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ABSTRACT

SPEAKING KOREAN IN AMERICA: AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF A COMMUNITY-BASED KOREAN HERITAGE LANGUAGE SCHOOL

Siwon Lee
Nancy H. Hornberger

In the United States, often referred to as a nation of immigrants, language diversity has been ironically concealed from public arenas by the displacing ideology of English monolinguism. Minoritized languages have been acknowledged and respected, but they have not been actively promoted and included in mainstream schools. In this context, many immigrant communities have strived to maintain their languages and cultures through community-based heritage language programs. Previous literature has highlighted the challenges these programs face due to inevitable lack of support and resources, as well as the conflicts between immigrant youth and older generations.

Through the lens of ethnography of language policy and planning (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007), this study explores the space of a community-based Korean heritage language school in Philadelphia, which I deem as the site of struggle but also the site of promise for immigrant youth. Guided by the notions of communicative repertoires and speech communities (Blommaert & Backus, 2011; Gumperz, 1964), this study explores what linguistic practices teachers and students display, promote, or negotiate in the school, and how these practices construct their own definitions of “speaking and being Korean.” First, I trace students’ talk about the named codes around them, and discuss how students’ metacommentary reflects their monoglossic imagination of bilingual
speakers, and how such imagination might motivate them in learning ‘the Korean language’ yet at the same time discourage them in the process. Then, the study delves into the language ecology of Korean language classrooms in the school, where literacy-focused activities and curricula promote the production of written repertoires of Korean, while creating a gap between the imposed repertoires and students’ existing repertoires. Then, I compare the language policies of two Korean language classrooms and explore the potential of translanguaging pedagogy as a tool for co-learning for both the teacher and students. Community-based heritage language programs may continue to be positioned as marginalized educational spaces in the U.S. context. Nonetheless, this study foregrounds the varied yet converging imaginations of its local actors in constantly pursuing and embracing their ethnic and linguistic heritage and highlights the importance of bringing these voices forward.
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Transcription and Translation

In this dissertation, in most discourse excerpts, original text and translation are presented side by side. (If English is mostly used in original text, the excerpt was presented just in one column, and translation was included in text, following the conventions below.) Translations are all mine. Here are the transcription conventions used in the translated excerpts.

- (( )): To describe non-verbal actions or to offer further explanation
- =: To mark an utterance interrupted in the middle
- Underline: To mark the words originally said in English
- When particular attention is paid to a specific Korean word, the word is written in the following format: 사랑 sa.rang [love]

1. 사랑: How the word is spelled in Korean;
2. sa.rang: Transliteration of the word according to McCune–Reischauer romanization system. Syllabic boundaries are marked with periods (.)
3. [ love]: English translation of the word
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Only when you have that [Korean identity], may you survive in the U.S. First of all, your face is different [from others]. Anyone can see that you are different. Then, how can anyone accept you as the same? So, knowing that “I look different, but I have an identity of my own”—I think you can stand on it, firmly. Otherwise, you might fall apart. I think more so as you grow older. “I may look different, but I speak the same language [as you]?” Well, I don’t think they’ll accept that.

-Interview with a student’s parent, Sarang Korean School

For immigrant families, living in the United States as an ethnic and linguistic minority brings inevitable conflicts among various identity positions that they themselves desire to achieve and others ascribe to them. In schools, only English acquisition is emphasized while many minoritized languages do not seem to have any place to stand. Many immigrant children grow up following these school standards, even believing themselves to be no different from other kids in the school. However, one day, they are confronted with questions that befuddle them: “Where are you originally from? Why can’t you speak Korean if you’re Korean?”

In the United States, often referred to as a nation of immigrants, language diversity has been ironically concealed from public arenas by the displacing ideology of English monolingualism. Minoritized languages have been acknowledged and respected, but they have not been actively promoted and included in mainstream schools. In this context, many immigrant communities have strived to maintain their languages and cultures through
community-based heritage language programs. Previous literature has highlighted the challenges these programs face due to inevitable lack of support and resources, as well as the tensions between immigrant youth and older generations. Through the lens of ethnography of language policy and planning (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007), this study explores the space of a community-based Korean heritage language school in Philadelphia, which I deem as the site of struggle but also the site of promise for immigrant youth. Guided by the notions of communicative repertoires and speech communities (Blommaert & Backus, 2011; Gumperz, 1964), this study explores what linguistic practices teachers and students display, promote, or negotiate in the school, and how these practices construct their own definitions of “speaking and being Korean.”

1.1. The Development of the Current Study and Research Questions

The formation of my research questions and the design of the current study are intricately related to my prior experiences and positionality with Korean heritage language users/learners. Thus, in this section, before I introduce the research questions and the organization of this dissertation, I will first discuss how my prior experiences and assumptions have shaped the development of this study.

I am a native Korean who was born in South Korea and lived there for more than twenty years. I also learned English and Japanese as foreign languages through formal instruction. As I double-majored in English and Korean linguistics as an undergraduate student in Korea, I became interested in the issues of language diversity and identity. However, it was primarily a scholarly interest I developed from reading the stories of others from research articles and books. Personally, I do not recall any critical moment
when I had to question or reflect on my identity in relation to the languages I spoke. As a speaker of the dominant language variety coming from a relatively prestigious educational background, I was never picked on for the languages I spoke or the way I spoke.

As I was studying Korean linguistics, I became interested in teaching Korean language to speakers of other languages, and that was why I decided to go to the U.S. to teach Korean language courses at a university in Oklahoma. Living in a country where the majority of people did not speak my native language was an eye-opening experience. Although people were kind to me, I often felt left out even in the most mundane small talk they engaged in, which was very different from what I grew up with. That was the first time I began to wonder about the experience of moving to another country where most people do not understand the languages I grew up with.

Living in a small town in Oklahoma, I met many Korean immigrants and their children through a local Korean church I attended, and also through the Korean courses I taught at the university. These were the places where I felt safer from the experiences of feeling left out. Just because of the fact that the majority of people in these places had the same ethnic heritage and knew the experience of living as a linguistic minority, I felt a sense of belonging and security, which was a strange feeling I had never experienced before.

Despite this sense of belonging, however, I was also different from many others in the community and positioned in many different ways. As a scholar coming from South Korea, I received much attention from many adults in the church. They would often ask me about my educational background and how they could raise their children to
receive a good education. At other times, I was viewed as a newcomer, perhaps because of my lack of experience living in the States as well as my relatively young age. At the lunch table in the church, I would often sit with these adult church members—along with a few people like me, people who were visiting the town for a few months from South Korea—and their children would sit at another table. I always saw a clear divide between these two generations at the church, and although I hung out more with the parents’ generation, I also felt that I was a bystander who belonged to neither of these groups.

I had the chance to learn more about the second generation of Korean Americans through the Korean language courses I taught at the university. Unlike in the church setting where I was viewed as a stranger, I was viewed by students as a language expert who also had more cultural sensitivity than other Korean adults. Interestingly, the position of a teacher, particularly a young teacher of their age, allowed me to hear these young Koreans’ side of the story. Students openly shared their personal stories of resisting learning Korean as a child, a growing sense of shame and regret for not being able to speak the language of their parents, and struggles of learning Korean as grownups.

Through their stories, I learned that many of these students had the experience of attending community-based language schools at least once in their childhood, but did not keep up with their Korean as they became older. I also learned about a strong push toward English monolingualism due to a complete lack of support for minoritized languages like Korean, which are only spoken by a small number of students in mainstream schools. I wondered what kind of support could have been provided during these primary school years to prevent the struggles they experienced as they were re-learning the language as adults. While community-based language schools seemed to
have potential for filling in this gap from mainstream schooling, seeing many learners re-
learning the language as adults, I also felt that there were limitations in the efforts of local
communities, and wondered whether an official recognition of the Korean language in
mainstream schools would make a difference.

With these mixed feelings about community-based language education, I left
Oklahoma and started my Ph.D. study at Penn in the following year. Reading more
literature on bilingual education and grassroots language maintenance/revitalization
efforts, I wanted to know more about what was happening—what was going wrong to be
honest—in these community-based Korean heritage language schools. To gain some
firsthand experience, I looked for a school in Philadelphia and spent two years as a
teacher at Sarang Korean School, which later became the research site for my
dissertation. As a teacher, while I again observed tensions between two generations,
teachers and parents on the one hand and students on the other, I also witnessed instances
of the promotion and negotiation of heteroglossic language practices and ideologies
across generations of Korean speakers.

Thus, instead of assuming a problem-oriented view on these community-based
Korean language schools (i.e., assuming that there would be problematic educational
practices deterring students’ bilingual development), which I confess that I came in with
when I first started teaching, I decided to conduct an ethnographic study that openly
explores how local actors involved in these schools utilize and negotiate their linguistic
and cultural resources. The central theme of the current study, the meaning of “speaking
and being Korean” was also developed during my years of teaching, as I often heard
parents and teachers at Sarang saying things such as “students become Korean not just by
learning the language, but by learning Korean culture and sentiment” and “my son goes to the Korean school, and sees that he is Korean” (Notes from preliminary fieldwork), when they stressed the importance of teaching Korean to their children.

1.2. Research Questions

For this study, I pose the following research questions:

(1) What linguistic practices do teachers and students display, promote, or negotiate in a community-based language school?

With the first question, I would like to explore the linguistic practices the local actors display, promote, or negotiate in the school space. Here I define linguistic practices as socially situated verbal (oral and written) and non-verbal behaviors. To closely examine what is going on in the local contexts of classrooms and the school, the linguistic practices of teachers and students will be observed, analyzed, and compared through multiple data sources including class observations, research sessions, interviews, and policy documents.

(2) How do their practices construct their own definitions of “speaking and being Korean”?

By observing and analyzing the linguistic practices of teachers and students, I hope to simultaneously address the second research question, as I assume that their linguistic practices in the school are intricately related to their own imagination and aspirations for “speaking and being Korean.” I hope to understand each individual’s definitions of “speaking and being Korean” by attending to the indexed voices of various speakers in each individual’s linguistic practices, which may not only be limited to the local
communities and families, but also to changing sociopolitical contexts in the United States and South Korea.

By addressing these two questions, I hope to achieve a deeper understanding of community-based heritage language education, and illuminate not only the limitations but also the positive roles heritage language programs can play for the maintenance and development of bi-/multilingualism for immigrant youth.

1.3. Chapter Outlines

This dissertation contains seven chapters. In Chapter 2, I first situate the current study in the U.S. educational policy context as well as previous literature on community-based heritage language education, and present the conceptual framework of this study, drawing upon the notions of communicative repertoires, imagined speech communities, language planning, and language ecology. Chapter 3 provides a methodological overview, including methods of data collection and analysis, as well as an overview of the study context and participants. Chapters 4-6 present findings based on the analysis of data. In Chapter 4, I trace students’ talk about the named codes around them, “Konglish” in particular, and discuss how students’ metacommentary reflects their monoglossic imagination of bilingual speakers, and how this imagination might motivate them in learning ‘the Korean language’ yet at the same time discourage them in the process. Chapter 5 delves into the language ecology of Korean language classrooms in the school. I particularly attend to Ms. Shin’s Korean language classes, where she uses Korean language arts textbooks provided by the South Korean government to implement literacy-focused activities. I discuss how this focus on written practices might create a gap
between the imposed repertoires and students’ existing repertoires, failing to fully utilize
the implementational space opened up with the provision of materials. Then, in Chapter
6, I analyze the discourse of two Korean language classrooms led by Ms. Cha and Mr.
Hyun respectively, and discuss how Korean-only policy in Ms. Cha’s classroom
ironically directed students to the use of English rather than Korean, while the lack of
such a policy in Mr. Hyun’s classroom created space for students’ creative language play
in both Korean and English. In this chapter, I argue that translanguaging pedagogy is not
simply the teachers’ verbal use of translanguaging practices in classrooms, but that the
scope of translanguaging pedagogy extends to the teacher’s identity positioning and
alignment with students. In Chapter 7, I discuss the major findings of this study and their
implications for practice and future research. I particularly reflect on the importance of
conducting research in marginalized educational spaces.
CHAPTER 2 RESEARCH CONTEXT AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter is divided into two parts. I first discuss the context and background of the current study, as I situate it in the U.S. educational policy context as well as previous literature on community-based heritage language education. In the latter part of the chapter, I introduce the conceptual framework of this study, drawing upon the notions of communicative repertoires, imagined speech communities, language planning, and language ecology.

