



4-1-2019

# Global Citizenship and Local Social Relations in the Discourse of Self- Development: Translanguaging in Address Terms

Jay Jo

*University of Pennsylvania*, [jojay@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:jojay@gse.upenn.edu)

---

# Global Citizenship and Local Social Relations in the Discourse of Self-Development: Translanguaging in Address Terms

## **Abstract**

This study examines communicative practices of a group of South Korean adults conducting self-organized English practice to develop their oral competence in English. In the context of globalization, these young Koreans organized a study group that practiced English-mediated communication as a means of self-development—a collective discourse in South Korea that encourages individuals to make relentless efforts to develop oneself. However, in this study of communicative practices in a study group, I found that members of the group endorse not only such a societal discourse but also the making of locally-based social relationships among the people sharing similar values and goals. I interpret the instances of simultaneous English–Korean use as translanguaging and examine the interactional sequences where Korean terms of address/reference come into the English-based communication, which can be read as a flexible embracement of the locally-rooted social relations within the practice of a global language.

# Global Citizenship and Local Social Relations in the Discourse of Self-Development: Translanguaging in Address Terms

Jay Jo

*University of Pennsylvania*

This study examines communicative practices of a group of South Korean adults conducting self-organized English practice to develop their oral competence in English. In the context of globalization, these young Koreans organized a study group that practiced English-mediated communication as a means of self-development—a collective discourse in South Korea that encourages individuals to make relentless efforts to develop oneself. However, in this study of communicative practices in a study group, I found that members of the group endorse not only such a societal discourse but also the making of locally-based social relationships among the people sharing similar values and goals. I interpret the instances of simultaneous English–Korean use as translanguaging and examine the interactional sequences where Korean terms of address/reference come into the English-based communication, which can be read as a flexible embracement of the locally-rooted social relations within the practice of a global language.

In the midst of his busy workday, Geunho<sup>1</sup> calls a number of study cafés to arrange a room reservation for the study session of the week. Since he was elected as one of the schedule organizing officers in this term, this will be his weekly responsibility for the next six months. As a senior member, he works as a mentor with Dongha, a first term officer and his partner in the schedule organizing team, to get the coming Saturday’s session ready. On Saturday, Guenho goes to the study café he reserved thirty minutes before the session begins and meets Dongha to confirm the room conditions and reservation details. A few minutes later, Taegoen, the chief officer of the study group for the term, arrives, gets his coffee, sits in one of the desks, and asks Dongha how things are going for her. Twenty minutes after the session should have started, only six people are present. As usual, many members are late. Taegoen steps out to the front and starts the session with English to ask how everyone’s week has been so far and makes a few announcements. He looks around the room. Only two more members have taken their seats. He sighs, switching to Korean, makes a sarcastic joke about how beautiful the weather is and blames the weather for why people are not showing up on time, then in English, asks Hana, this week’s host for *Issue Talk Talk* who is sitting next to him, to begin the session (Fieldnote, Nov. 16, 2013).

The opening vignette illustrates the pre-organization of a study session which was a weekly process for responsible staff of *Multi-Colors*. *Multi-Colors*

---

<sup>1</sup> All names of persons and the group are pseudonyms.

was an exemplary group of young Koreans who practiced *jagi-gyebal* ("self-development") through self-organized study sessions that allowed them to talk to each other in English (Jeon, 2008). In this study, I explore interactional practices of translanguaging among those young Koreans in the processes of acquiring communicative skills in English under this slogan of self-development. The discourse of self-development is a societal discourse in South Korea (hereafter, Korea) that urges individuals to continue learning skills that earn and secure their places in the globalized job market based on local imaginations of transnational networks (Abelmann, Park & Kim, 2009). In this context, Multi-Colors is one example of diverse forms of study groups that facilitate spaces and social relations to enable young Koreans to embody the discourse of self-development by striving to improve their oral proficiency in English. Ideally, Multi-Colors was to be a local center of English learning under interactional capacity-focused regimes in the job market of the East Asian regions—that have increasingly been adding criteria of evaluating oral English proficiency as a necessary condition to pursue careers in white-collar jobs and further promotion opportunities—that help the members to develop themselves and enter the world beyond the geographical boundary of Korea (Abelmann, Park, & Kim, 2009; Kang & Abelmann, 2011).

However, at the level of actual practices, the members of the group constantly employ sociolinguistic norms and features of their local language in their English-mediated communicative activities, as it is not just opportunities of learning they seek from the group, but also the development of locally-based solidarity relationships with people sharing similar values and goals. Through an examination of three interactional sequences from study sessions that involved simultaneous uses of English and Korean, I discuss translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2018; García, 2009; Li & García, 2017) that indexed the covert local meanings in the interactional practices of a global language. The focal point of my analysis is the members' use of address terms: how Korean terms of address/reference were embraced in English-based communications. To address the disjuncture of local-global languages and ideological–interactional practices, I explore the following questions: 1) What are the linguistic components that carry local pragmatic norms, and what are the denotational contents of these components? 2) In what ways do members of the study group adopt such pragmatic features of Korean in their English utterances? 3) How do members understand the disjunction between the conventions of English-based communication and the locally-reflected communicative norm?

### **Theoretical Framework: Global Citizenship, Social Indexicality, and Translanguaging Imagining Global Citizenship**

The idea of global citizenship or local individuals' place in the world is often understood as a product of *imagination* (Appadurai, 1996; Gupta & Ferguson, 1997; Lewellen, 2002). Appadurai (1996) describes imagination as a fundamental quality of modern subjectivity. In the modernist view, the work of imagination was the power that (re)produces regional-/cultural-specific world visions articulated in arts, myths, and legends that configure the social lives of people around the world. In contrast, in poststructuralist perspectives, imagination stands at the frontiers to transcend the geopolitical borders through examinations of the patterns and

processes in people's daily practices mediated by transnational networks of goods, people, media, and language. As language learners build and act upon their transnational subjectivity in their daily lives, they imagine deterritorialized/denationalized spaces where globalization is situated across their existing notions of class, gender, ethnicity, and nationality.

