At first glance, these two sentences have no linkage relation. but if we take into consideration the situation that there is a dinner wager on how many novels Jeongrae Jo has written it make sense. As a result, someone has to serve dinner. When we think collectively about this situation, it has coherence. To grasp its coherent mean-

the formation to encompass an aspect of production. Construction corresponds to the aspect of understanding, while formation corresponds to aspect of expression in a discourse.

30 As an example of a non-lingual source, the sequence and conventionalized knowledge have been indicated in Brown and Yule (1983).

31 Following the example shows coherence which goes beyond discourse. I only want to emphasize a lot of coherence has an aspect of external dimension.

ing, it needs to consider situation. In order to reflect on this fact, the coherence range from internal dimension to external dimension in table 2.1.

2) foci of external dimension in terms of discourse education

The external dimension is related to the enlargement of the interlocutor's mind. That is to say, based on what discourse says, it needs to be involved in the interpretation and reception of information or interaction in an interlocutor's mind to integrate it. It needs to keep discourse records and recall information which has been in the producer's mind or memory in order to generate information and interaction related to discourse.

The integration and generation of information and interaction is requisite to both production and understanding just as constitution and formation are. In the process of production, integration works to recall discourse records and take into account the coherence of newly updated contents.³² This is the procedure of understanding, integration of discourse into what one have known already is arisen. In the summary task, a generation of macro-proposition (≒theme of whole discourse) would be generated if it is needed. In the production and comprehension, integration and generation work through the whole process whether it is conscious or not.

Generation of interaction means that relations between interlocutors that already have been formed change according to the contents or aspects of discourse. Contrary to the formation of relations in the internal dimension, it reflects the fact that relations formed more concretely. For example, two participants who do not know each other, as discourse develops, the relations may vary considerably. The relation of the speaker and hearer will change into friends, lovers, enemies, etc. That is, the relations have been made more concrete.

32 Macro-proposition of a discourse do not always come from interlocutor's mind. As noted in van Dijk (1980), there's zero rules which generates macro-proposition.

Because text has interrelation between textures, participants such as the speaker or reader should recognize it. This recognition is inclusive in generation.³³ In conclusion, relevance to discourse situation and interlocutors might be gained through integration and generation. The comprehension of a situation should take place to accomplish proper integration and generation of information and interaction because fixed meanings of a expression and unchanging relations are unlikely to exist. Additionally, strategies of communication should be used to understand and express harmonious and effective communication according to types of discourse.

3) provisional conclusion

In the discussion so far, textuality which shows the nature of discourse, cohesion and coherence which belong to textuality might be the contents of teaching for discourse at stand point of internal dimension. In the internal dimension, construction and formation of information and interaction is executed in discourse.

Integration and generation of information is requisite to production and understanding in the external dimension. A series of studies, for example Heo Seonik (2007, 2010, 2013b, 2014a³⁴ · ³⁵) have showed how most students generate and integrate information. These studies indicate that constitution and formation have been discovered in some degree, but integration and generation haven't. As a result, a

- 33 In the era of electricity, hyper text is well used. Integration and generation will be more needed in communication through hypertext.
- 34 Heo Seonik (2014a) shows the consequence of analyzing hearer's constitution of a situation model (according to Kintsh, 1998) making use of a qualitative method. 4 Remarkable features have been identified. One of them is the deficiency of the metalanguage and recognition of macro structure. Metalanguage should result from a students' background knowledge.
- 35 Heo Seonik (2007) studies aspects of utilizing other texts for expository text. Heo Seonik (2010) also shows aspects of the summarization of essay. Heo Seonik (2013b) analyzed students' essay summarization to identify the summary rule. Focus of study of Heo Seonik (2014a) has shaped of the situation model of listening comprehension for high school students. These studies encompass writing, reading and hearing.

situation model which could take various shapes is not sufficient for integration and generation of information and interaction. The fact that students don't integrate and generate information and interaction correctly is problematic. This means that students can not generate new knowledge and view phenomena from their own critical perspective against another's view.³⁶ In this context, discourse education, more specifically the practice of strategies of communication, is most needed. Effective strategies of communication should be mobilized more actively.

3. Implication for discourse teaching

The implication for discourse teaching will be treated, as before, in two dimensions. Because two dimensions do not imply that they have stage, these don't need to divorce. That being said, these could be taught in the same discourse activity in a task.