2.1. An Overview of Research Background and Context

This study is situated in a Korean heritage language school in Philadelphia. In this section, I first discuss how I define heritage language and why I decided to use the term for the study. Then, I discuss the U.S. educational policy context that has contributed to the development of heritage language schools in local immigrant communities. Lastly, I introduce the history and the current status of Korean heritage language schools in the United State and review previous empirical studies on community-based heritage language education.

2.1.1. Definition of Heritage Language

Heritage language (HL) has been defined as the language of an immigrant, refugee or Indigenous group that a speaker has familial or ancestral ties to (Cummins, 2005; Wiley, 2005). Especially within the context of North America, heritage language is synonymously used with community language, native language, and mother tongue (Cummins, 2005; Lee & Shin, 2008). Some scholars have been critical of using the heritage language label in that
it signals fixity in the past and tradition, overlooking the living presence of many immigrant and indigenous languages spoken in the U.S. (Baker & Jones, 1998; García, 2005).

Although I acknowledge the term’s negative connotation, it should also be acknowledged that the term captures a certain sense of shared tradition or community that has held together Indigenous and immigrant languages over many generations in America. I do not necessarily mean that there exists a set of concrete, homogenous practices and beliefs that enabled the maintenance of minoritized languages. Immigrant and Indigenous people may choose to speak, refuse to speak, or transform the languages spoken by their families or ancestors according to various reasons. Nevertheless, however varying their reasons and linguistic practices may be, I assume that there exists the ‘imagination’ of group belonging (Anderson, 1992; Norton 2001) that is associated with these languages, which sometimes motivates them to learn the language or at other times resist it. The term heritage is flexible enough to describe this imagination of group belonging, however heterogeneously it may be interpreted by different individuals. In this respect, Hornberger (2005) argues that “none of the terms for heritage language is in fact ever straightforward or neutral, even when it is originally intended to be so; rather these terms are contested and ever-shifting in meaning, even as the local heritage identities, knowledges, and purposes the languages convey are also inevitably contested and ever-shifting in their national contexts” (p. 608). Thus, instead of trying to present one coherent definition of heritage language, I use the term in this study to attend to how people define their own heritage or relatedness to a certain social group through their linguistic practices.
2.1.2. The U.S. Policy Context

Language diversity has always existed in North America for longer than the history of the United States. However, through the nation-building process, such linguistic diversity has been effectively concealed by the monoglossic ideology of one-language, one-people, and one-nation (Flores & Schissel, 2014). English, the language that was first brought to the American soil along with British settlers, became the language of the United States, and many Indigenous and immigrant languages became ostracized from public arenas including schools and mass media. Against this displacing influence of English, minoritized language communities have strived to assert their linguistic rights through a series of legal actions and grassroots educational movements.

Hall (2002), however, cautions that this discourse of linguistic recognition ironically creates “‘language’ as a reified object associated with essentialist constructs of ‘discrete’ linguistic, ethnic, or national ‘groups’” (p. 98, emphasis in original). By claiming the ownership of language(s), minoritized groups may end up essentializing their own linguistic and cultural practices. Flores (2013) argues that efforts to affirm linguistic rights may be short-lived, unless language minoritized communities challenge the discrete categories of languages imposed by their oppressors. Further, the language-as-right discourse is in danger of being manipulated as a means to keep language minoritized communities separate from the dominant English-speaking population. Although state policies may ‘acknowledge’ or ‘respect’ the rights of language minoritized students to maintain their language practices, such acknowledgement may imply that responsibility for maintenance belongs to local communities that own the language(s), and that
mainstream schools should treat all students fairly through the use of English as *lingua franca*, or a language of wider communication.

This rhetoric is clearly evidenced in a series of English-only movements in the U.S. in the late 1980s and the 1990s. Following these movements, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act was stipulated under Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2002. Evans and Hornberger (2005) note that in Title III, there is no mention of the term “bilingual” or issues related to language minoritized students’ native language maintenance. Instead, the Act aims “to help ensure that limited English proficient children master English and meet the same rigorous standards for academic achievement as all children are expected to meet, including meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards” (§3202).

One thing that is notable in the Act is its differential treatment of Indigenous languages and immigrant languages. Title III explicitly states that language instruction educational programs shall not “limit the preservation or use of Native American languages” [§3125 (3)]. This may be due to a series of affirmative laws achieved through the turmoil of oppressive history toward Native Americans in the United States. In contrast, the Act only mentions immigrant students alongside the term “limited English proficient children,” urging them to meet the same standards for English proficiency development and academic achievement; for instance, many parts of the act state that educational programs are “to help limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, develop proficiency in English while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards” [§3301(7)]. There is no mention of their rights to maintain their heritage languages in any part of the Act.
In fact, across the U.S. history, the government’s attitude toward most immigrant languages has been largely that of no intervention. Wiley (2001) notes that immigrant languages have been rarely recognized as resources in the U.S. This may possibly be why efforts to maintain immigrant languages have continued mainly through local communities. These efforts turned into the establishment of heritage language programs in the form of weekend schools and after-school programs. Also, these community-based efforts have recently begun to receive support from the National Heritage Language Resource Center which holds annual conferences, and professional development workshops and engages in teaching material development. Although this is certainly a positive change, it should be noted that the scope of support has not been extended to the nationwide policy level. Compton (2001) argues that heritage language education suffers from a lack of public awareness and separation from mainstream schooling. Due to the marginalized status of heritage language education, immigrant children see lesser value in their mother tongue as they start going to school.

The repressive discourse of NCLB has further exacerbated the situation. Wright (2007) argues that the high-stakes testing policies of NCLB, along with the accountability provisions which demanded that language minoritized students learn English as quickly as possible, ultimately served to discourage schools from offering heritage language programs. He discusses how NCLB actually ended many heritage language programs in California, Arizona, and Texas and severely restricted others. In 2015, NCLB was replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which granted more flexibility to individual states to develop plans to “close achievement gaps, increase equity, improve the quality of instruction, and increase outcomes for all students” (US Department of Education, n.d.). In
particular, ESSA strengthened accountability provisions for English language learners, requiring English language proficiency as an indicator in every state’s school accountability system, while allocating substantially more funding targeted at English language learners. Thus, emphasis on English language acquisition remains as strong as before, if not stronger, and there is still no mention of developing bilingual competences of emergent bilinguals. Although the allocation of more funding may provide some leeway for developing bilingual education programs, it is still premature to draw any conclusions at this stage.

Thus, I believe the United States is still facing the English-only era in which immigrant language maintenance efforts are restricted. Wiley (2001) contends that the history of language education policy in the US shows waxing and waning governmental support for minoritized languages and that “the best strategy is to use government policies to promote heritage languages during favorable times and to rely on community-based efforts over the long term” (p. 106). In fact, attempts to reverse language shift can have enduring effects through intergenerational transmission that can be only fostered within families and local communities (Fishman, 1991). Successful cases of Indigenous language revitalization show the power of community-based efforts that led to the opening of ideological and implementational space on the macro-policy level (e.g., McCarty & Dick, 1996). In this respect, it may be premature to say that the future looks bleak for the maintenance of immigrant languages in the United States. As I hope to show in the study of Korean heritage language schools, although there are many challenges ahead, these community-based heritage language schools also pose potential for nurturing bilingual youth in safe community environments and beyond.
2.1.3. Korean Heritage Language Schools

Despite the lack of support from the U.S. government, Korean communities have been resilient in their effort to maintain the language since the first Korean heritage language school was established in 1906 (You, 2011). According to Lee and Shin (2008), there are approximately 1,200 Korean heritage language schools in the United States with a total student enrollment of about 60,000. Min (2000) states that “the Korean community seems to have far more ethnic language schools than any other Asian community mainly because of Korean immigrants’ high level of affiliation with Korean churches” (p. 325). These schools are operated in the form of weekend schools, offering a few hours of language and culture instruction every week (Pak, 2003; Zhou & Kim, 2006). Protestant churches have had a great presence in Korean communities, which makes them ideal places for teaching Korean, as they can offer resources such as space for classrooms, funding, and volunteers. According to the Korean Church Directory in America, by 2001, there were reported to be 3,375 Korean protestant churches (hereafter, Korean churches) in the United States. The percentage of protestant Christians among Koreans living in the United States ranges from 60 to 80 percent depending on the regions, which is much higher than the percentage of Christians in South Korea (25 percent of the entire population) (Shin, 2005). Shin (2005) speculates that this high percentage of Korean Christians in the United States is partly due to the influence of American protestant missionaries on early Korean immigration to the United States. According to Sunoo and Sunoo (1977), nearly half of the first group of immigrants to Honolulu in 1903 were members of Yongdong Church led by an American missionary, Reverend George H. Jones. According to Shin (2005), many early Korean immigrants had already had contact with Christian missionaries and had been
baptized Christians before their emigration. Since then, besides religious purposes, Korean churches have served various functions as a community center in most Korean communities: socialization among immigrants, Korean language education, information exchange related to jobs, education, housing, etc. and practical assistance such as translation and interpretation (Kim, 2011).

Since most Korean heritage language schools are operated by churches as part of their service to local communities, many of these schools suffer from a lack of financial resources. With low student tuition, teachers are minimally compensated, and most schools do not have the capacity to support further professional development or teaching materials development. Particularly before the 1990s, with virtually no textbooks or professionally trained teachers to teach Korean as a heritage language, pastors and volunteers from church often served as instructors, and the Bible and Korean newspapers were used as textbooks (Kwon & Lee, 2009).

However, since the late 1990s, the situation has improved as the South Korean government started to support overseas Korean heritage language schools by providing them with textbooks, teacher training workshops, and funding. Most Korean heritage language schools in the United States use Korean language textbooks developed by the Ministry of Education in South Korea, and the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs offers financial subsidies to regional organizations such as the National Association for Korean Schools (NAKS) and the Korean School Association of America (KSAA). These organizations host annual conferences and workshops for teachers (Lee & Shin, 2005; Park, 2002).
As seen from this review, Korean heritage language schools have a long history since the early 1900s when the first immigrants came to Hawaii as sugar plantation laborers. When imagining the typical student of a heritage language school, one may conjure up an image of a child forced to attend these schools every Saturday by their first generation Korean parents. However, the student population of Korean heritage language schools should be understood more deeply in the context of Korean immigration history in the United States. Through a series of unfortunate events on the Korean peninsula, including the Japanese colonization (1910-1945) and the Korean War (1950-1953), approximately 24,000 Koreans came to the United States to find political freedom and better economic opportunities till the early 1960s. The second wave of Korean immigration started from the late 1960s till the late 1980s as the Immigration Act of 1965 lifted the national quota system that gave preference for people from Northwestern European countries. During the 1970s and 1980s, annual Korean immigrants, numbering over 30,000, composed the third largest immigrant group in the U.S., and 95 percent of Korean Americans are reported to be immigrants from this period (Min, 2011). The majority of these immigrants were highly-educated white-collar laborers who sought freedom from the military dictatorship in South Korea as well as better economic and educational opportunities for themselves and their children. Immigration slowed down drastically since the 1990s, as economic and political conditions in South Korea became more stabilized.