However, it is also important to note that people's imagination of selves and claim for their spot in transnational networks often emerges from the locally-generated social relations and experiences (Robbins, 2007). In exploring the imagination of transnational networks and people who belong to them, identity practices are important cross points where individuals' life trajectories encounter various social realities and imaginations intermingled within the local-global continuum (Lewellen, 2002). To examine identity practices in globalization, Brettell (2000) proposed two approaches: an instrumentalist approach—individuals' strategic understanding of identity and practices to serve pragmatic interests—and a situational approach—emphasizing fluidity and contingency of identity situated in specific historical and social contexts. Both approaches enable individuals to employ the emergent and interactive natures of societies/cultures and the constantly fluctuating worldviews that project the poststructuralist understanding of the multiple modes and shifting bases of self-perception/representation (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). To this extent, the processes of imagining one's positions in the world and integrating others in one's worldviews are not a simple matter of achieving the unification of humanity under the slogan of global citizenship. It is rather a complex interplay between politico-historical issues around local-regional-global scales that homogenize or amplify the differences among ethnic/political groups of distant regions. The purpose of this study is to unpack this complexity through an investigation of the communicative use of global language in a local context where local social norms are covertly reflected, thus constructing the imaginations of globality from local practices.

### **Translanguaging and Indexicality: Beyond the Boundaries of Languages in Culture**

With the influx of diverse media from various global contexts, people imagine lifestyles different from their own. Mobility across geographic and cultural borders allows these imagined lives to become everyone's reality, and changes in self-perception rearrange one's relation to one's country/culture of origin (Dolby, 2004). For example, Spitulnik (1997) and Pennycook (2010) illustrate how mass media became the "reservoirs and reference points" (Spitulnik, 1997, p. 162) that connect the everyday lives of people around the world. When the labeling of social actions/people using English words from an American TV show becomes a normalized social behavior in Zambia (e.g., Dallas City and Hawaii), any assumed/imagined geopolitical boundaries seem to fade. Along with the fading boundaries, the social categories and cultural values that distinguish groups of people from one another seem to lose their functions. From there, researchers find the potential to rethink language as aggregates of locally- and globally-meaningful "denotational code(s)" (Silverstein, 1998, p. 406) that carry multiple meanings that constantly redefine people's relationships in the world.

The term *translanguaging* facilitates theoretical ground that promotes such a view. Originating from Welsh pedagogical practices that involved reading and

writing in two different languages (i.e., English and Welsh), the conceptualization of translanguaging emerged as a product of the Welsh revitalization project in the 1980s–1990s (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, 2012b).

Throughout the 2000s, the definition of translanguaging has continued to expand to cover various sociolinguistic phenomena where multiple languages and modalities are involved. Under the common understanding of the concept as a way of validating marginalized voices (Rymes & Smail, 2018), translanguaging is defined as “*multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds*” (García, 2009, p. 45, emphasis in original). Moreover, emphasizing the prefix *trans-* in their definition of translanguaging, García and Li (2014) add three layers of epistemological understanding of the concept: translanguaging as trans-system and trans-spaces (i.e., flexible multilingual practices that “*go between and beyond socially constructed language and educational systems*” (p. 3, emphasis in original); translanguaging with a transformative nature (i.e., newly configured communicative practices that have potential for transforming multilingual subjectivities and social structures); and translanguaging as transdisciplinary consequences (in the study of language and education). We can also mobilize the understanding of translanguaging/translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013, 2018) to (re)address the interactional dynamics in multilingual communications and capture the polyphonic nature of multilingual subjectivities (Li & García, 2017) in explanations of the communicative practices in transnational spaces.

To further explore the polyphonic nature of interactional practices of translanguaging, I anchor intertextuality or interdiscursivity, which Bakhtin (1981) also terms double-voicing or heteroglossia. While there is a wide range of how intertextuality is defined in different disciplines, I focus on the Bakhtinian notion of text as structured in dialogic relation with other forms of texts (Bakhtin, 1984). I do so primarily because Bakhtin’s use of text has been widely acknowledged among the disciplines that focus on the social and cultural aspects of language as a term that covers a wide range of denotational codes not only printed in words but also in verbally narrated and visually/materialistically mediated forms (Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Silverstein & Urban, 1996). In the discussion of the relations between texts/voices, Bakhtin (1981) suggests that each voice would resonate with other voices from other texts/contexts when there is not only explicitly expressed meaning but also implicitly embedded meanings/messages. The discursive use of intertextuality thus includes quotation, allusion, parody, and mimicry. When we think of texts as registers of certain social groups, as dialects of certain racial, regional, or gender groups, and as modes of (in)formalized discourses, layers of meanings include markers of social categories, degrees of formality, and social images or people’s attitudes toward the text forms. Through discussion of double-voicing in the pragmatic analysis of translanguaging, it is possible to see that “each word tastes of the contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293). Thus further links can be traced between spatiotemporally distanced texts and the contexts that bring them together.

Furthermore, in adopting the theoretical framework of entextualization, decontextualization, and recontextualization, we shed light on the semiotic processes of intertextuality: how texts from different contexts become transportable resources and are arranged to create new meanings (Briggs & Bauman, 1992; Lucy,



1993; Silverstein & Urban, 1996). In their exploration of semiotic processes of intertextuality, Bauman and Briggs (1990) raised the notions of entextualization, decontextualization, and recontextualization as the extracting of “a stretch of linguistic production into a unit, a text,” then decentering, and finally recentering it into other discursive practices (p. 73). In other words, entextualization refers to the process of producing and recognizing certain forms as a text. As an example, in Rampton’s (1995, 2006) study, this is how youngsters in multi-ethnic peer groups were able to identify linguistic features of ethnicity and social classes that they did not identify with. Decontextualization describes how texts are detached from their original contexts. Thus, for example, Rampton’s youngsters adopted each other’s linguistic features outside of the normative usage. Finally, recontextualization refers to the processes by which texts are recycled/reproduced in new contexts, such as when the youngsters articulated or mixed the adopted features in practicing their interactional strategies in differently situated interactions.

It is essential to bring forth the notion of intertextuality to understand that interactional practices of translanguaging are complex semiotic practices that have multiple layers of meanings. Moreover, intertextuality helps to reconstruct understandings of language and its naturalized linkages with sociocultural values. When the focus is reoriented to the individuals’ allegiances to the situated social meanings grounded in local multilingual practices, this may allow for a greater understanding of the new forms/modes of communication emerging from mixing/sampling/crossing in urban classrooms (Rampton, 2006), the flexible bilingualism in pedagogical practices in complementary schools (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), and the English-mediated communication sessions in a study-café in Korea as daily practices in a globalized world.