In the internal dimension, the goal of teaching discourse is recognition and practice of basic discourse type. This goal reflects the principles which are innate to discourse should be taught in this dimension. Principles which should be taught is not simple and easy but basic and obligatory. For these principles, we should teach these contents : cohesive device, summarization rule³⁷ and management of interaction.³⁸

36 This idea would be thought real state of Korean Education is extremely exaggerated but if we scrutinize classroom of reading and writing, and take count of Heo Seonik's discussions, it would not be the case. This situation is not restricted to Korean Education. In America 45% of university students don't progress remarkably in composition and critical thinking (Arum and Roksa, 2011)

37 Heo Seonik (2010) distinguished a summarization in a broad sense from one in a narrow sense of word. The former indicates a more general summarization rule which applies to most of texts freely. The latter represents a more specific summarization which is specific to particular genre or task. In internal dimension summarization indicates the former summarization which includes information accretion and information deletion. They have been proposed as the five summary rule in van Dijk (1980).

38 In speaking, the management of interaction is treated by Heo Seonik(2013a) which

- a. summarization strategies – accretion and reduction of information – inference; proposition and implication
- b. contextualization – rules of politeness, cooperative principle, conventions of discourse, knowledge of discourse frame, rhetorics⁴²
- c. self-regulation – revision – substitution, amalgamate, addition, deletion

In briefly, the contents of external dimension for discourse teaching are strategies of communication. This could contain several strategies which connect discourse to the real world via an interlocutor's mind. Therefore, making use of strategies⁴³ of communication is most important in the external dimension. This does not mean that strategies, if any, are not important in the internal dimension. Rather, this means that those are restricted and finite. It is a strategy related to the external dimension that requires a real performance. The problem of designing contents to teach discourse strategies is not simple. A few strategies have been discovered, and even they are not elaborated enough to apply to discourse teaching.⁴⁴ So, I will present only a few of strategies which are widely acknowledged and relatively clear in the study of discourse. These are divided roughly into three subcategories as in (5). In the design of these categories, I tried to cover four communication activities: reading, writing, speaking and hearing. (5a) is related to literacy, that is, the ability to read and write. (5b) is related to oracy, that is, the competence to speak and hear. This distinction may not apply to four areas strictly. For example, cooperative

The significance of summarization has been widely discussed (Heo Soenik, 2010, among others).

42 Rhetorics is a undeveloped field in Korean education. Though several of rhetorical techniques are illogical, it bases the logic. So, as a kind of logical training its teaching should be encouraged upper high school. Kim Yonggyu (2007) would be helpful for a realistic reference.

43 Since strategy is related to war, the term cognitive activity or cognitive ability is preferred recently (Levy and Ransdell, 1996).

44 Although the circumstance is not good, it is valuable to the endeavor to elicit contents of discourse teaching. More effort is needed to apply appropriately this to the context of education.

principle in (5b) would be applied to writing a letter and strategies of summarization would be applied to hearing a lecture.⁴⁵

Because (4a) has properties of the internal, contrary to (4), the textuality of (4a) is omitted in (5). (5a) becomes simpler than (4b), but accretion and reduction of information needs high level thinking, that is to say, inference. According to Kintsch (1993), inference is roughly divided into two categories. These are either automated or controlled. Controlled inference especially need to composition and decomposition of discourse. The meaning of presupposition and implication could be gained through inference.

In (5b), contextualization means that expression and production is to be made appropriately in the context of discourse. The complication of it depends on the communication activity, but the contents of teaching have not any specification centered around core principle or strategy in KC.

Politeness strategies originated in Goffman (1956), and are developed by Brown & Levinson (1978). They are needed for interaction in various situation. They would make expression more careful, so it would make interpersonal relations smooth. The contents of politeness strategies might be 1) the effect of indirect expression, 2) the grade of politeness, and 3) the felicity condition of illocution.⁴⁶ Both daily conversation and writing of essays might necessitate politeness strategies. Habermas (1981) proposes a basic illocution of verbs: invite, presume, defy, offer condolences, request, describe, acquit, guarantee, and order (recite in Renkema, 1992: 51). For extension of thinking skills, an inquiry of the felicity of these verbs will be helpful.

Grice's cooperative principle is relatively well known. These principles governing cooperation in conversation are two fold. One rule

45 The discussion of application on the main learning activity of a realm (i.e. speaking), to a another (i.e. writing) is to go beyond the scope of this paper.