Thus, while the majority of students in Korean heritage language schools had been children of the first generation immigrants who came to the United States in the 1970s and 1980s, the recent student population is becoming more diversified as Korean immigrant communities are going through generational changes along with the drastic decline of
immigration since the 1990s. More third and fourth generation Korean American students—English dominant students growing up with parents who themselves do not speak Korean fluently—have started going to Korean schools. Also, a portion of the student population now consists of Korean adoptees and children from multiethnic families, who Shin and Lee (2013) refers to as “non-traditional heritage language learners” (p. 357).

2.1.4. Previous Studies on Community-Based Heritage Language Schools in the United States

In the United States, many immigrant communities have strived to maintain their languages and cultures through community-based heritage language schools. In the early 1980s, the number of ethnic heritage language schools was over 6,500, involving 145 different heritage languages across the nation (Fishman, 2001). A significant number of studies discuss the efforts of various immigrant communities, including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Vietnamese, Turkish, and Armenian communities, offering heritage language education through weekend or after-school programs, and among them, Chinese and Korean community language programs have been most discussed in literature.

The majority of studies on community-based heritage language education have focused on the linguistic practices and identities of immigrant youth, which are often portrayed as in tension with those of parents and teachers. For instance, based on interviews with four Korean American students attending a Korean heritage language school, You (2005) writes that contrary to the parents’ expectations for their children to maintain their heritage language, these students showed ambivalent attitudes toward their heritage language and identity, sometimes resisting yet at other times showing desires for exploring their heritage. In an ethnographic study of a Korean heritage language school in the U.S.,
Pak (2003) attends to a context where English monolingualism in the mainstream society is replaced by Korean monolingualism within the school. While teachers and adults in the school mostly communicated in Korean, students tended to stigmatize the practices of speaking Korean among themselves. Pak notes that depending on different situations, there was a constant interplay between Korean as the majority language and Korean as a minority language. In another ethnographic study, Lo (2009) particularly examined the ideologies and practices of respect displayed by teachers and students in a Korean heritage language school in California. While teachers embraced students’ failure of using linguistic forms of deference, perceiving it as an indicator of their cross-cultural identity and limited Korean proficiency, they interpreted students’ bodily demeanor such as crying, eye gaze, and bodily deportment as signs of disrespect and thus reprimanded them for their rude behavior. Lo (2009) writes that students responded to teachers’ reprimands with “double-voiced compliance,” which meant that while the students verbally expressed agreement with the teachers, they still showed signs of resistance through intentionally delayed, monosyllabic responses in English (p. 231).

Several studies particularly focused on the motivations of parents who send their children to heritage language programs (Guardado, 2002; Lao, 2004; Lawton & Logio, 2009; Park & Sarkar, 2007; Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009; You & Liu, 2011). These studies portray parents’ concerns for their children who would have to bear the burden of living as an ethnic and linguistic minority regardless of their choices; these concerns, however, are not necessarily shared by their children, which illuminates possible reasons for the above-mentioned tensions in heritage language schools. In these studies, immigrant parents generally believed that heritage language learning would provide their children
with necessary emotional and social support to grow up as bilingual and bicultural persons in the United States. For example, based on an ethnographic study in a Korean heritage language school, Kim (2011) discusses that Korean immigrant mothers in her study felt double-pressure to help their children maintain their heritage language and culture on the one hand while helping them to successfully adapt to the mainstream U.S. society on the other. They perceived the heritage language as “a guide for crossing between these different worlds” (p. 139). Similarly, Lao (2004) found that Chinese immigrant parents strongly believed that learning Chinese language and culture would help their children form positive cultural identities, better communicate with the older generation, and gain more job opportunities. Korean immigrants also believed that heritage language learning would foster the positive development of their children’s identity and create better career opportunities as bilingual speakers (Park & Sarkar, 2007).

While the studies discussed above mostly focused on the perspectives of immigrant parents, Shin (2013) investigated the motivations of mothers of transnational adoptees who learn Korean with their children in Korean heritage language schools. These mothers echoed the voices of immigrant parents, asserting that learning Korean culture and language as a family would “facilitate their children’s development of a strong Asian American identity and actively counter “racism and negative social attitudes directed towards racial minorities” (p. 176). At the same time, Shin (2013) notes that these parents were also keenly aware of the linguistic and cultural needs of their children, distinct from those of traditional heritage language learners who grew up in Korean-speaking homes. While immigrant parents wanted their children to acquire linguistic and cultural practices in Korean, these adoptive parents wanted their children to explore their ethnic heritage and
grow a deep appreciation of Korean language and culture, but not necessarily to develop linguistic and sociocultural competencies like other heritage language students.

This review of empirical studies on community-based heritage language schools show both the divergence and convergence of perspectives held by various stakeholders ranging from immigrant youth, teachers, and parents. This study will contribute to this body of literature by discussing both the convergence and divergence of perspectives held by the local actors regarding heritage language education, while also reflecting on the driving forces behind resilient community efforts to maintain their languages and cultures despite many challenges reported in previous literature.

2.2. Conceptual Framework

Theoretically, this study can be situated within the fields of language policy and planning, educational linguistics, literacies, linguistic anthropology, social theory, and sociolinguistics. The frame on which I base this study consists of the following assumptions, each of which I will explore and describe in the pages to come:

(1) There is no such thing as a discrete, autonomous language or a concrete linguistic community but a set of communicative repertoires that individuals creatively deploy in everyday practices, aligning to or diverging from particular groups of people across different times and spaces. A sense of community is created through individuals’ imagination, practice, and knowledge.

(2) Language planning can be conceived as ways of influencing the behavior of others in the process of constructing imagined speech communities. Any act of language planning is situated in, and impacts the language ecology of a given
context (e.g., classroom, school, local community, society), and it can be located along the continua of biliteracy.

2.2.1. Imagined Speech Communities and Communicative Repertoires

One of the major milestones that have been achieved in the field of sociolinguistics may be the denaturalization of the idea that languages exist as pure, discrete entities comprised of a bounded system of structured sounds, grammar, and vocabulary. Many have argued that the naming of languages (e.g., English, Korean, Spanish) is a tradition that emerged with the rise of European nation-states in the 19th century (Flores, 2014; Gal & Irvine, 1995). Gal (1989), Heller (1992, 1995, 1999), and Woolard (1985, 1989) were among the first who explicitly discussed the role of language ideology in the societal construction and manifestation of the notion of language. According to Irvine and Gal (2000), ideologies “locate, interpret, and rationalize sociolinguistic complexity, identifying linguistic varieties with ‘typical’ persons and activities and accounting for the differentiations among them” (p. 36). Through language ideologies, certain linguistic features are legitimized, and others are erased to create coherent one-to-one mapping of ‘a language’ with ‘a people’ or ‘a nation.’ Flores and Schissel (2014) write: “these nationalist language ideologies positioned monolingualism in the standardized variety as the expectation for full citizenship and connected this monolingualism to a homogenous ethnic identity” (p. 456).

Monolingual ideology is deeply entrenched in every sector of modern society and can also be found in the discussion of bilingualism in many institutional practices. In a significant number of schools in the U.S. for example, bilingual students are labeled limited English proficient, as their linguistic practices are not considered as a whole repertoire in
and of itself, but as a deficient one lacking competencies in both languages—English in particular. Even the grassroots movements and scholarly work that seek to challenge national monolingualism often assume a pure minoritized language to belong to a certain ethnic group through the discourse of linguistic recognition (Hall, 2002). By claiming ownership of language(s), minoritized groups end up essentializing their own linguistic and cultural practices.

Pennycook (2006) and Flores (2013) explain this formation and manifestation of monolingual ideology within the framework of governmentality—a range of “mechanisms through which authorities of various sorts have sought to shape, normalize and instrumentalize the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others in order to achieve the objectives they consider desirable” (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 8). Flores (2013) introduces a particular form of governmentality named nation-state/colonial governmentality that seeks to create docile national subjects by imposing Eurocentric monolingual ideologies. By tracing various mechanisms that act to perpetuate the association of a language with the essence of a people, nation-state/colonial governmentality sheds light on the ways in which colonial relations of power are still maintained through the manipulation of language ideology, despite the move from an authoritarian to a supposedly more liberal government in the current post-colonial era. In this way, monolingual ideology serves to establish and maintain “social relations of power, domination and exploitation” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 9).

If language is an ideological artifact constructed to maintain the existing colonial relations of power, it should be an object of analysis, rather than a taken-for-granted, a priori unit of analysis in linguistic research. In fact, many sociolinguists and linguistic
anthropologists have made efforts to resist a priori and clear-cut boundaries of language by introducing terms like *flexible bilingualism* (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), *translanguaging* (García, 2009), *heteroglossia* (Bakhtin, 1981; Bailey, 2007), *truncated multilingualism* (Blommaert, 2009), *polylingualism* (Jørgensen, 2008), *plurilingualism* (Canagarajah, 2009), *codemeshing* (Canagarajah, 2006; Young, 2004), *heterolingualism* (Pratt et al., 2010), and *metrolingualism* (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010). They have long maintained that it is far more valid and analytically productive to analyze how individuals manipulate various linguistic features as they align and disaffiliate with different groups of people, rather than assuming a priori categories of language, ethnicity, or nation-state.

Following this line of research, I would like to attend to the notion of *communicative repertoire*, the term first proposed by Gumperz as *verbal repertoire*, which may become a viable unit of analysis for the study of communication. In an ethnographical study in two rural villages, one in India and the other in Norway, Gumperz (1964) calls his “universe of analysis” a *speech community*, which he defines as “any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction over a significant span of time and set off from other such aggregates by differences in the frequency of interaction” (Gumperz, 1964, p. 137). A verbal repertoire is connected to a particular speech community, and a repertoire consists of a range of varieties that set off one type of social interaction from another. These varieties “form a behavioral whole, regardless of grammatical distinctness, and must be considered constituent varieties of the same verbal repertoire” (p. 140). Gumperz’s conceptualization of verbal repertoire was innovative in that the concept provided an alternative way of understanding verbal interaction in relation with its social context without fitting it into the abstract category of languages.
However, Gumperz’s focus tends to be on the shared norms and practices of a community rather than the idiosyncratic trajectories of individuals that may have acquired a range of communicative resources engaging in multiple communities. Although Gumperz recognizes linguistic diversity, this diversity is mostly situated within the boundary of a community. Rampton (2006) argues that the aim of early sociolinguistics was “to describe system-in-grammar and coherence-in-discourse in ways that accommodated diversity within the community” (Rampton, 2006). Rampton cites Pratt (1987) who called this tradition of sociolinguistics “the linguistics of community” and argued that "when social division and hierarchy [were] studied, the linguist's choice [was] often to imagine separate speech communities with their own boundaries, sovereignty, fraternity and authenticity” and to look within, but not across, the "lines of social differentiation, of class, race, gender, age" (Pratt, 1987, pp. 56, 59, 61).

Investigating the shared repertoire of a community holds significance; as I will discuss later, one of the important aspects of verbal communication that needs to be addressed is a sense of relatedness or belonging individuals seek to achieve as they deploy certain communicative resources. However, a sole focus on this sharedness draws linguists’ attention to a set of specific linguistic features, thus abstracting complicated communicative practices, and depending on these several features, clear lines of inclusion and exclusion are drawn. For instance, in defining the Philadelphian English speech community, Labov (1989) argues that “the phonological pattern of the short a split, which uniquely defines Philadelphia as a linguistic unit, is uniform across social classes, ethnic groups, and family and friendship networks” (p. 2). He argues that just as the English
language is a property of the English speech community, this short a split can clearly define the boundary of the Philadelphian English speech community.

What can be overlooked in demarcating speech communities is the mobility of individuals constantly moving about and shifting the lines of differentiation. Recent scholarship has attended to this mobility and flow of individuals, texts, ideas, and objects. Vertovec (2007) noted the increasingly diversifying patterns of migration and the unpredictable nature of transnational diaspora, which couples with the development of technology and communication channels since the 1990s—the diversification of diversity, a phenomenon which he referred to as superdiversity. Jacquemet (2005) proposed the term transidiomatic practices to capture the deterritorialized communication patterns in this superdiverse era. All individuals move about and simultaneously engage in various communities with varying degrees of participation through different media.