### Social Indexicality in Translanguaging

According to Agha (2007), an examination of the semiotic effects of linguistic units in utterances can result in the deconstruction of language into linguistic fragments and genres of discourse that carry social meanings and untangle complexly intertwined webs of symbols. In every dialogic utterance, each word form has the potential to carry multiple referents. Depending on how morphosyntactic properties are combined, the lexico-semantic range of a word in utterances moves along the indexical orders as subsequent co-texts that enable interlocutors to interpret the contextualized meaning (Agha, 1997; Parmentier, 1994). When things are said in a normative manner built upon common understandings of social conventions, interlocutors would not need to know more than the information about the immediate linguistic and interactional context to interpret the referent or the meaning of an utterance. However, when different linguistic forms are employed to say the same thing or the same utterance is said in a differently situated time and space, interlocutors would need more information about contexts to comprehend the indexed meaning. Therefore, any sociolinguistic conduct is a propositional act that involves an on-going process of moving up and down on the ladder of indexical orders. To explain the multiple layers of indexicality, Silverstein (2003) introduces *registers* as alternate ways of “saying ‘the same’ thing” considered “appropriate to” particular contexts of usage (p. 212). An individual speaker’s selection of linguistic forms applied in social interactions with different

interlocutors in different social circumstances is a matter of investigation of social/ external co-texts: differences in speaker and addressee's age group, social status, hierarchical ranks in work relations, degree of formality, and genre of speech in the given speech situation. Also, in cases of tropic uses of linguistic forms that depend on the associated pragmatic values, the indexed meaning changes drastically. Thus, the non-referential indices (Silverstein, 1976)—the indexical words that refer to something—have little to do with the linguistic context and more to do with socially and culturally constructed categories and conducts, which will be the focus of my forthcoming discussion.

As translanguaging is a post-structural approach that focuses on the positive social effects that multilingualism can invoke, I underline the social performativity of translanguaging that allows for the co-presence of local and global languages and reconciles the disjuncture of concrete locality and imagined globality. In this study, I focus on the social indexicality of address terms—more specifically, terms of address/reference—as examples of how non-referential indices of the relative age and gender of a speaker and an addressee within a similar age group in Korean are accommodated into English-mediated communication. The utilization of the terms of address/reference of Korean in English-based utterances can be understood as translanguaging practices that reflect forms and possibilities of globalization emerging from the locally-rooted identities and social relations.

### **Analysis of Korean Terms in Translanguaging**

To fully explore the social usages of Korean address terms in translanguaging, I begin the discussion on the essential role that address terms play in the pragmatics of Korean honorifics. I address the first research question by identifying the focal address terms and the social hierarchy and distance denoted by interactional uses of the terms. Through a literature review, I analyze pragmatics of Korean address terms in relation to honorific speech styles; I then present examples of the social usage of the address terms in a Korean television broadcast. In the discussion of the second question, Korean address terms in translanguaging are explored through discourse analysis (Wortham & Reyes, 2015) of the interactional sequences of audio-recorded study sessions. Lastly, to engage with the participants' interpretation of the disjuncture of the ideological goals and interactional practices, I investigate the participants' metapragmatic awareness of the presence of Korean features in their English practices from interviews with key informants. Through this analysis, I underline how values of English and practices of self-development emerge locally, not only as symbolic capital and endeavors for socioeconomic advancement in the globalized economy but also as reference points and objectives that facilitate social relations and build a local community of practice.

### **Korean Address Terms**

Korean is a language with honorifics. It has been reported to have as many as six styles, the stylistic variations in paradigmatic relations signifying social relations in the interplay of power and social distance (Wang, 1990). Each style of Korean honorifics (*jondaenmal*) aligns with an appropriate speech level, the hierarchical classification with respective lexical and morphological markers (i.e.,



terms of address, particles/post-positions, and verb endings). An individual's selection of which honorific style to employ is often determined in the examination of differences between social types/characteristics of speaker and addressee: differences in the speaker's and the addressee's age, social status, or hierarchical rank in work-based relations. The use of multiple honorific styles in interaction with the same addressee requires that the conditions of interactional events (i.e., degrees of appropriateness or formality, and differences in speech genres) be considered. In most studies of Korean honorifics, the styles are labeled after the verb endings: *hapsyo*, *haeyo*, *hao*, *hage*, *hae*, and *haera* (Hwang, 1976; Lee, 2004; Wang, 1990). Wang's (1990) review introduces classifications of speech levels from the early works of the sociolinguistic description of Korean honorifics by Hwang (1975), Howell (1967), and Dredge (1977). Several studies identify social status, conjugal relations, kinship, age-grading, and gender as the explicit social markers of speech level classifications (Lee, 2004; Wang, 1990). Integrating Wang and Lee's studies on honorific styles with Brown and Gilman's (1960) model of power asymmetry and Hwang's (1976) classification of speech levels focusing on the degrees of formality, in Table 1, I offer a default model of honorific styles for a speaker by speech levels.

As shown in Table 1, a younger and/or inferior member of a community (speaker), in interactions with older and/or superior members (addressee), uses *hapsyo* and *haeyo* styles to signal deference and respect. The difference between the two styles would be the degree of formality or social distance between interlocutors. In the middle, *hao* and *hage* styles are exchanged among interlocutors of equal status, distinguished by formality or social distance. At the bottom, *hae* and *haera* styles are utilized by a superior member of a community in interaction with inferior members, also distinguished by the degree of formality or social distance.

However, Lee (2004) observes that uses of *hao* and *hage* style have decreased drastically since the early 1990s and are only in use among older age groups (50+ years of age). Meanwhile, *haeyo* style has expanded to cover the speech levels of *hao* and *hage* styles in formal interactions, and *hae* style has expanded to cover the speech levels of *hao* and *hage* style in informal interactions among interlocutors of equal status. To illustrate this, I suggest a revised model of classification of Korean honorific styles in Table 2.

Table 1

*Korean honorific styles modeled by speech levels (as investigated in the 1980s)*

Classification of speech levels	Power asymmetry	Formality & Verb endings	
		Formal	Informal
<i>hapsyo</i> style	Superior	<i>-pnida</i>	
<i>haeyo</i> style		<i>-yo</i>	
<i>hao</i> style	Equal	<i>-o</i>	
<i>hage</i> style		<i>-ne</i>	
<i>hae</i> style	Inferior	<i>-a</i>	
<i>haera</i> style		<i>-ra</i>	

*Note.* Classification of speech levels adapted from from Wang (1990) and Lee (2004). Levels of power asymmetry adapted from Brown & Gilman (1960). Degrees of formality adapted from Hwang (1976). The synthesis of these models to create the table is my own.

Table 2

*Changing honorific styles in Korean (as investigated in the early 2000s)*

Changing honorific styles	Speech levels based on power asymmetry	Verb endings and formality	
		Formal	Informal
<i>hapsyo</i> style	Superior	<i>-pnida</i>	
<i>haeyo</i> style		<i>-yo</i>	
<i>hae</i> style	Equal	<i>-yo</i>	
		<i>-a</i>	
<i>haera</i> style	Inferior	<i>-ra</i>	

*Note.* Based on Lee's (2004) analysis of shifting styles.