46 This idea comes from Austin (1976). He distinguished utterance in three kinds of speech acts: locution, illocution, perlocution. In theory of speech acts, the most interesting is illocution.

is for the allocation of turns, which is presented in (4c). The other is the characterization of the contribution of participants. Although it is vague to some degree as in maxim of quantity, four maxims could be used as a means of care for others in the writing of expository text, essay, or greetings.

A frame⁴⁷ is mental construction that forms the method which we view our world(Lakoff, 2004: 11). And it reflects our mode of thinking, planning and ways of deciding. Though Lakoff says it in regards of discourse of politics, it shows us a method of language use. So, it is helpful to comprehend another's intention and express one's thought within these frames in daily life. The difference of frame reflect especially the distinction of opinion and idea, so comprehension of it will be useful in negotiation, debate, and public speech.

(5c) has been neglected in Korean education but reflexive awareness of oneself is human nature. Especially, communication as intention realization, it is always necessary.⁴⁸ The degree of manifestation of it would be variable from person to person, so completeness of discourse may result from this, but not all, of course.

Knowledge on types of discourse is identified by Im Chilsung (2008), which classified genres of speech by a criterion of sememe into eight genres in the 2007 revision KC. When determining what should be taught related to the types of discourse is important to consider authenticity. That being said, it is not the easiness of teaching but usefulness when students enter college or work place. So, discourse teaching for types of discourse should focus on academic or professional context in high school.⁴⁹

47 It' meaning has related to Lakoff. It has been used differently in cognitive science, which has same meaning of script as in (4c).

48 In Heo Seonik (2014), native language awareness as specific kind of introspection has been proposed. Self-monitoring is needed in communication, whether it is conscious or not,

49 As subjects for achievement of this goal, there are *Korean II, Speech and Composition, Reading and Grammar* in sub-subject of Korean at high school.

Summary of discussion has done so far is below:

Table 2.2. contrast between dimensions: internal and external

Dimension	Teacing-Learning		Representative teaching-learning activity	
	Goal	Details	Reading & Writings	Speaking & Hearing
internal	recognition and practice of discourse of basic genre	repetition, ellipsis, substitution lexical chain, conjunction, schema, etc.	text-base summarization	Introduction oneself in front of class
external	practical use of strategies	rules of politeness, cooperative principle, knowledge on types of discourse, rhetorics frame, self-regulation, etc.	summarization based on situation model	entrance interview

IV. Practice of Discourse Teaching

Here, I will introduce an example of teaching, on the basis of the debate. The script used in teaching is Martin Ruther King (1929-1968)'s speech⁵⁰ in the Washington peace march. This discourse is persuasive and an example of using effective strategies. I will plan a teaching-learning activity to be centered around each question. The lesson plan was designed in two steps: internal dimension and external dimension.⁵¹

(6) teacher question in the internal dimension

- a. What is the topic of this script?
 - what is not coherent to this topic?

50 This script is presented in <appendix> in Korean. This text is in *Speech and Composition* was published as a textbook according to 2009 revision KC.

51 Of course, this example can not show all of the lesson plan. That is to say, writing (i.e. a letter to him) and speaking (i.e. performance of his voice or students' own texts in a self-selecting theme) activity could be possible. I will only focus on what I have discussed here.

- b. Is the connection between sentences natural?
- c. What element of a cohesive device being used?
- d. What is the referent in the phrase 'this place, we' etc?
- e. What word is in relation to manacles, Negro, dream, prison etc.(in lexical chain with)?
- f. Summarize this text, keeping in mind 'what is his dream?'

(7) teacher question in the external dimension

- a. How did use the rules of politeness?
- b. What did he suppose the audience would know?
- c. On the base of frame that we have learned, what word should he not use? (for example, Negro)
- d. What strategies of communication have been used?
 - to emphasize the sadly crippled life of Negro
 - to justify his assertion
 - to elicit of the cooperation of Negro
 - to elicit of the cooperation of White
- e. What features of the text of this speech have appeared?
- f. What cooperative rule has been violated intentionally?
 - why? when?
 - if in your case, could it be utilized?

V. Conclusion

Until now, I have discussed the positioning of discourse. Distinction between grammar and discourse is established in terms of concept of acceptability and relevance and scope of dealing with language units. This is favorable in order to set up a goal of discourse teaching. To present discourse teaching contents concretely, I have divided the dimensions of discourse into two: internal and external. According to this division, the order of discourse teaching is transparent. In the process of discussion, on the basis of the assumption that the groundwork of strategies is to interact with interlocutor(s), I stress

that strategies of communication are contents of discourse education. As a result, the contents of teaching become abundant. However the hierarchy of contents for discourse teaching is not strict. This is a residual issue for the next article.