Attending to this flow of individuals, texts, ideas, and objects, Blommaert and others thus suggest that the analysis of repertoire should be based on an individual rather than a speech community. Individuals do not belong to one speech community in which they cumulatively acquire a whole ‘native’ repertoire, but their learning occurs as “a process of growth, of sequential learning of certain registers, styles, genres and linguistic varieties while shedding or altering previously existing ones” (Blommaert & Buckus, 2011, p. 9). Every community consists of these individuals with varying repertoires, or indexical biographies, and individuals momentarily choose certain linguistic features from their indexical biographies to signify their sense of belonging to or alignment with a particular group of people. Because of this variation and mobility of individuals, there is no stable speech community nor fixed repertoire of the community.
Agha (2005) elaborates on this changing nature of speech community and individual variation through the process he calls enregisterment. According to Agha, enregisterment refers to “processes whereby distinct forms of speech come to be socially recognized (or enregistered) as indexical of speaker attributes by a population of language users” (p. 38). In Agha’s terms, through enregisterment, a certain register (or a repertoire) gets to be recognized by a group of people (or a speech community). However, these socially recognized registers are not static but “undergo various forms of revalorization, retypification, and change” through “micro-level processes of register use in interaction” (p. 38). These “micro-level processes of register use” vary depending on who is talking with whom, when, and where, and individuals present themselves as certain personae by appropriating the voices of others they have acquired across different times and spaces in their lives—a process Agha draws from Bakhtin (1981)’s notion of voicing.

The disinvention of languages and the recent return to and development of the notion of communicative repertoire demonstrate a greater interest in what happens on the ground—practice or performance, as well as the sensitivity of scholars who are not taking for granted commonly-held concepts in linguistic and social research. In this study, I seek to attend to the indexical biographies of individuals engaged in community-based Korean language education, as I consider the varying social contexts they encounter in life and observe their practices on the ground, constantly scrutinizing my own preconceived notions of nation, ethnicity, and language. At the same time, I seek to get at the level of ideological group formation through these practices. Individuals claim their affiliation with certain groups despite their heterogeneous linguistic practices accumulated through their idiosyncratic life experiences. The concept of repertoire does not hold without its
association with certain groups of people, which I hereafter call speech communities, following Gumperz’s tradition. A sense of belonging or relatedness to a speech community is created through the practices of communicative repertoires, and these practices in turn reflect one’s sense of belonging.

Fishman (1982) offers a useful insight in conceptualizing the relationship between practices and a sense of group belonging. Although ethnicity is a cautiously scrutinized term in social research, defining *ethnicity* as “a phenomenological experience of relatedness to a historically unique and continuous collectivity” (p. 7), Fishman writes that he does not intend to claim any consciousness or validity for ethnicity but merely asserts that there exists “a kind of self and collective definition that is and has been widely and frequently sensed, however mutable and manipulable its stigmata may be” (p. 7). He breaks down the notion of ethnicity through the exercises of *being, knowing, and doing*:

Ethnicity is "peopleness" relatedness, i.e., the sense of *being* part of a particular people, *doing* the things that this people traditionally does, and, therefore, of *knowing* (appreciating, sensing, feeling, intuiting) the things this people claims to know when it is true to its particular genius, to its own self, to its unique authenticity of being and doing. (p. 7)

This framework of ethnicity can be adapted to the notion of speech community. Like ethnicity, speech communities may not be proven as a thing that really exists, but there is a certain relatedness that is clearly sensed by a group of people. It can be said that like ethnicity, speech communities are constructed through the acts of knowing, doing, and being. First of all, the act of knowing is related to the concept of repertoire, in that repertoire is something that one ‘knows.’ Blommaert and Backus (2011) wrote that “whenever repertoire is used, it presupposes knowledge–competence–because having a particular repertoire is predicated on knowing how to use the resources that it combines” (p. 3). Thus,
I define *repertoire* as a set of linguistic and cultural practices that individuals ‘know’ in relation to a speech community. This knowledge is ‘experiential,’ rather than theoretical or intellectual, in that it stems from one’s exposure to and performance of linguistic and cultural practices in various speech communities. Although one may not always verbally articulate what they actually know (while some parts of knowledge may be more explicit and verbally claimed), such experiential knowledge enables them to “appreciate, sense, feel, intuit” the practices that are typically associated with certain speech communities and recognize the practices that are not (Fishman, 1982, p. 7). Also, this knowledge involves not only passively recognizing the practices associated with different speech communities but also ‘knowing how’ to perform those practices. Individuals may possess varying degrees of passive and active knowledge of multiple repertoires, depending on their experience with different speech communities they traverse in their lives.

Second, ‘doing’ is associated with the *linguistic and cultural practices* that individuals actually do by deploying resources from their repertoires and in accordance with their imagination of belonging to different speech communities. Although Fishman limited ‘doing’ to the typical practices that members of an ethnic group would do, I would like to suggest that these practices can be the acts of boundary crossing, as well as boundary demarcating. Individuals may intentionally cross the existing boundaries of speech communities by creatively modifying traditional practices or introducing new practices from their other repertoires. At the same time, they may strengthen the existing boundaries of speech communities by doing what legitimate members of communities would do, while verbally or non-verbally stigmatizing, or simply avoiding, the practices that diverge from those usual practices. However, even with the intent of keeping the tradition of speech
communities, every practice inevitably differs from the past practices, depending on the specific contexts of interaction and the indexical biographies of the individuals involved. Through these varying practices of boundary demarcation and crossing, stability and change co-exist within the repertoires of different speech communities. Stability always encompasses micro-changes with every practice, some of which may be accumulated and lead up to greater changes in the construction of repertoires.

Lastly, the act of ‘being’ can be defined as the imagination of belonging, as individuals imagine themselves being in certain speech communities through the knowledge and practices of their repertoires. A speech community does not exist as a physical entity with clearly marked boundaries, but it is rather ‘imagined’ through a sense of belonging that is strengthened through shared knowledge and practices that are constantly negotiated and manipulated by individual speakers. Latour (2005), a major proponent of actor-network theory, also writes that “social aggregates are not the object of an ostensive definition—like mugs and cats and chairs that can be pointed at by the index finger—but only of a performative definition. They are made by the various ways and manners in which they are said to exist” (p. 34). Drawing on Anderson’s (1991) notion of imagined community, Norton (2001) also argued that through language learning, second language learners not only engage in practices in the classroom community, but also ‘imagine’ themselves to be part of a broader world or community through those situated practices. It should be noted that the notion of speech community I propose here is based in, but also diverges from the one proposed by Gumperz—“any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction over a significant span of time and set off from other such aggregates by differences in the frequency of interaction” (Gumperz, 1964,
In this study, a speech community is an imagined one by individuals who may possess varying degrees of knowledge and display a range of practices; sometimes their imagination may partly converge with one another, but in other cases, it may clash. By observing the practices of various policy actors and listening to their voices through these practices, I seek to explore their collective and idiosyncratic imaginations of speech communities.

2.2.2. Language Planning, Language Ecology, and Continua of Biliteracy

In this study, I particularly attend to the role of language planning, which I assume as a particular kind of practice that greatly influences the imagined construction of a speech community. Discussing the premises of actor-network theory, Latour (2005) argues that for any group to emerge, individuals become “spokespersons which ‘speak for’ the group existence . . . justifying the group’s existence, invoking rules and precedents and, as we shall see, measuring up one definition against all the others” (p. 32). He further argues that “groups are not silent things, but rather the provisional product of a constant uproar made by the millions of contradictory voices about what is a group and who pertains to what” (p. 32). A speech community, like other social groups, exists through individuals’ varying yet converging claims about what a speech community is and who pertains to what. As individuals imagine their belonging to a speech community, they not only make choices for themselves but also make claims of others, i.e., what others ought to know and ought to do in order to achieve membership in a speech community.

These ought-to claims about speech communities are substantiated through the acts of language planning. Cooper (1989), one of the most influential contributors in the Language Policy and Planning (LPP) field, defined language planning as “deliberate efforts
to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes” (p.45). Although the level of intentionality may differ, language planning acts may encompass practices such as a student’s comment on his/her classmate’s funny pronunciation, or a teacher’s implementation of Korean-only language policy in the classroom, all of which, predicated on one’s imagination of speech communities, contribute to “influencing the behavior of others.” Here, as Cooper (1989) elaborates, the verb “influence” is used to imply that the goal may not only be limited to “change” the behaviors of others but also to “maintain” or “reinforce” (p. 45). Thus, through the acts of language planning, the boundaries of speech communities may sometimes be established and strengthened, and at other times shifted.

In order to conceptualize the contexts or environments in which such change occurs and explore how it occurs in a given context, I adopt the metaphor of language ecology and Hornberger’s continua of biliteracy framework. Any act of language planning does not influence just one repertoire but multiple repertoires present in a given environment. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) explained that “language planning activity must be perceived as implicating a wide range of languages and of modifications occurring simultaneously over the mix of languages in the environment – that is, implicating the total language eco-system” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 296, emphasis added), and this language eco-system (or ecology) is situated in “the vast cultural, educational, historical, demographic, political, social structure in which language policy formulation occurs every day” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 13).

Hornberger’s continua of biliteracy framework, as a heuristic used to “situate research, teaching, and language planning in multilingual settings” (Hornberger, 2002, p.
is also built on this ecological understanding of linguistic environment. According to Hornberger (2002), the conceptualization of biliteracy continua assumes that there is an “unequal balance of power across languages and literacies” (p. 38) and that “one language and literacy is developing in relation to one or more other languages and literacies” (p. 37), and the following figure comprehensively represents the continua of biliteracy model.

Figure 2.1. *Power Relations in the Continua of Biliteracy* (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000)

- traditionally **less** powerful < -------- > traditionally **more** powerful

**Contexts of biliteracy**

- micro <------------------------------> macro
- oral <--------------------------------> literate
- bi(multi)lingual <----------------------> monolingual

**Development of biliteracy**

- reception <----------------------------> production
- oral <--------------------------------> written
- L1 <--------------------------------> L2

**Content of biliteracy**

- minority <------------------------------> majority
- vernacular <----------------------------> literary
- contextualized <-----------------------> decontextualized

**Media of biliteracy**

- simultaneous exposure <----------------> successive exposure
- dissimilar structures <-----------------> similar structures
- divergent scripts <-------------------> convergent scripts
Regarding each continuum and how together they make up the whole framework, Hornberger (2002, p. 36) provides the following explication:

Specifically, it depicts the development of biliteracy along intersecting first language–second language, receptive-productive, and oral-written language skills continua; through the medium of two (or more) languages and literacies whose linguistic structures vary from similar to dissimilar, whose scripts range from convergent to divergent, and to which the developing biliterate individual’s exposure varies from simultaneous to successive; in contexts that encompass micro to macro levels and are characterized by varying mixes along the monolingual-bilingual and oral-literate continua; and with content that ranges from majority to minority perspectives and experiences, literary to vernacular styles and genres, and decontextualized to contextualized language texts.

The model thus helps a researcher to locate bilingual development of any individual, classroom, community or society, along the continua of contexts, media, and content. I adopt the framework to discuss how local participants’ acts of language planning might tap into different ends of the continua and influence (or are influenced by) the language ecology of the classroom and the school, situated in the broader U.S. society.

Based on the conceptual understanding of language planning and language ecology discussed so far, in this study, I attend to the ways various policy actors, teachers and students in particular, make claims about one another and themselves—what they ought to know, what they ought to do, or what they ought to be—through a range of language planning acts. I will also analyze how these acts of language planning may impact the ecology of the classroom or the school, as well as individuals’ imagination of particular speech communities.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the methodological approach of the current study. I first introduce the ethnography of language policy and planning as the overall methodology of the current study. Second, I provide an overview of my research site, Sarang Korean School and the profiles of my focal participants. Then, I discuss how I positioned and negotiated my identity with the participants, as a former teacher returning to the site as a researcher. Finally, I describe the processes of data collection and analysis.