In the revised model, *haeyo* style marks not only a case where an inferior speaker refers to a superior addressee informally but also marks mutual exchange of formal interaction between interlocutors of equal status. On the other hand, *hae* style marks mutual exchange of informal or intimate interaction between interlocutors of equal status as well as inferior–superior interlocutors with the approval of a superior addressee.

The focal point of this study is the deictic components of the honorific styles (i.e., terms of address) among Korean young adults. The honorific styles in the analysis are *haeyo* and *hae* styles where the determination of which style to apply often depends on interlocutors' perceptions of situated conditions of speech events such as appropriateness and formality rather than being explicitly marked by the relative social status of interlocutors. The address terms that appear in the interactions are mutual exchanges of names, *hyeong/oppa* ("brother"), *nuna/unni* ("sister"), and a name modifier *-ssi* that are primarily in use as markers of style-shifting for politeness or social distance. Table 3 displays the categorial default attributes that are marked by the use of each form.

The address terms in Table 3 are markers of the gender of a speaker and an addressee (referent), the age difference between interlocutors, and the social distance that one would imply by using the form. When a speaker and an addressee are similar in age, close friends, and hold the same social status, they would call

Table 3

*Categorial text-defaults of different address terms*

Address Terms	Gender (of speaker)	Gender (of referent)	Age <sup>a</sup> (of referent)	Social Distance
Mutual exchange of names or use of <i>neo</i> "you"	—	—	same	proximal
<i>hyeong/oppa</i> "brother"	male/female	male	+age	proximal
<i>nuna/unni</i> "sister"	male/female	female	+age	proximal
<i>-ssi</i>	—	—	—	distal

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>+age indicates that the referent is perceived to be older than the speaker.

each other by name. On the other hand, when interlocutors are close friends, but the addressee is older than the speaker, the speaker would call the addressee *hyeong* (if both the speaker and the addressee are males), *oppa* (if the speaker is female and the addressee is male), *nuna* (if the speaker is male and the addressee is female), or *unni* (if both the speaker and the addressee are females). It is notable that the categorial defaults of the address terms are kinship terms. When used within kin relations, the speaker would refer to the addressee as *hyeong/oppa* or *nuna/unni* without attaching the addressee's name; this is a default use of the forms. On the other hand, *-ssi* is a marker of politeness/formality or distal relations that is attached to the full or first name. However, it can also be an indexical marker of relative social status between interlocutors as a person of lower status would avoid using the addressing form name + *-ssi* to address a person of higher status without prior approval from the addressee.

These denotational contents help us understand that how, when, where, and with whom to apply the address terms include differently attached linguistic features (i.e., particles/post-positions, and verb endings), tones/manners that entail each address term, and identification of social categories of interlocutors and social situations that suit to each form. Yet, as with any other linguistic phenomena, there are indexical facts beyond the denotational facts at the surface level that "point to occurrence structured for sign-users in one or another sort of way" (Silverstein, 2003, p. 195). In other words, based on matches between the identified social attributes of the people and the pragmatic functions of the address terms, interlocutors might connect other social attributes that the use of a particular address term would also display. For example, when a female speaker in her early twenties identifies a male addressee belonging to her category of *oppa* (e.g., a young male who seems to be a year older than herself), there are embedded, implicit social facts, such as the socially acceptable range of age difference in her categorization of *oppa*. There are also social expectations, such as what kind of social actions older male figures would conduct in interaction with younger female figures, that entail the social relation between them and determine their respective social behaviors. Throughout such semiotic processes of linking address terms and social relations, obligations, and behaviors, common features of the social relationship indexed by the use of the address terms such as expected behavioral norms and stereotypic images of the interlocutors situated are established.

To examine the socially circulating understandings of the common features that define the address terms that should be used and their social significance, I explore how the address terms are used in mass media, particularly in a short episode from a comedy show broadcast on Korean national television in 2015. The episode represents situations where a female white-collar worker in an office setting would encounter different address terms and how she uses and reacts to them. In Excerpt 1, the main character (F1) becomes upset when a co-worker (F3) addresses her as *unni*. The excerpt is selected as a good example that illustrates the widely shared metadiscourses on judging the appropriateness of situations in using the address terms as it appeared in a famous skit aired in the oldest running comedy program in the Korean national public broadcaster.

Excerpt 1.<sup>2</sup> A television broadcast representation of honorific addressing norms

- 1 F1 What time do you think it is?  
 2 F2 oh, sorry. we are late  
 3 F3 ((smiles)) I am sorry, *unni*  
 4 F1 what? *unni*? ((sighs and turns her gaze away))  
 5 F1 ((turns her gaze back to F3)) do you think you are still in a sorority?  
 6 ((rapidly swings her right arm)) this is your WORKPLACE  
 7 F1 you were late and now you fail to keep business and private matters apart?  
 8 ((sighs))  
 9 ((M1 comes in from stage left in a hurry))  
 10 M1 I am sorry I am late  
 11 F1 ((turns gaze to M1, places left hand on M1's right shoulder, and  
 12 touches M1's upper abdomen with right hand))  
 13 ((in softened voice)) You can think of me as a *nuna* ((leans on M1's left shoulder)  
 14 ((lines omitted; meanwhile F2, F3, and M1 leave the stage ))  
 15 M2 ((walks close to F1)) Should I also call you *nuna*?  
 16 F1 ((covers mouth with left hand, leans toward M2, and whispers in M1's  
 17 ear))  
 18 M2 ((towards audience)) She just swore at me  
 19 F1 ((swings left hand downward)) Get back to WORK

In Excerpt 1, F1 is in the position of superior rank to the other characters on the stage. At the beginning of the excerpt, F2 and F3 enter the stage in a hurry as they are late to work. F1 indirectly scolds them for being late in line 1. Then, F2 and F3 both apologize with smiles (lines 2–3), which are likely attempts to mitigate the unpleasant situation. In line 3, F3 adds the address term *unni* in her reply, which could be a strategic move to mark intimacy between her and F1 to bypass the troubled moment (Figure 1<sup>3</sup>). However, in line 4, F1 responds negatively to F3's use of the term *unni* as indicated by multiple verbal and nonverbal cues: rising intonation, sighing, and turning her gaze away (Figure 2). In lines 5–6, F1 turns back to F3 and scolds her by telling her to take the matter seriously as she emphasizes the formality of the situation. F1 tells F3 not to think of it as an informal matter (i.e., sorority), but a formal condition (i.e., workplace) while rapidly swinging her arm in an angry manner (Figure 3). F1 explicitly describes F3's fault in line 7, then sighs in line 8 to amplify seriousness of the situation (Figure 4). At the moment of heightened tension, M1, the tall and well-suited young man, enters the stage (line 9) and tells F1 that he is sorry that he is late (Figure 5).