- * Submitted: 2014.10.31.
- first Revision Received: 2014.11.30.
- Accepted: 2014.11.30.

REFERENCES

Arum and Roksa (2011). *Academically Adrift*. University of Chicago Press.

Austin (1976). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.

Beaufort (2007). *College Writing and Beyond*. Utah State University Press.

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). *Introduction to textlinguistics* (translated into Korean by Taeok Kim (1990), 『텍스트언어학 입문』, Yangyeonggak).

Brown, P., and Levinson (1978). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G., and Yule (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Clark, *Using Language* (translated into Korean by Jeehong Kim (2009), 『언어사용 밑바닥에 깔린 원리』, Kyungjin).

van Dijk (1980). *Macrostructures*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fairclough (2001). *Language and Power*, Pearson Education (translated into Korean by Jeehong Kim (2011), 『언어와 권력』, Kyungjin Publishing Company).

Halliday and Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Kintsch, W. (1993). Information accretion and reduction in text processing: Inferences, *Discourse Process*, 16, 193-202.

_____ (1998). *Comprehension* (translated into Korean by Jeehong Kim and Seonmo Mun (2010), 『이해』, Nanam).

Lakoff (2004). *Don't think of an elephant* (translated into Korean by Nayoung Yu (2006), 『코끼리는 생각하지 마』, Sam-in).

Levett (1989). *Speaking* (translated into Korean by Jeehong Kim (2008), 『말하기』, Nanam).

Levy and Ransdell (1996). *Science of Writing*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Renkema, J. (1992). *Discourse Studies* (translated into Korean by Wonpyo Lee (1996), 『담화연구의 기초』, Hankook-munhwasa).

Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. Havard University Press (translated into Korean by Tae-ok Kim and Hyonho Lee (1994), 『인지적 활용론』, Hanshin Publishing Co.).

교육과학기술부(2012), 『국어과 교육과정』.

강연임(2013), 『매체와 텍스트』, 한국문화사.

김용규(2007), 『설득의 논리학』, 웅진 지식하우스.

김은성, 「문법교육 내용의 표상체로서의 담화」, 『문법교육』 16, 83-110.

김지홍(2010), 『언어의 심층과 언어교육』, 경진문화사.

백정이(2010), 『교실수업담화 구성교육 내용 연구』, 서울대학교대학원 석사학위논문.

서유경(2004), 『비즈니스 대화의 구조 및 단계별 발화 특징 연구』, 연세대학교대학원

석사학위논문.

송경숙(2003),『담화 화용론』, 한국문화사.

윤석민(2011),『텍스트언어학과 화용론』,『한국어의미학』34, 1-24.

임규홍(2007),『담화 문법 교육에 대하여』,『문법교육』4, 161-183.

_____ (2010),『‘문법’과 ‘독서’의 통합성』,『문법교육』12, 39-64.

_____ (2012),『탐구학습을 통한 담화문법지도 방법에 대하여』,『문법교육』16, 297-326.

임칠성(2008),『화법 교육과정의 ‘담화 유형’에 대한 범주적 접근』,『한국화법학회 제17회 전국학술대회 논문집』.

허선익(2007),『설명문 쓰기에서 다른 덩잇글의 활용 양상』,『배달말』39, 299-338.

_____ (2010),『논설문 요약글의 산출과정에 관련된 변인 분석』, 경상대학교대학원 박사학위논문.

_____ (2013a),『국어교육을 위한 말하기의 기본 개념』, 도서출판 경진.

_____ (2013b),『논설문 요약의 과정에 관련된 요약 규칙과 덩잇글 활용 양상 분석』,『국어교육연구』52집, 231-262.

_____ (2014a),『듣고 이해하기에서 청자의 상황 모형 구성 분석』,『국어교육연구』55집, 77-114.

_____ (2014b),『국어의식의 자리매김』,『국어교육』146, 121-144.

허재영·성희영(2013),『문법의 담화와 화법의 담화』,『한국문법교육학회 제18차 전국학술대회 자료집』, 61-72.