3.1. Ethnography of Language Policy and Planning

The study of language policy and planning (LPP) has gone through a series of theoretical shifts over the years. Earlier LPP studies focused on describing the processes of national language planning, as languages were perceived as discrete, autonomous entities that can be systematically planned and managed by authoritative bodies (Fishman, 1979; Haugen, 1983). Later, these studies were criticized for underlying positivist orientations and for not giving due consideration to the surrounding sociopolitical contexts (Ricento, 2000). Eschewing apolitical LPP approaches, a critical approach to language planning emerged, which sought to deconstruct the mediating language ideologies in language policies that establish and maintain relations of power (Tollefson, 2006). The critical approach, however, was criticized for not fully accounting for the processes of language planning on multiple layers and underestimating the agentive role of local actors and how their practices relate to language policies on the macro level (Davis, 1999; Ricento, 2000).

In this context, many scholars have advocated an ethnographic approach to the study of LPP (Canagarajah, 2005, 2006; Davis, 1999; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996).
Ricento and Hornberger (1996) introduced the metaphor of the LPP onion to highlight the multiple layers of LPP—composed by agents, levels and processes—moving away from solely top-down understandings of LPP in order to describe how the different layers “permeate and interact with each other in a variety of ways and to varying degrees” (p. 402). The ethnography of LPP (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, 2011), with origins in Hymes’ scholarship (Hymes, 1964), has since gained momentum in the field of LPP over the past two decades (Canagarajah, 2006; Davis, 1999; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, 2011; Johnson, 2009; McCarty, 2010; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996).

In the current study, I strive to understand the space of community-based Korean language school as situated in multiple layers of the LPP onion. With the methodological toolkit afforded by the ethnography of LPP, I will examine policy texts and the local practices of various policy actors, all of which are intertwined with a range of imagined speech communities these actors draw on across different times and spaces. Also, through an ethnographic stance that is “grounded in long-term, in-depth, first-hand accounts” (McCarty, 2010, p. 3), I will try to provide a rich description of the varying practices and perspectives of policy actors, instead of imposing my a priori assumptions. Lastly, through reflexive exercises, I hope to bring in the experience-far view of an ethnographer, through which the experience-near view of local policy actors will be interpreted (Geertz, 1983), and possibly highlight potential implementational and ideological spaces (Hornberger 2002, 2005; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007) for multilingual education that can be broadened through community-based heritage language education. The following is the research questions I pose for this inquiry:
(1) What linguistic practices do teachers and students display, promote, or negotiate in a community-based language school?

(2) How do their practices construct their own definitions of “speaking and being Korean”?

3.2. Research Site: Sarang Korean School

The choice of my research site, Sarang Korean School (hereafter SKS), was based on a combination of purposeful and convenience sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As my initial goal was to explore what was happening in a ‘typical’ Korean language school, I looked for a school that offered Korean language and culture classes every weekend in affiliation with a local Korean church around the local Korean community. As I did not have any personal connection with the local Korean communities at the time, I did an online search for schools that seemed to fit the criteria, while limiting the search to the schools in Philadelphia for an easy commute. That was how I came to contact SKS in Spring 2013, revealing my possible research intentions in the future. Mr. Nam, the vice principal of SKS, offered me a position to teach Korean language classes, and after two years of teaching, I decided to choose the school as my research site. Because of the time I spent at SKS as a teacher, I could not be a complete “stranger” (Agar, 1986) to the site, and I will discuss how I negotiated my positionality with participants at SKS later in this chapter.

SKS was founded by four Korean protestant churches in a suburban area of Philadelphia in 2010. The four churches co-founded SKS in order to combine their resources (e.g., budget, staffing, facilities, teaching materials) and provide students with better education. The collaboration was successful initially. It became possible to offer
Korean language classes in many levels, which they had not been able to do due to a limited number of students. Also, financial support from respective churches began to be used more efficiently for supporting teachers, students, and teaching materials. The student enrollment grew up to around 130 students just in a year. However, over the years, two churches quit the coalition with the change of church leadership and church members’ growing complaints about sending their children to another church on Saturdays. When I started teaching in Spring 2013, SKS was divided to two campuses, and the student enrollment also decreased to 30-35 students on each campus. By the time I began my fieldwork in Fall 2016, SKS came to be operated by just one church. Classes were held in the church building every Saturday, and the school was financially supported through the church budget along with student tuitions and subsidization from the South Korean government. Some church members volunteered to support the school by cooking and offering van rides, and the majority of students and teachers were also members of the church.

A typical day at SKS started at 8:30AM every Saturday, when teachers came to school for a brief meeting and lesson preparation. By 9:20AM, students gathered in the chapel, and Mr. Nam, the vice-principal, gave a short announcement and started the day with a morning prayer. Then, teachers and students went to their respective classrooms for class. In the morning, Korean language classes were offered for three class hours (each class hour lasted 40 minutes). Then, during 30-minute lunch time, volunteers from the church prepared food for students. In the afternoon, students attended Korean history class and extracurricular activity class (e.g., taekwondo, art, acting, music) for one class hour each. All the classes ended at around 2PM, and students again gathered in the chapel for
wrap-up and a closing prayer. Parents came to pick up their children, and for those students who did not have a ride, van rides were offered by volunteers from church. After all the students went home, teachers met in the teachers’ room to discuss their classes that day and plans for the following week. The meetings usually lasted for 30 minutes to 1 hour.

Each semester, 15 weeks of classes were offered. The Korean language curriculum at SKS consisted of seven levels, and students had to attend SKS for a specific number of semesters to move from one level to the next level (Table 3.1.). As for class materials, while some teachers developed their own materials, teachers mainly used two textbook series developed and offered by the South Korean government: 맞춤 한국어 Mat.chum han.gu.gŏ [Customized Korean] and elementary school Korean language arts textbooks. The following table summarizes the overall Korean language curriculum at SKS. The level of textbooks used for each class level differed every year, depending on the proficiency level of students enrolled that year.
Table 3.1. *Korean Language Classes Offered at SKS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Level¹</th>
<th>Program Length</th>
<th>Textbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>새암 Sae.am</td>
<td>Beginning 1 (Age 3-5)</td>
<td>6 semesters</td>
<td>Teacher-developed materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한별 Han.byŏl</td>
<td>Beginning 2</td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>Mat.chum han.gu.gŏ 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나래 Na.rae</td>
<td>Beginning 2 (for students with less exposure to Korean at home)</td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>Mat.chum han.gu.gŏ 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다슬 Ta.sŏl</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>Mat.chum han.gu.gŏ 3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>가람 Ka.ram</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>3rd and 4th grade Korean language arts textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한울 Han.ul</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>5th and 6th grade Korean language arts textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>하랑 Ha.rang</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>Children’s books (individual translation project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Participants

There were about 35 students, six teachers, and two school administrators in SKS at the time of my fieldwork. In the following, I will briefly discuss the profiles of school administrators and teachers at SKS, and introduce the focal group of students selected for this research. Some of them will be introduced in greater detail as necessary in the following chapters.

¹ The class names and levels are listed as stated in the SKS school documents. The class names are indigenous Korean words that are no longer functional in the contemporary Korean language.
3.3.1. School Administrators and Teachers

The school administrators and teachers were 1st and 1.5 generation Korean immigrants, and their length of stay in the U.S. varied from one year to twenty years. All of them were affiliated with SKS’s host church either as part of the clergy or as regular members. While the teachers had regular jobs during the week, they devoted their Saturdays to teaching at SKS. They attended a local teachers’ seminar every year, and two of the teachers were taking online courses to achieve a B.A. in Korean language education at the time of research.

Table 3.2. Teacher and Administrator Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role at SKS</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of stay in the U.S.</th>
<th>Current Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Park</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Senior pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nam</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Graduate student/conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kim</td>
<td>Teacher (Sae.am/ Ha.rang)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Assistant pastor's wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Moon</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.byŏl)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Junior pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cha</td>
<td>Teacher (Na.rae, history II)</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>College student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lee</td>
<td>Teacher (Ta.sŭl, history I)</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>College student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kyung</td>
<td>Teacher (Ka.ram)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>part-time piano tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shin</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.ul)</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hyun</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.ul)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Junior pastor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Park was the senior pastor of SKS’ host church, and as the principal, he represented SKS in official events, although his involvement in teaching was scarce. Mr.
Nam was my point of contact when I first started teaching at SKS. As the vice-principal, he led the teachers’ meetings and oversaw the overall curriculum and other administrative tasks. Each teacher taught Korean language classes in one level, except Ms. Kim who also advised two students in Ha.rang class on their translation tasks, besides teaching Sae.am class.

For my research, I closely worked with Ms. Shin and Mr. Hyun, who taught Korean to the focal participants of my research. Ms. Shin came to the U.S. as her husband was admitted to a seminary. In Korea, she used to be an elementary school teacher, and she said that her previous teaching experience greatly helped her teaching at SKS. After her husband graduated, they opened an electronics store to support themselves and participate in Christian mission work in Mexico. Her husband often went back and forth between the U.S. and Mexico for the mission. Ms. Shin had three children, Hoon, Da-in, and Da-rae, all of whom attended SKS. Ms. Shin was a passionate parent and teacher, and she always made sure students were getting enough exposure to Korean in class.

Mr. Hyun started teaching Han.ul class in the middle of semester when Ms. Shin had to quit teaching as one of her employees was sacrificed in a shooting incident at her store. Mr. Hyun had recently come to the U.S. to study in a seminary, and as a junior pastor, he also led the youth group at SKS’ host church. Before becoming a pastor, he used to be a math teacher in 학원 ha gwŏn, or private educational institutions in Korea. He was a very friendly teacher, and students loved hanging out with him. Nonetheless, he said he feels much cultural difference with students at SKS, and he was still adapting to teaching, as well as living in the U.S. in general. The teaching practices and beliefs of these two teachers will be further discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
3.3.2. Students

The majority of students at SKS were 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Korean Americans, and many of their parents operated small business in the neighboring communities. There were also a small number of 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation students and recent arrivals from South Korea, as well as students with no ethnic heritage in Korean who attended the school because of their interest in Korean culture.

As for the focal participants of this research, six students in \textit{한울 Han.ul} and \textit{하랑 Ha.rang} classes were selected, as I assumed that teenage students would be more conscious about their varying identity positions and linguistic choices that my research questions inquired into (Erikson, 1968). My Saturday mornings started with these six students, as I had one-hour research sessions with them for the first class hour. For the remaining two class hours in the morning, I mostly observed \textit{Han.ul} Korean classes. Two students in \textit{Ha.rang} class independently worked on translating children’s books without formal Korean lessons, and I usually took pictures of their finished work, and observed them reading the translated stories to students in lower levels in between classes or during lunch hour.

Table 3.3. \textit{Student Profiles}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SKS class</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age of arrival in the U.S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rina (F)</td>
<td>하랑 \textit{Ha.rang}</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoon (M)</td>
<td>하랑 \textit{Ha.rang}</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Born in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joon (M)</td>
<td>한울 \textit{Han.ul}</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Born in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon-ho (M)</td>
<td>한울 \textit{Han.ul}</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da-in (F)</td>
<td>한울 \textit{Han.ul}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Born in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ye-un (F)</td>
<td>한울 \textit{Han.ul}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Born in US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the above table, all the students either came to the U.S. at a very early age or were born in the U.S. Except Ye-un whose parents did not go to church, students also interacted with one another on Sundays in the host church.