As F1 turns to M1, the tension vanishes. She places her arms around M1 (lines 11–12) and tells him to think of her as a *nuna*, as if framing herself as a figure

<sup>2</sup> F1, F2, and F3 are identified in Figure 1, M1 in Figure 5, and M2 in Figure 7. The excerpt is translated for the purpose of legibility. See Appendix for transcription conventions.

<sup>3</sup> Figures 1–8 from KBS Entertainment (2015).



Figure 1. Rage at being called *unni* (3:11–3:14)



Figure 2. Rage at being called *unni* (3:14–3:15)



Figure 3. Rage at being called *unni* (3:15–3:25)



Figure 4. Rage at being called *unni* (3:26–3:30)



Figure 5. Rage at being called *unni* (3:30–3:31)



Figure 6. Rage at being called *unni* (3:31–3:35)



Figure 7. Rage at being called *unni* (3:40–3:45)



Figure 8. Rage at being called *unni* (3:45–3:48)



that M1 can approach easily without worrying about the formal conditions of the workplace (Figure 6). When she makes such an abrupt change in her attitude regarding the formality in the workplace, other characters on the stage call her a chameleon to allude to her ironic double standard. After the junior colleagues leave the stage, M2, also a younger-aged but less attractive male figure, approaches F1 and asks whether he could call her *nuna* (line 15). F1's immediate response is to lean toward him and whisper (lines 16–17; Figure 7). M2 discloses to the audience of the show that she has sworn at him (line 18), and F1 again swings her arm angrily and tells him to just mind his own business (line 19; Figure 8). F1's contrasting response, expressed in verbal and non-verbal cues, about whether another younger male figure may address her as *nuna* seems to imply that she has a concrete model of what kind of persons among her junior colleagues should be allowed to address her as *nuna/unni* even in troubled moments. It is not just a matter of gender difference but also a matter of relative attractiveness between male junior colleagues that affects how much she allows the social distance marked by hierarchical ranks to be narrowed.

The case of the television broadcast in Excerpt 1 provides a useful illustration of how the appropriateness of address terms may be negotiated through the examination of the relative seriousness and formality imposed by an interactional setting, gender difference between interlocutors, and personal qualities (i.e., appearance in this case). Socially acceptable ways to use address terms are thus not a simple deterministic model. Rather, the complex meaning-making practices involve semiotic processes of selecting and categorizing who and in what settings individuals decide to use or allow the use of the address terms. They do so as social actors who (re)formulate social relations situated in every given moment. In the remainder of this paper, I will discuss the indexical meanings of Korean address terms in instances of translanguaging practices that I observed during my fieldwork to answer the second research question about the pragmatic meanings of using the address terms. I adapt the theoretical framework of entextualization, decontextualization, and recontextualization to interpret the semiotic processes.

### Translanguaging in Address Terms

Multi-Colors was a study group of adult English learners in Korea that met once every week to conduct oral English practice. It was founded in 1999 and named after a famous English-medium radio show for English learners. In the mid-2000s, when the group was at its prime, the number of members reached more than 100. While many of the other major English study groups disbanded before/around 2010 as their core members aged, Multi-Colors survived until 2016. In my three-month participant-observation in 2013, the group was still very active with about 25 actively participating members, most of whom were in their twenties and thirties and had at least two years of membership.

During an interview, Taegoen, the president of the group, stated that the reason for the group's survival was the recurring elections that took place every six months to select officers that operate the group. Members of two years or less are encouraged to continue to participate in the group, in hopes of being promoted to operational positions with more responsibilities such as organizing weekly sessions and special events (Fieldnote, Oct. 26, 2013). Despite being in more or less the same age group



and some members being previous acquaintances, the majority of active members of Multi-Colors were young professionals who had few identifiable social ties with other members (i.e., current occupation, *alma mater*, or neighborhoods) outside the study group. Among the members who appeared in the opening vignette, Geunho, a schedule organizing officer, worked as an assistant manager in an operational division of his company. Dongha, Geunho's partner in the schedule organizing team, worked as a finance assistant at one of the largest banks in Korea. Taegoen, the president of the group, was working in a managerial position at the marketing department of his company. Lastly, Hana, who hosted the session of the day, taught English at a large private education institution that provides after-school tutoring services for high school students.

Interestingly, the degree of verbal proficiency in English they perceived in one another differed drastically. Yet, on average 15 to 20 people came to study sessions every Saturday, had dinner together, and shared stories of their everyday lives. Members met in one of the study-café's they had been using for years from 3:00 to 6:00 PM. The weekly study sessions were composed of two hours of whole group sessions with three hosts, each of them leading a 30–40 minute session with topics and formats of their choice, and one hour of sub-group studies under three groups discussing different subject: reading books, colloquial expressions in the media, and engaging in free-topic conversations. During the fieldwork, there were two questions I had in mind: What motivated them to come and spend their weekends with people they only know from a study group? What held them together in this community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998)?

This study is based on my participant-observation in the study group's regular study sessions and occasional social nights, including a year-end celebration, over seven weeks from October to December 2013. I audio-recorded study sessions under everyone's consent. After every session, the group always had dinner together, which I also attended to build rapport with members. Although I could not record conversations during dinners, members usually shared stories about their everyday lives, as well as their thoughts about English and globalization in natural conversations. I also had three formal interviews with staff and five informal interviews with members who had been a part of the group for over a year. I recorded five weekly sessions and went to three of the social events, where most of my interviews were done, and had questionnaires answered by members at the end of the observation period.

The members of Multi-Colors frequently mobilized Korean and modified English loanwords<sup>4</sup> in their communicative practices of English, and most of the time, other members did not interrupt each other's utterances to correct. While there were several routinized practices of translanguaging (e.g., use of Korean words to bridge lexical and syntactic gaps in their English-mediated utterances), one of the most salient patterns of such usage were the interactional sequences where they used Korean address terms or English-translated forms of such expressions to refer to one another. In the following excerpts, I examine sequences of utterances where such interactional practices of translanguaging are observed. The cases demonstrate fluid interchange between two different languages, specifically, in how pragmatic functions of Korean address terms are embedded in English-dominant utterances.

<sup>4</sup> Many Koreans incorporate English words in everyday conversations. Many of the English words are modified in accordance with Korean phonological and morphological patterns.

To begin with, Excerpt 2 displays a situation where Jooyim (JOO)<sup>5</sup> shares her story about the reason she could not attend the previous session at the beginning of a small group session when members had a brief moment of sharing stories about their week.