ABSTRACT

Positioning of Discourse in Korean Education

Heo, Seonik

This study investigated the position of discourse in Korean education. First I have discussed the necessity of argument, pointing out the fact that the contents of discourse teaching is not sufficient. For the goal of discourse education to be apparent, I have distinguished discourse from grammar. Dividing it into two dimensions, I have presented it according to these dimensions. In the internal dimension, comprehension and expression of cohesive and coherent discourse have been set up as a teaching-learning activity. On the contrary, strategies of communication have been an established goal of the teaching-learning activity. The strictness and hierarchy of these contents in teaching setting should be residual issues for further debate.

KEYWORDS internal dimension, external dimension, textuality, interaction, strategy of communication, discourse teaching

Martin Luther King' text of speech in Washington peace march

나에게는 꿈이 있습니다

마틴 루서 킹

저는 오늘 우리 역사에서 자유를 위한 가장 위대한 행진으로 기억될 이 자리에 여러분과 함께하게 되어 기쁩니다.

100년 전, 우리 위대한 미국인(링컨 대통령)이 노예 해방령에 서명했습니다. 지금 우리는 그를 상징하는 자리에서 있습니다. 그 중대한 선언은 부당함이라는 불길에 몸을 데이며 시들어 간 수백만 흑인 노예들에게 희망의 등불이었습니다. 그 선언은 노예 생활의 기나긴 밤을 걷어 내는 환희의 새벽이었습니다.

그러나 그로부터 100년이 지났지만 흑인은 여전히 자유롭지 못합니다. 100년이 지났지만 흑인은 여전히 인종 분리 정책이라는 족쇄와 인종 차별이라는 쇠사슬에 묶인 채 절뚝거리며 비참하게 살고 있습니다. 100년이 지났지만 흑인은 이 거대한 물질적 풍요의 바다 한가운데에 가난이라는 섬에 고립되어 살고 있습니다. 100년이 지났지만 흑인은 여전히 미국 사회의 후미진 곳으로 내몰려, 자신의 땅에서 추방당한 채 살고 있습니다. 그리하여 우리는 이 치욕스러운 현실을 알리고자 오늘 이 자리에 모였습니다. 〈중략〉

동지 여러분, 저는 오늘 여러분에게 말씀드리고 싶습니다. 절망의 구렁에 빠져 허우적대지 맙시다.

비록 우리는 지금 고난을 마주하고 있지만 나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 그 꿈은 아메리칸드림¹에 깊이 뿌리를 내리고 있습니다.

나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 언젠가 이 나라가 '모든 인간은 평등하게 태어난다는 사실을 우리는 자명한 진리로 받아들인다.'라는 이 나라 건국 신조의 참뜻을 되새기며 살아가리라는 꿈입니다.

20

25

나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 언젠가 조지아 주의 붉은
언덕에서 노예의 후손과 노예 주인의 후손이 형제애
라는 식탁 앞에 나란히 앉을 수 있는 날이 오리라는
꿈입니다.

5 나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 부당함과 억압의 뜨거운
열기로 신음하는 미시시피 주도 언젠가 자유와 정의
가 샵솟는 오아시스가 되리라는 꿈입니다.

나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 언젠가 내 아이들이 자신
의 피부색이 아니라 인격으로 평가받는 나라에서 살게 되리라는 꿈입니다.

10 지금 나에게는 꿈이 있습니다!

나에게는 꿈이 있습니다. 지독한 인종 차별주의자들이 들끓는 앨라배마, 주지
사가 '주권 우위²'라느니, '연방 법령 실시 거부³'라느니 같은 말만 떠벌리는 저
기 앨라배마에서도 언젠가 흑인 소년, 소녀들이 백인 소년, 소녀들과 형제자매처
럼 손을 마주 잡게 되리라는 꿈입니다.

이것이 우리의 희망입니다. 저는 이러한 믿음을 안고 남부로 돌아갈 것입니다.

이러한 믿음이 있으면 우리는 절망이라는 산을 깨아 희망이라는 돌을 만들 수
있을 것입니다. 이러한 믿음이 있으면 우리는 이 시끄러운 불협화음을 형제애라
는 아름다운 교향곡으로 바꿀 수 있을 것입니다. 이러한 믿음이 있으면 우리는 언
젠가 자유로워지리라는 사실을 알면서 함께 일하고 함께 투쟁하며 함께 감옥에
갈 것이요, 함께 자유를 옹호할 것입니다.

2 주권 우위_ 미국에서 각 주(州)의 권리가 연방 정부의 법령보다 우위에 있다
는 주장.

3 연방 법령 실시 거부_
미국에서 주(州)가 연방 정부에서 통과된 법령의 실
시를 거부하는 것.