Rina was the daughter of Mr. Park, the principal of SKS and senior pastor of SKS’ host church. Her two younger siblings also attended SKS, but they were assigned to different classes. Rina enjoyed reading books and writing, and won many awards in local Korean writing tests. Although people often mistook her for recently coming from South Korea because of her fluent Korean, Rina came to the U.S. at the age of one, and she identified herself as “being perfectly bilingual.” As 언니 on.ni [lit. older sister; address term used for an older female friend], one of the oldest students at SKS, Rina set a model for other students, actively participating in class activities, and she sometimes admonished other students to listen to the teacher.

Hoon was the son of Ms. Shin, the teacher of Han.ul class, and the older brother of Da-in. Hoon was a humorous, easy-going student, and he always got along well with his peers at SKS. He also enjoyed writing, and he often asked teachers to check his spelling. Hoon particularly enjoyed translating children’s books that semester, and he was very proud to read the translated stories to younger students at SKS. After Ms. Shin quit teaching because of a shooting incident in her electronics store, Hoon occasionally missed class to help his mother at the store.

Along with Rina and Yoon-ho, Joon was one of the first students at SKS. He was a creative student, who enjoyed drawing and making things, and he often said that he wanted to be an engineer and inventor when he grew up. From my observation, I noticed that Joon was a bit of a loner in class, and he had a hard time focusing on the lesson—
reading and writing activities in particular. Although the teachers and his peers often pointed out his bad attitude in class, as will be seen in the following chapters, he also contributed a lot to classroom discussions when he felt interested in the topic.

Yoon-ho was an outgoing student, and he enjoyed making jokes in class. He often said that he first learned English from “Spanish people” who frequented their parents’ cleaners. Although he was a fluent bilingual speaker, he was particularly insecure about his writing. He wrote very little during writing activities in class. When I was teaching at SKS, the teachers used to label him as a “problem child” as he had a hard time concentrating in class. However, by the time I started my fieldwork, while still a class clown, Yoon-ho came to be much more engaged in class and contributed a lot to classroom discussions.

Da-in was an energetic, chatty student. She loved watching Korean dramas and dancing to K-Pop songs. She also led dance practice every week with the youth group at the church. She was a “good student” in class. While Ms. Shin, Da-in’s mother, was also her Korean language teacher at SKS, Da-in addressed Ms. Shin as 선생님 sŏn.saeng.nim [teacher] during class. She often volunteered to answer questions and present her work. She was a good friend with Yoon-ho, and as I went back to listen class audio-recordings, I noticed that these two students did a lot of side-chatting in class.

Ye-un was a reticent student in class. Although she chatted a lot between class hours with her peers, she was very shy when it came to classroom discussions. Ms. Shin sometimes called on Ye-un to participate in discussions, but she often remained silent for a long stretch of time before saying anything. Although her parents did not go to church, Ye-un attended SKS and SKS’s host church on weekends, and she seemed to enjoy spending time with her peers.
3.4. My Researcher Positionality

My positionality at SKS was an interesting mix of insider and outsider perspectives, because of the time I spent as a teacher prior to fieldwork. The two years of teaching experience at SKS gave me access to much information that would not be easily gained from a site I enter as a complete stranger. Teachers naturally included me in insider teacher talk about their classes and interaction with other teachers, parents, and students, and it did not take me long to build good rapport with focal students, as I used to teach them at some point during my two years of teaching at SKS.

At the same time, I was also positioned differently from the other teachers in many ways, which prevented me from becoming a complete insider. First of all, as I made my future research intentions clear from the moment I joined SKS as a teacher, many people at SKS, particularly the teachers, were aware that I might leave the school at some point when my research was done. I was also an outsider in that I did not belong to the community that was closely tied through SKS’ host church. As mentioned earlier, most of the participants at SKS were also members of the host church, including parents, teachers, and students. Some teachers and parents had known each other for more than twenty years, as they grew up in the same neighborhood. Compared to their relationships that had continued and would continue for many years, the two years I spent in the school was very brief. Also, I was at a different stage of life, being a single woman studying abroad in the U.S., while most of the adults at SKS were first-generation immigrants with school-aged children. I remember the moments when I could not really be part of their conversations,
aside from just nodding and smiling, as they talked about the most ordinary parts of their lives such as their spouses, children, or church.

When I first started teaching, students also seemed to be aware that I was different from the other teachers. Noticing that they never saw me except on Saturdays, some students would ask, “Where do you live? Do you live far way?” Also, some wondered if I had a husband like the other teachers. With all these questions, they were amused to find out that I was not married, and that I was also a student just like them. Despite our commonalities, students also recognized me as a teacher or an ‘adult’ at Sarang, because of the fact that I was teaching them. This was also evident at the morning school meetings when they were allowed to sit wherever they wanted. Besides very young students, most students would sit with their peer groups in a different row, instead of sitting next to me or the other teachers.

When I returned to SKS as a researcher, I explained my research intentions to the focal students and asked for their consent. I brought research consent forms written in English and Korean and explained to the students that I would like to conduct research with them, which meant that I wanted to know more about what they do and what they think about various things in their lives, such as SKS, their school life, family, and hobbies, and I would need their permission to conduct research, as they were the experts about their lives. The students were already familiar with the term, research, from their school, and all of them willingly signed the form. Some of them said that they wanted to “help” me with the research. During my fieldwork, I intentionally used more English with students, than I normally would as a teacher, and this helped students to more actively engage in discussions and share their stories.
Returning to SKS as a researcher, besides re-negotiating my identity with the students, I also had to fight familiarity (Delamont & Atkinson, 1995). Creswell (2007) recommends that for an ethnographer to study their own organization or workplace, they have to “ensure that the account is accurate and insightful” through “multiple strategies of validation” (p. 122). One of the strategies I used in terms of data collection was that I began my fieldwork at SKS after taking a break for three semesters from Spring 2015 to Spring 2016, and it certainly gave me some fresh eyes to the site. I noticed the things I had not noticed before as a teacher. The following is the fieldwork journal (16/09/10) I wrote on my first day of fieldwork:

Wrapping up my first day at SKS, I am noticing the things I have not noticed before. First of all, I have not really noticed different language policies each teacher had in their classrooms, and today I noticed a stark difference between the two classes I observed, and I may observe these two teachers more closely. Also, even when the lessons seem to proceed without much distraction from the teacher’s perspective, students chat a lot among themselves during class. It would be interesting to analyze students’ ‘side talk.’

These impressions on the first day also guided my ensuing observations, and I also video- and audio-recorded all the classes to play them back during the week to see whether I might have missed anything because of my bias toward some participants or any recurring practices at SKS. I was also able to get the perspectives of complete outsiders, as I shared part of my data with various colleagues through seminar and conference presentations. With these processes of negotiation and validation, I strove to gain a perspective as a simultaneous insider-outsider (Lofland, 1971), or marginal native (Freilich, 1970).

3.5. Data Collection
In the concluding chapter of Teresa McCarty’s edited volume, *Ethnography and Language Policy*, Hornberger and Johnson (2011) summarize various research methods the contributing authors have adopted under the umbrella term of ethnographic approaches to LPP, which include participant observation, interview, and document collection with varying foci. Some studies focus more on document analysis, including macro-level policy as well as locally produced materials, while others mainly draw on participant observation or various types of interview. For this study, my focus is more on the local space of Korean language schools. Nevertheless, I will draw on the analysis of macro-level policy documents as well as participant observation, interviews, and the analysis of locally produced documents, as local practices are situated in and connected to practices in different timescales and spaces. Each of these methods is described in greater detail below.

### 3.5.1. Document Collection

Atkinson and Coffey (2004) stress the significant role documents play in constructions of reality, in that they create “facts, records, diagnoses, decisions, and rules” that are involved in social practices. The documents I collected ranged from macro-level policy documents and textbooks to locally produced educational materials, and student work, all of which constituted part of the linguistic ecology in the local space. As for macro-level policies, I collected a series of policy documents on Korean language education for Korean heritage language learners. These policies included overt policy statements announced by the South Korean government (i.e., Ministry of Education and Overseas Korean Foundation under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), as well as other national and regional-level organizations in the U.S. such as the National Association for Korean Schools and Korean Education Center of New York. Besides overt policy statements, I also
collected textbooks used in the classroom, most of which were developed and offered by the South Korean government. As for the local materials, I collected teachers’ weekly lesson plans, letters to parents, teaching materials, publicity materials, materials uploaded on the schools’ websites, teachers’ meeting notes as well as students’ classroom writings and artwork.

3.5.2. Participant Observation

My Fieldwork at Sarang was conducted from September 2016 to December 2016. I visited the school every Saturday, and I also attended events hosted by the regional association of Korean Schools. As Saturdays were usually the only days I was in the field, I made the recordings of my observations as detailed and in-depth as possible. I recorded my observations via three methods: taking fieldnotes, audio-recording the classroom discourse, and video-recording the classroom interaction. These three methods of recording participant-observation complemented one another.

My fieldnotes complemented the selective recording of audio and video, in that they included the notable practices and side conversations that were out of the audio range or the camera frame. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) also argued that fieldnotes convey the ethnographer’s “sense of the field” (p. 148), which cannot be captured by audio- or video-recordings. As writing is a less salient activity in class compared to typing on a laptop, I made some jottings in class regarding specific incidents, instant thoughts, and actual words used by the participants. These jottings were further expanded on and developed into full fieldnotes, as soon as I left the field on Saturday. Fieldnotes included descriptive notes on one side and analytic and reflexive notes on the other (Emerson, Fretz, Shaw,
During the week, I reviewed the fieldnotes I had written up till that point, identified recurring patterns, and planned what I should pay more attention to for the next observation.

Regarding digitally recording observations through audio and video, Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) caution that “no means of data recording should be simply adopted as a matter of routine: reflexive awareness is required here as much as anywhere else” (p. 147). Recordings are always selective, and decisions have to be made about what equipment to use and whose voices and behaviors to include or not to include. For every class, I placed one camera and one audio-recorder at the front of the classroom, which was enough to capture who was saying what and how students moved about in the classroom. When I first brought the camera and audio-recorder to class, students were curious to see how they were being recorded and had occasional eye contact with the camera. Later, they became familiar with the devices and did not care about them as much, except when they mischievously spoke to the camera or audio-recorder when I was not watching them.

3.5.3. Interviews

For the current study, I consider interview data as a valuable source of information that cannot be easily elicited from informal conversations or participant observation alone. Also, interviews reflect the discursive strategies and ideologies that the participants draw on, which make them also the object of discourse analysis. Interviews were conducted with all the focal participants who gave permission, including students, their teachers and parents, and school administrators. Interviews were semi-structured in that I brought a list of questions I was interested in finding out about, but I allowed “the discussion to flow in a way that seems natural” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2006, p. 117). I interviewed each participant once, and all the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. For adults,
interviews lasted for an average of one hour, and all the interviews were conducted in Korean, the language they felt most comfortable with. As for parental interviews, although I gave them the option to be interviewed together or separately, only one parent from each family agreed to be interviewed. Student interviews lasted for an average of thirty minutes, and most of the interviews were conducted in English, although some of them occasionally used Korean as well.