*Excerpt 2.* (Nov. 30, 2013)

- 1 JOO my week, last week was a little bit busy for preparing (.) scheduling or  
 2 planning for the christmas party. I met, we uh Junbeom *brother* and Wooil  
 3 *brother*, and we planned (.) and it will be fun?  
 4 HYU really?  
 5 JOO so you should COME. and we have like games and prizes and it will be  
 6 (.) so you should come with no anything.  
 7 ((turns and looks at MIN)) so, how was your week?  
 8 MIN ah: it was all right?

In lines 1–3, Jooyim, who was an officer in the event organizing team at the time, talked about how she spent her weekend preparing a Christmas party for the study group and mentioned the names of other officers of the team, Junbeom and Wooil. When she referred to two male officers in the team, she modified the addressing term by attaching *brother* instead of addressing them just by their names. The social fact implied in her address term modification may be that she marked the age difference between her and the two male officers. It could also be interpreted as her expression of the proximal distance or solidarity with the other members of her team. While there are several possible interpretations of Jooyim's address term modification, Excerpt 3 also illustrates a case of similar uses of English kinterms that occurred when Dongha (DON), a female member in her twenties at the time, presented her first experience with *Morning Prime*, the English-mediated radio show that Multi-Colors had been affiliated with.

*Excerpt 3.* (Dec. 7, 2013)

- 9 DON so, today's, actually I'm (.) this, I prepared a listening lounge, but it's  
 10 kind of a presentation. so it could be over time so please forgive me. this,  
 11 my subtitle is nau Morning Prime munhwa dapsagi [My cultural  
 12 exploration of Morning Prime] featuring by Taemoon *brother*.  
 13 it was a morning prime winter concert. so (.) I'm afraid to speaking  
 14 I'm not a good listener of this radio program so I am never listen.  
 15 but I am a vice president so it's really weird but (.) so I have, there are  
 16 very many kinds of awesome things in here. so first one, we took a  
 17 picture. Inae *sister*, Inae *unni* always postpone her presentation. so I'm  
 18 very, very glad to meet her. and also Taemoon *brother*. and also next to

<sup>5</sup> All names in excerpts are expressed with the first three letters of names of participants.

- 19 Inae *sister*, there is Ahn Wonho person but we didn't take a picture  
 20 ((DON scratches her hair and stands few seconds in silence))  
 21 ALL ((laugh))  
 22 DON WE didn't (.) I couldn't take a picture. I took a picture of whole host, Lee  
 23 Boyoun and Steve? I don't know. so the other person, and also next to  
 24 Steven, she: uh Elena Hwang? but I heard that she married, right?  
 25 TAE yea right.

In lines 9–19, Dongha described her first experience of attending a special event held by the radio show the group has been closely affiliated with. She talked about other members she went with: Inae (lines 17 & 19), Taemoon (lines 12 & 18), and Wonho (line 19). In line 20, Dongha paused, and it seemed like she was trying to select the right expression to describe the situation or sequences of what had happened for her narration. In lines 22–24, she continued with her story and asked for confirmation on the validity of personal information about one of the hosts of the show, which Taemoon (TAE), who went with her, confirmed (line 25). Again, it is significant that Dongha also modified an address term to refer to other members that are older than her. She attached *brother* to articulate Taemoon's name (lines 12 & 18), and *sister* to Inae's name, which she reiterated with *unni* in line 17.

In both Excerpts 2 and 3, two female participants in different settings used the same ways to address other members by adding *brother* and *sister/unni* after the names. As part of the English-mediated notion of kinterms, we can also find fictive or metaphorical use of kinterms as an American cultural construction, in which kinterms refer to people in proximal relation (Stone, 2004). However, the way the participants use the kinterms *brother* and *sister* here seems to differ in that the marking of age difference plays a significant role, which would not carry equal weight in the fictive use of kinterms in American culture. Jooyim's uses of address terms *brother* (Junbeom *brother* in line 2 & Wooil *brother* in lines 2–3) and Dongha's use of *brother* (Taemoon *brother* in line 18) seem to carry an additional indexical value to how the term *brother* is often used to mark proximity/intimacy in American English: the age differences. In a similar vein, Dongha's reiterative use of "Inae *unni*" that immediately followed "Inae *sister*" to address Inae (line 17) can be interpreted as a more overt marker of the presence of age difference as one of the essential elements of the address terms that cannot be translated as synonyms. Therefore, the categorical mismatch between denotational contents would be evidence of translanguaging. It is questionable, though, to state what the more nuanced indexical values of the Korean address terms (e.g., as markers of informality or proximity, such as the ones displayed in the above section) also entail.

On the other hand, the way Dongha addresses Wonho as "Ahn Wonho person" (line 19) clearly differs from the previous cases of using kinterms to modify the addressing behavior. She addresses Wonho by his full name in last + first name order, the normative way to call someone in full name in Korean, and attaches *person* at the end. Here, we need to add a strand of social context behind this address term modification to grasp Dongha's interactional conduct fully. Dongha only met Wonho, a relatively new male member in the group, a few times; thus, one of the possible explanations of her conduct would be that

it was an indicator of social distance between the two. However, why then, did she not address him just by first name rather than full name + person? This may be related to the interactional sequences in Excerpt 4 where *-ssi* is applied as a deference/politeness marker. In Excerpt 4, Ahjong (AHJ), the speaker and host of the session, employed another Korean address term to pick a member to read sentences with blank spaces and guess words to fill the blanks.

*Excerpt 4.* (Nov. 9, 2013)

- 26 AHJ            Kyunghossi? can you say what the second question is about, please?  
 27 KYU            number two? this phrase meaning is something that you say (.) that  
 28                    means in order to achieve an important aim, it is acceptable to do  
 29                    something bad  
 30 AHJ            yea, it is very difficult, very difficult (4.0)  
 31                    ((waits for members to answer))  
 32                    okay (.) I will skip it (3.0)  
 33                    nobody knows? anyway, I will say the answer. the answer is (.) justify.  
 34                    so (.) Hyeonjeongssi? could you read the question number five please?  
 35 HYE            the allegation is that the United States has (.) using electronics? to  
 36                    eavesdrop? bugging german chancellor angela merkel's mobile phone.