3.5.4. Research Sessions

Based on my prior experiences of interviewing children, I realized that students do not talk as much in a formal interview setting. That was why I began to search for better ways to elicit student’s individual stories and experiences. Regarding interviews with children, Säljö (1997) argues that using an artifact or an object can serve as an effective trigger for much longer and complex accounts, and I decided to design a series of research sessions where students would be provided with certain props to share their related experiences and thoughts in the format of group discussion. Here I use the term “research sessions,” instead of focus group interviews, as it was the term used by the students. Students often said that these research sessions were their favorite part of the day, and boasted to students in other classes that they were doing “research sessions” in the morning. The following table summarizes the topics and audiovisual materials shared each week. I was only able to have 10 research sessions with students instead of my originally planned 15, because of occasional time conflict with other school events.
Table 3.4. Research Session Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Orientation</td>
<td>PPT introduction about the current research; consent forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 My week and hobbies</td>
<td>Pictures taken by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People who are important to me</td>
<td>Pictures taken by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social justice</td>
<td>Thought-provoking pictures covering the topics of immigration, poverty, racism, and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 K-pop</td>
<td>K-pop song lyrics and music videos (Lonely by 2EN1 and Love by C.N.Blue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Korean and American parents</td>
<td>“The difference between American parents/Korean parents” (The World of Dave, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Student's language</td>
<td>YouTube video: “Asian Americans try to speak their native language” (As/Is, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Parents' language</td>
<td>YouTube video: “When your parents speak broken English” (BuzzFeedVideo, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Korean school</td>
<td>Pictures of various events and activities in SKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Final reflections</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topics of research sessions were chosen to get a sense of students’ lives and interests outside of SKS, and to elicit their metacommentaries on their own linguistic practices and those of their family and others. For the first two research sessions, I asked students to take pictures of their weekly routines, hobbies, and people around them, partly because I wanted to let them know that these research sessions need not be difficult or serious, but that they can have fun sharing their stories. It has been also reported that photos provided by participants show their inner thoughts and conceptualizations of the world, which cannot be explained by words alone (Bessell, Deese & Medina, 2007; Martin-Jones, Hughes, & Williams, 2009; Pietikäinen, 2012). After two weeks of sharing students’ own pictures, I began to bring audiovisual materials from outside sources, which covered topics
more directly related to the research questions. Students made insightful comments on various aspects of the materials (e.g., the content, language, appearance) and shared their reflections and related experiences, which later developed into one of major findings of this research.

3.6. Data Analysis

In this section, I delineate data analysis processes in three stages: preliminary analysis, emergent coding, and discourse analysis. These analytic processes emerged organically, rather than as planned processes, as ethnography in and of itself is a grounded practice, co-constructed with participants in the site. The following table summarizes all the data collected for the purposes of the current study.

Table 3.5. Summary of Collected Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom &amp; other school activities</td>
<td>64 class hour audio- and video-recordings of classroom interactions; 200+ pictures; 45 fieldnotes, 12 analytic memos, 15 fieldwork journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>23 interviews (7 student interviews; 8 parent interviews; 6 teacher interviews, 2 administrator interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research sessions</td>
<td>10 class hours of audio- and video recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>100+ locally produced school documents, 60+ student work, 13 textbooks, policy documents on overseas Korean language education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1. Preliminary Analysis

Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) argued that data collection and data analysis should be in “a dialectical interaction” (p. 205), which means that an ethnographer should analyze data while collecting data, and their preliminary analysis should in turn influence aspects of the research design or data collection methods. As I visited the field on weekends,
I engaged in reflexive and analytic practices during the week. Every week, I went over the fieldnotes and the audio and video recordings of classroom, marked data points I wanted to analyze more carefully later, and planned a strategy for participant-observation in the following week. I also wrote analytic notes on these reflections at least once in two weeks. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) also stress the significance of analytic notes and memos, calling them “the essence of reflexive ethnography” (p. 151). In addition, I kept a fieldwork journal that not only shows a record of research processes but also the ethnographer’s personal emotions and experiences in the field (Coffey, 1999). Besides functioning as an outlet for relieving the stress of fieldwork, recording my personal emotions and reactions in the field offered valuable insights about the research sites and participants and also opportunities to continuously negotiate my researcher positionality. All the field notes, analytic memos, and fieldwork journals were stored in a qualitative data analysis software. This preliminary analysis, involving analytic memos and fieldwork journal writing, guided my ensuing data collection, which in turn informed a deeper understanding of the field site and the development of emergent patterns and categories.

3.6.2. Emergent coding

Although preliminary coding already started during fieldwork, I became fully engaged in the coding processes when I exited the fieldwork. I started coding data from classroom interactions, then moving to the research sessions, to participant interviews, but often went back and forth between them and other data sources such as school documents and textbooks, which organically became the ongoing processes of triangulation. In terms of coding schemes, I first started with descriptive codes and grouped them together for recurring themes to get a sense of what activities participants were engaged in, what the
participants were talking about, and how they interacted with one another. Although this may be labelled as inductive coding, it was inevitably a deductive process as well, as throughout the processes of data collection and analysis, I naturally oriented towards the moments when the themes related to my research questions and theoretical understandings emerged. Through this emergent and iterative coding, I came to identify the major findings of this research (e.g., oral reading, Konglish, teachers as language learners, textbook as curriculum, Korean vs. non-Korean), and noted specific points of data that needed more detailed discourse analysis.

3.6.3. Discourse Analysis

In this study, I assume that any type of discourse, whether it be from policy documents, class discussions, or interviews, is constructed through what Blommaert (2005) refers to as entextualization: “the process by means of which discourses are successively or simultaneously decontextualised and metadiscursively recontextualised” from different times and spaces where different ideologies are at play (p. 47). While tracing the embedded intertextual links analyzing the linguistic practices from different sources of data, I particularly attended to emerging notions of self through narratives. By telling stories in interaction, people mediate between the telling world and the tale world (Bamberg, 1997), or the narrating event and the narrated event (Wortham, 2001), through a wide array of communicative repertoires deployed from their individual indexical biographies (Blommaert & Backus, 2011). Thus, in order to have a deeper understanding of what the narrator chooses to say, how, and why, one should be able to understand “the trajectories followed by people throughout their lives”—“the opportunities, constraints and inequalities they were facing” and “their movement across physical and social space”
(Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p. 29), all of which were informed by insights gained from the fieldwork.

3.7. Conclusion

Concluding this chapter, I have to admit that although I described the processes of data collection and analysis as “organic,” I oftentimes felt lost or uneasy about such indeterminateness and diversions from my original plan of research. Much data gathered for this study came not to be included in the final writing up process due to many unforeseen circumstances. It was partly because of my lack of experience dealing with large amounts of ethnographic data, and this discouraged me from even writing up this chapter for a long time. However, as I write and conclude this chapter, I would like to conclude it with the following paragraph I ran across in my original research proposal. Although I wrote this paragraph based on my theoretical understanding of ethnographic research at the time, in actually collecting and analyzing data for this research, I came to experience the weight of these words, and despite many changes from my original plan, I still hope that data analyzed and presented in the following chapters will fairly represent the voices of individuals who participated in this research:

Ethnography, by its nature, is a research enterprise grounded in the field, co-constructed with participants, and my fieldwork experience may change the research questions, theoretical understandings, and research design I laid out in this proposal to varying degrees. Whatever path it may lead to, I hope that this ethnographic inquiry will represent the often marginalized voices of local actors involved in community-based heritage language education and their varying
imagination of “being/becoming Korean” to live in the United States, a nation of many dreams and aspirations.
CHAPTER 4 “YOU ALWAYS SPEAK IN KONGLISH”: TRACING STUDENTS’ METACOMMENTARY

This dissertation is built on an assumption that a speech community does not exist as a physical entity with clearly marked boundaries, but it is rather ‘imagined’ through a sense of belonging that is strengthened through shared knowledge and practices that are constantly negotiated and manipulated by individual speakers. Latour (2005), a major proponent of actor-network theory, also writes that “social aggregates are not the object of an ostensive definition . . . but only of a performative definition. They are made by the various ways and manners in which they are said to exist” (p. 34, emphasis added). In this respect, to explore students’ imagination of speech communities, or groups of speakers, this chapter offers an analysis of students’ metacommentaries—how they describe and characterize different communicative repertoires used around them, what persons or images they associate these repertoires with, and how they position themselves amid such typifications. By tracing students’ metacommentaries, I aim to understand students’ conceptualization of the named codes, “Konglish” in particular, and explore how they position themselves in relation to speakers indexed in the metacommentary.

4.1. Analyzing Metacommentary

Metacommentary, i.e., talk about language, can take various forms, ranging from the labeling of codes (e.g., That’s Konglish right there) and the discussion of specific linguistic features (e.g., I feel like Korean is, kind of, like getting degraded these days) to mimicking the voice of other speakers (e.g., They’re like, “애크미 가자” ae.kŭ.mi ka.ja [Let’s go to Acme]). It is also not limited to verbal utterances, but extends to other modes
of communication, such as gestures, facial expressions, and even clothing, all of which can express the individual’s perception of other speakers (Rymes, 2014). In these various forms, metacommentary reflects ongoing processes of typification and identity negotiation, through which individuals associate particular forms of speech with certain groups of speakers, imbued with particular values or images, while negotiating their positioning in relation to such typifications. Further, like any other utterances, metacommentary is socially situated, in that individuals choose to make certain kinds of metacommentary to position themselves in relation to their interlocutors in the context at hand, as well as the groups of speakers indexed in the commentary.

In this respect, “metacommentary signals an understanding of what a sign means . . . by pointing to that sign’s situated communicative value” (Rymes, 2014, p. 11, emphasis added). To unpack and analyze this situatedness, insights can be drawn from narrative analytic methods which provide an analytic lens built on the understanding of narratives as socially situated action (Bakhtin, 1981; Bamberg, 1997; De Fina & Georgakopoulous, 2012; Holland & Lave, 2000; Mishler, 1999; Wortham, 2001). Narrative research assumes that while telling stories, people mediate between the telling world and the tale world (Bamberg, 1997), or the narrating event and the narrated event (Jakobson, 1957/1971; Wortham, 2001). A narrator, as the author of a story, appropriates the voices of others in order to position him or herself within and with respect to the story (Bakhtin, 1981). A narrative, with its carefully orchestrated collection of different voices by its author, also indexes history in person (Holland & Lave, 2000) or indexical biographies of individuals—“social and cultural itineraries followed by people through
“the various social arenas they inhabited or visited in their lives” (Blommaert & Backus, 2012).

Such layered understanding of narratives also applies to metacommentary, in that individuals index or characterize certain groups of speakers with their choice of semiotic resources (e.g., particular sounds, words, gestures, or clothing) they have accumulated through various social arenas they traversed in their lives. Through metacommentary, individuals position themselves in relation to others, including the speakers indexed in the commentary as well as interlocutors in the local context. Thus, in analyzing metacommentary, one should analyze not only its denotational content, but also the interactional positioning of the speaker in relation to the indexed voices and other participants in the local context. The analysis should be also complemented with ethnographic fieldwork to gain insights into the choice of semiotic resources by the speaker.

Wortham (2001) identifies five linguistic devices that can guide a researcher to trace the mediation between the narrating event and the narrated event. Adapting Wortham (2001)’s framework, in my analysis, I will attend to: (1) language chosen to describe certain codes or groups of speakers, such as reference nouns, verbs, or adjectives (e.g., serious, awkward), (2) metapragmatic verbs that characterize the past events of speaking (e.g., yelled, mixed), (3) the distribution and characterization of direct and indirect quoted speech, (4) evaluative indexicals, which put codes or groups of speakers in certain social positions, often by invoking widely circulating stereotypes, and thus position the speaker with respect to those positions (e.g., bucket dippers), and (5) epistemic modalization that denotes the relative epistemic status of the speaker in the
local communicative context with respect to other speakers indexed in the commentary. Along with these five linguistic cues, the analysis was also guided by ethnographic information gathered from class observation and interviews.

4.2. What is Konglish?: Students’ Metacommentary

My research sessions with students were intentionally set up to encourage students to share their thoughts on various aspects of their lives—particularly those pertaining to this research, such as family, local community, immigration, and language learning. I usually showed one or two audiovisual materials to students each week, and students were encouraged to talk and write about their related experiences and reflections in whatever linguistic forms they preferred. In one of the research sessions towards the end of the semester, students watched a YouTube video where the mother of a Korean American boy talks about various strategies she employed to teach her son Korean, and it opened up students to talk about their language learning experiences—how their parents helped them learn Korean and how they learned different languages as they grew up. Afterwards, they were asked to write about their daily language use, and this writing activity led to the discussion of various communicative repertoires students engaged with in their lives. This chapter will discuss metacommentaries students made in this particular discussion, as well as follow-up interviews regarding a repertoire they referred to as “Konglish.” A total of six students, Da-in, Hoon, Rina, Yoon-ho, Joon, and Ye-un, participated in the discussion, and the analysis will focus on the cases of four students, Da-in, Joon, Yoon-ho, and Rina.
4.2.1. Da-in

Da-in was the daughter of Ms. Shin, who was also her Korean language teacher at SKS. Before Da-in was born, Da-in’s parents came to the U.S. as her father was admitted to a seminary. They ended up settling in Philadelphia opening an electronics store to prepare for mission work in Mexico. Da-in had one older brother and one younger sister, who also attended SKS. Her older brother, Hoon, also joined my research sessions every week. When asked about language use at home, Ms. Shin said that she intentionally used Korean at home to teach her children as much Korean as possible. Da-in and Hoon in fact spoke and wrote in Korean with ease, compared to other students at their age. Da-in and her siblings were considered “good students” at SKS, always attentively listening to the teacher and actively participating in classroom activities.