In line 26, Ahjong called out Kyungho (KYU) to read the sentence he projected on the screen. Kyungho responded by reading the sentence (lines 27–29). Ahjong tried to find a volunteer by giving a few seconds of wait time, and as no one volunteered, he gave out the word “justify” (lines 30–33). As he moved on, he asked Hyeonjeong (HYE) to read another sentence on the screen (line 34), and Hyeonjeong read the sentence (lines 35–36). As mentioned, the notable points in this excerpt are that Ahjong modified this address term by adding *-ssi* after the names: “Kyunghossi” in line 26 and “Hyeonjeongssi” in line 34. The term *-ssi* is a title in Korean that is roughly equivalent to Mr. or Ms. in English and that often indicates politeness in the act of addressing/referring to someone. Similar to Dongha and Wonho’s relationship in Excerpt 3, Ahjong was not familiar with Kyungho or Hyeonjeong as both were new members of the group in Fall 2013, and it was Ahjong’s first attendance at the study session that term. He had just learned their names on that day. In this context, Ahjong’s interactional conduct of modifying the address term was likely to signal deference/social distance to those members with whom he was not familiar. Use of *-ssi* could also be an indexical marker of relative social status as a person of lower status would not be able to use *-ssi* to address a person of higher status in general. Yet, there seems to be no difference between the relative social status between Ahjong, Kyungho, and Hyeonjeong. Therefore, it was most likely a lack of familiarity that triggered the use of *-ssi*.

Comparing Ahjong’s use of *-ssi* in this excerpt to Dongha’s use of “person” after Wonho’s name (line 19) in Excerpt 4, there are similar components in their categorical use of address terms. However, there is one notable difference in how they addressed the unfamiliar members. While Ahjong called the members by first name, Dongha referred to Wonho with his full name in the normative manner of

Korean. I suggest that the difference could be explained by the presence/absence of referents in interactional sequences. Ahjong called the members who were present at the very moment of interaction while Dongha referred to a member that was not present in the interactional sequences but only in the narrated event. It may have been the case that the absence of the referred addressee provided a sense of even further distance for Dongha, which triggered her to refer Wonho with the most deferential address term. To that extent, it seems that Dongha used “person” as an indicator of politeness or distal relationship with Wonho as Ahjong used *-ssi* to indicate politeness/social distance with new members.

Given that the participants in this study either used Korean address terms or expressions in English that roughly correspond to those Korean counterparts, I argue that the presence of Korean addressing behaviors in English-dominant utterances should be construed as translanguaging. This interpretation requires drawing on multiple layers of indexicality. As illustrated in the excerpts, the pragmatic norm of English would have allowed referring to addressees by first name only in the given interactional sequences. It is worth noting that the interactional behaviors of using the address terms—whether translated in English or uttered in Korean—could be understood as interactional strategies to manage potential conflicts between the local social norms that emphasize marking of relative status/hierarchy in Korean and the symmetrical relationship that English address words may signal (Kang, 2003).

Given these considerations, how local learners of a global language conduct the trans-systematic and transformative pragmatic practices that embrace their local identities and social relations in translanguaging practices should be understood in terms of the relations of intertextuality (Briggs & Bauman, 1992). The Korean address terms are transportable resources of translanguaging practices. The terms of address/reference were entextualized as identifiable units of social relations defined by local presumptions and expectations, detached from the other linguistic components in syntagmatic relations to index the applicable speech level in Korean honorific structure, and recycled in English-dominant utterances. Throughout the semiotic process, they were deployed as performative markers of existing social relations outside the study sessions and as a reworking of the situationally-adjusted social relations. Such a semiotic practice could be interpreted as one of the creative discursive practices that allow co-occurrence of the local cultural (metapragmatic) values in the pragmatic usage of a global language.

### **Ideological Construction of Self-Development and Community Membership**

Are these communicative behaviors coming from the participants’ metapragmatic awareness? It is difficult to make such an assumption. No member of Multi-Colors could state a clear reason to address: a) such a subtle difference in pragmatic norms of two languages; and b) their adaption of the locally-oriented pragmatic norm during the interviews. However, during a casual conversation, a member said that it just feels uncomfortable to call older members by name. Indeed, everyone speaks Korean to each other in any interaction outside of the contexts of the learning sessions. Thus, it would be rather unnatural to disregard the social norms entangled with the use of terms of address/reference that are deeply embedded with the relative status in Korean society.

Moreover, what is the ultimate goal for the members? Is it to become nativelike English speakers? When I asked members of Multi-Color about the reasons they came to the study sessions, most gave answers implying the embodied notions of self-development. In their understanding, self-development was not a short-term goal, but a life-long process through which one searches for the best way to improve oneself. In this sense, it was the positive stress of working with others that pushed them to go beyond their current level of development. They sought other people to practice with and the spaces that facilitate a welcoming atmosphere, which encouraged them to make efforts in speaking the language they would otherwise feel embarrassed to speak, as indicated in the following comments:

Eunjeong: The reason I like being here is that I am busy during weekdays with my job and tend to get lazy after work, but by coming here on Saturdays, I can learn and maintain my English. (Interview, Dec. 7, 2013, translation mine)

Donghoon: It is good influence. Things we do here actually helps in conversation with foreign buyers and working with documents. (Interview, Nov. 9, 2013, translation mine)

Most members demonstrated shared perceptions of the most important thing about the study group, which was to come to the sessions as often as they could and utilize other members who were willing to communicate in English. In other words, the goal was to practice, to try to improve while maintaining the current level of proficiency, rather than setting the ultimate goal of achieving nativelike English fluency. Regardless of how well they spoke English at the time, most members pointed out that it was unrealistic that they would reach the level of competence where they would not worry about the grammatical structure in their speech or choosing the right words. However, their self-perception of deficiency did not discourage them from speaking. Instead, they emphasized the significance of continuing to develop their English speaking proficiency by helping each other to find better words and expressions to describe the thoughts and feelings through which improvement shall entail in the future. Along the way, members believed in the positive effects of the social relations they were building among people that share the common interests. The following interview excerpt with Taegoen, the president at the time of research, illustrates his thoughts about the community membership, specifically, what it means to be a good member:

Taegoen: To be honest, (Multi-) Colors is a social gathering disguised in an English study group. I meet good people, make good friends. So as the president, I like those who come out every Saturday. How well they speak English is not important. When I see someone speaks English so well, I think to myself, "what does he do to speak English so well?" Well, it's good that when good English speakers motivate those who don't speak that well. At the same time, I think those who speak good English would also feel good to be showing their skills. (Interview, Oct. 26, 2013, translation mine)

As Taegoen explains, the good members were the ones with the highest rates of attendance, and often they had been with the group for many years. After



witnessing so many people come and go, a higher level of proficiency in English was not the quality that the group wanted from other members. For this reason, it was not the superior skills that determined one's position in this group. To be considered a qualified member of the group required devoted participation and demonstration of one's efforts to engage in self-development.

### Conclusion

In my investigation of how young Koreans envision globalized subjectivity through the development of fluency in English, I discovered various social values intermingling with the discourses emphasizing the importance of English while the actual practices of the group could be seen as instances of translanguaging indexing various meanings other than the power-driven local-global linkage. Although the value of English as prestigious linguistic capital played a significant role in establishing the social ties within the group, it was not a resource they competed against each other to acquire. In this context, I highlighted that the local subjects constructed their own understandings of the globalization process, thus the visions of becoming a global citizen should not be described only through the discourses that motivate internal competitions or distresses of survival. We have seen other directions and the dynamic interplay of local and global languages in the locally-emerging meaning-making processes that involve English learning. The disjunctions between the ideological goal of making space for communicative practices of English and the actual communicative norms that loosely implement such an ideology, allow us to capture alternative motivations (i.e., an expanding social network built upon the existing local communicative norms).

Regarding the complex interplay of different motivations and learning practices, this study could propose some pedagogical implications that account for such local practices in second language development: raising language awareness, sociolinguistic sensitivity, and negotiation skills (Canagarajah & Said, 2010). Larsen-Freeman (2014) has also made several points—including resetting of goals/end points of second language development, pedagogical approaches that afford creativity, and teaching to negotiate with translingual contexts—that open up the room for translanguaging to readdress the direction of second language development. It is not an active local resistance against the prestige of the global language or local subjects' helpless submission to the globalized socioeconomic hierarchies that I found in this study, but individuals' agency to bring new potential and new meanings to English.

### *Acknowledgments*

I appreciate Dr. Robert Moore for his feedback on an earlier draft of this paper and Dr. Nancy Hornberger for her suggestions in a subsequent presentation presented at the First International Conference on Literacy, Culture, and Language Education at Indiana University Bloomington in 2018. I would like to thank Gareth Smail, Karla Venegas, Kristina Lewis, Sarah-Lee Gonsalves, and the anonymous reviewers for their support, insightful feedback, and careful editing. Lastly, I thank all my participants in the study group for welcoming me in their learning sessions and sharing their stories.

Jay Jo ([jojay@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:jojay@gse.upenn.edu)) is a doctoral student in the Educational Linguistics division at the Graduate School of Education of University of Pennsylvania. With a primary focus on the impact of globalization in the valorization of different languages, his research interest is in communicative uses of English that index language ideologies and identity practices of people in countries where English is learned/used as a foreign language.

### References

- Abelmann, N., Park, S. J., & Kim, H. (2009). College rank and neoliberal subjectivity in South Korea: The burden of self-development. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 10(2), 229–247.
- Agha, A. (1997). ‘Concept’ and ‘communication’ in evolutionary terms. *Semiotica*, 116(2), 189–215.
- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., & Emerson, C. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., & Holquist, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19(1), 59–88.
- Blackledge A., & Creese A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Brettell, C. (2000). Theorizing migration in anthropology: The social construction of networks, identities, communities, and globalscapes. In C. Brettell & J. F. Hollifield (Eds.), *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines* (pp. 97–119). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Briggs, C. L., & Bauman, R. (1992). Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2(2), 131–172.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 40–67.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31–54.
- Canagarajah, S., & Said, S. B. (2010). English language teaching in the outer and expanding circles. In J. Maybin & J. Swann (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English language studies*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Dolby, N. (2004). Encountering an American self: Study abroad and national identity. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(2), 150–173.
- Dredge, C. (1977). *Speech variation and social organization in a Korean village*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard University: Cambridge, MA.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.

- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997). Culture, power, place: Ethnography at the end of an era. In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.) *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology* (pp. 1–29). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Howell, R. W. (1967). *Linguistic choice as an index to social change*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.
- Hwang, J. (1975). *Role of sociolinguistics in foreign language education with reference to Korean and English terms of address and levels of deference*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Austin.
- Hwang, J. (1976). 국어의 존대법 [Honorifics in Korean]. *Eoneo*, 1(2), 191–200.
- Jeon, S. (2008). Sociology of self-help: What alternatives can we advise other than self-help? *The Korean Journal of Cultural Sociology*, 5(1), 103–140.
- Kang, J. & Abelmann, N. (2011). The domestication of South Korean pre-college study abroad in the first decade of the millennium. *The Journal of Korean Studies*, 16(1), 89–118.
- Kang, M. A. (2003). Negotiating conflict within the constraints of social hierarchies in Korean American discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 299–320.
- KBSEntertainment. (2015, April 5). 개그콘서트-박은영, 홍예슬·김나희 ‘언니’ 호칭에 분개. [Gag Concert—Park Eunyoung, Hong Yeseul, and Kim Nahee; Rage at being called unni; Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tkdlZqmHaUg>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Another step to be taken. Rethinking the end point of the interlanguage continuum. In Z-H. Han & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 203–220). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, K. (2004). 현대국어 경어법의 사회언어학적 연구, 3 [A study of honorification in modern Korean (3)]. *Korean Language Education*, 113, 545–587.
- Lewellen, T. (2002). *The anthropology of globalization: Cultural anthropology enters the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Berger and Garvey.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654.
- Li, W., & García, O. (2017). From researching translanguaging to translanguaging research. In K. King, Y. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education* (3rd ed.) (pp. 227–240). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lucy, J. A. (1993). *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Parmentier, R. J. (1994). *Signs in society: Studies in semiotic anthropology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). Nationalism, identity and popular culture. In N. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 62–87). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London, United Kingdom: Longman.

- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, B. (2007). Cosmopolitanism: New and newer. *Boundary 2*, 34(3), 47–60.
- Rymes, B., & Smail, G. (2018, November 9). *We call this translanguaging: Language researchers jumping scale, citizen sociolinguists scaling back*. Proseminar presented at Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso & E. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 11–56). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1998). Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology*, 27(1), 401–426.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(2003), 193–229.
- Silverstein, M. & Urban, G. (1996). *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Spitulnik, D. (1997). The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 6(2), 161–187.
- Stone, L. (2004). Has the world turned? Kinship and family in the contemporary American soap opera. In R. Parkin & L. Stone (Eds.), *Kinship and family: An anthropological reader* (pp. 395–407). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wang, H. (1990). Toward description of the organization of Korean speech levels. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 82, 25–39.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S. & Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. New York, NY: Routledge.

## Appendix

### Transcription Conventions

[word]	Korean to English translation
((word))	description of paralinguistic and non-verbal actions
.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
,	continuing intonation
(#. #)	a pause of the length in parentheses
(.)	a micro-pause (less than 0.2 seconds)
WORD	loud voice
:	prolongation
word	Korean or English-equivalent address terms