When students were asked to present their writing in the research session, Da-in was the first to volunteer, and the following excerpt shows her description of her daily language use.

Excerpt 1. Da-in: Discussion on Daily Language Use

1 Da-in: ((Starts reading)) “I use English 75 percent of my day. At school, I talk to friends in English because they don’t understand in Korean. When I come home, I speak Korean with my parents, because they push me to try and use more Korean. It’s very awkward to speak Korean in front of friends, because they don’t understand. And when they try to mimic me ((0.5, snigger)), it gets VERY awkward. I use Konglish ((laugh)) when talking to siblings.”

2 Hoon: You have to explain what Konglish is.

3 Da-in: Okay, Konglish is, Korean and English together.

4 Da-in: “But usually I talk in English when I’m trying to start a conversation. When I’m mad or joking, I use Korean, because it seems more mature and more official and serious.”
5  Yoon-ho: ((mimicking Da-In)) 아 왜 그래. 오빠는 좀 면날, 오빠는 좀 면날 이리= [Gosh, why are you like that? O.ppa always, o.ppa always keeps doing this=]

In Line 1, she juxtaposes the use of English and Korean. Da-in says she uses English to talk to friends at school, while she speaks Korean with her parents. English belongs to the domain of school, while Korean belongs to the domain of her family, her parents in particular. When these boundaries are crossed—for instance, when Da-in speaks Korean in front of her friends at school or when her friends try to mimic Da-in—she emphasizes that she feels “very awkward.” These two named codes are also characterized in divergent ways. The words used to describe English use are rather neutral. Da-in says, “I use English 75 percent of the day” (Line 1), and “I talk in English when I’m trying to start a conversation” (Line 4). However, in describing Korean, she uses more value-laden verbs and adjectives. She says, “My parents push me to try and use more Korean,” and “When I am mad or joking, I use Korean, because it seems more mature and more official and serious” (Emphasis added). Yoon-ho chimes in, mimicking the irritated voice of Da-in directed at her 오빠 o.ppa [address term for an older brother used by female]: “아 왜 그래. 오빠는 좀 면날, 오빠는 좀 면날 이리=” [Gosh, why are you like that? O.ppa always, o.ppa always keeps doing this=]. While English seemed to be considered the default language of school and daily conversation, it seemed that Da-in was associating the Korean language with an authoritative voice used to admonish or scold others whether in serious or humorous ways, and as will be discussed later, this was also corroborated in her follow-up interview.
Then, at the end of Line 1, Da-in says, “I use Konglish ((laugh)) when talking to siblings.” The term, Konglish, immediately caught my attention, not only because Da-in suddenly laughed as soon as she mentioned the word, but also because she was using the term in a different way than the way I would assume other Koreans do. In Korea, the term Konglish is often used in pejorative manner referring to either 1) English loanwords incorporated into Korean that are used in ways not readily understandable to other English speakers, or 2) erroneous (often accented) English used by Korean speakers. Probably thinking that the term needs explanation, Da-in’s older brother, Hoon, interrupts, asking Da-in to define the term for the others (Line 2), and Da-in offers a brief definition, “Okay, Konglish is, Korean and English together” (Line 3). This brief exchange between Da-in and Hoon—the fact that Hoon made a performative clarification request to Da-in, instead of posing a genuine question (“What is Konglish?”)—signals that “Konglish” was something they were both aware of as a shared repertoire. This triggered my interest, and I decided to ask students more about Konglish in the follow-up interviews that were conducted on the same day.

In Da-in’s interview, I asked Da-in what she thought about using Konglish, and she shared her ambivalent feelings.

Excerpt 2. Da-in’s Interview

1 Da-in: Konglish? Um. Well, for our family, it’s a positive thing, because then my mom tells us what the word means and we make it into a learning experience.
2 Siwon: For your family, but in other situations=
3 Da-in: =In other situations, I don’t like, I don’t like, when I speak to parents, I would speak in Konglish, but I wouldn’t to other adults, because then like it would kind of be negative, ‘cause like they would think I’m really like- I’m not good with Korean, and I don’t understand that well.
4 Siwon: What adults?
In Line 1, Da-in says, “It’s [Konglish] a positive thing, because then my mom tells us what the word means and we make it into a learning experience.” In her interview, Ms. Shin in fact explained that whenever her children use an English word when talking in Korean, she immediately asks them for the Korean equivalent, and if they do not know, she offers the word in Korean and asks them to restate the sentence with the word. Da-in labelled this as “a learning experience” and associated it with the adjective “positive.” Da-in was in fact the only student who positively characterized use of Konglish among the focal students. Also, in her description, Da-in uses the pronoun “we” three times to signify Konglish as a shared practice among her family. This is also in line with the sharedness signified in the brief exchange between Da-in and Hoon in the previous excerpt as well (Excerpt 1).

However, when probed to share her thoughts regarding Konglish in other situations, she immediately responds with many negations: “In other situations, I don’t like, I don’t like, when I speak to parents, I would speak in Konglish, but I wouldn’t to other adults, because then like it would kind of be negative, ‘cause like they would think I’m really like- I’m not good with Korean, and I don’t understand that well.” (Emphasis added). When asked to clarify who “other adults” were, she elaborates, “like the people at the church, 권사님들 kwŏn.sa.nim.dŭl [senior deaconesses].” She does not point to specific individuals here, but rather she distances herself by using impersonal descriptors...
in plural forms. In particular, the use of plural suffix 들 dŭl in 권사님들 kwŏn.sa.nim.dŭl [senior deaconesses] puts emphasis on the plurality of these individuals, as plurality is often not marked in Korean. The term, kwŏn.sa.nim.dŭl, also signified an authoritative female figure in the Korean church context. With these linguistic devices, Da-in constructed an image of Korean speaker imposing pure use of Korean on youth in the church. This authoritative image was also in line with Da-in’s characterization of Korean language as being mature, official, and serious.

Here, it is worth noting that despite positive characterization of Konglish as a shared learning practice within her family, Konglish was still considered as a tool that would help Da-in to achieve better proficiency in Korean, rather than a whole repertoire in and of itself. Furthermore, before an authoritative Korean adult figure, Konglish was considered sign of lacking proficiency in Korean. This negative characterization of Konglish becomes more evident in the cases of the other three students, as will be discussed in the following sections.

4.2.2. Joon and Yoon-ho

In this section, I will discuss the cases of Joon and Yoon-ho together because of their frequent interaction in the research session. Joon was a student who often got distracted during reading and writing activities in class, but he excitedly participated in class discussions that he felt interested in. Joon’s mother said that she felt sorry for the teachers at SKS because of Joon’s lack of concentration and impulsive behavior in class, but that he always waits for going to SKS and church every week. Joon’s parents moved to the U.S. before Joon was born. Since both parents worked full time at a restaurant, Joon and his younger brother grew up spending most of the time with their grandmother,
who came to the U.S. when Joon was two years old. Joon’s mother was Chinese Korean, and she proudly said that she was fluently bilingual in Chinese and Korean. In her interview, she said that she would often tell Joon to “master” Korean, so that he can become a fluent bilingual like her. She stressed that speaking Korean would be a “bonus” for her son, as it is hard for him to compete with his English-speaking peers on the job market without bilingual abilities. Although Joon agreed with her about the need to “master” Korean, Joon’s mom felt that his progress in Korean had been slow. When asked about language use at home, Joon’s mother reported that Joon mostly uses Korean with her and his grandmother as they do not speak English well.

Yoon-ho came to the U.S. at the age of three with his parents. Since both parents worked at a laundry and Yoon-ho was the only child, Yoon-ho’s father said that SKS had been like a haven where Yoon-ho can safely spend his Saturdays learning Korean, eating Korean food, and meeting other Korean friends. When asked about language use at home, Yoon-ho’s father said that he speaks “100 percent Korean” to Yoon-ho because he does not speak English well. Despite their busy schedule, Yoon-ho’s parents always helped Yoon-ho do his homework from SKS, and he was in fact the only student who faithfully submitted all the weekly assignments. In his interview, his father expressed his hope that Yoon-ho would not lose Korean identity: “We look different. They wouldn’t fully accept us as American, even if we may speak the same language. I always tell Yoon-ho, ‘You have something different than others.’” At SKS, Yoon-ho was a class clown, livening up the mood of class with funny jokes while trying to follow class instructions from the teacher.
In the research session, after Da-in shared her writing, other students volunteered to share their writing. Then, I noticed that Joon did not write much on paper, and I asked him to describe his daily language use verbally. In the following excerpt, as Joon-ho describes his daily language use, Yoon-ho makes explicit comment on Joon’s use of “Konglish.”

Excerpt 3. Joon: Discussion on Daily Language Use

23 Siwon: Joon, can you share? ((Seeing that Joon didn’t write much)) You can share your thoughts.
24 ((Joon and Yoon-ho are talking among themselves))
   Joon: Okay, I’ll just share my thoughts. I don’t like to write that much.
25 Siwon: 애들어, 들어. [Guys, listen]
26 Joon: I use English mostly in school, because well, it’s one of my, I prefer using English over Korean, ‘cause I don’t really get that many opportunities to use Korean, (0.5) and such. Um, Korean school, mostly use Korean. Sometimes I use English, whenever I get mad, and just feel like it. And sometimes I use Konglish during, while talking in Korean=
27 Yoon-ho: =Sometimes?
28 Joon: =which is the combination of, replacing Korean words with English.
29 Yoon-ho: Sometimes? You always speak in Konglish.
30 Joon: And, when I play games, I do speak English. When I’m yelling at someone, like sometimes I like, I mostly say yeah, English. At home, sometimes, I speak Konglish to my mom, because some words I don’t know how to say=
31 Siwon: =Uhm, right
32 Joon: And my mom scolds me sometimes but anyway. My grandma understands in English. My little brother likes speaking English as well as I do. Um, even when I’m talking to myself, I speak in English, I don’t speak in Korean that much. And when I’m commenting on something, I always speak English.

Joon’s description of daily language use differs from Da-in’s, in that he puts more emphasis on the use of English. He provides examples of many contexts where he would use English, such as in school (Line 26), when he gets mad or just feels like it (Line 26),
when playing games (Line 30), yelling at someone (Line 30), talking to his little brother and to himself (Line 32), and commenting on something (Line 32). He also uses value-laden verbs, as he says, “I prefer using English over Korean” (Line 26, emphasis added) and “My little brother *likes* speaking English as well as I do” (Line 32). On the other hand, when describing the use of Korean, the context is limited to “Korean school” (Line 26). He also reiterates that he does not speak in Korean often (“I don’t really get that many opportunities to use Korean,” Line 26; “I don’t speak in Korean that much,” Line 32).

Joon uses the term Konglish when describing his language use in two contexts: In Korean school and when talking to his mother. As he explains that in Korean school, he uses Korean mostly and English sometimes, he adds, “And sometimes I use Konglish during, while talking in Korean, which is the combination of, replacing Korean words with English” (Lines 26, 28). Regarding language use at home, he says, “At home, sometimes, I speak Konglish to my mom, because some words I don’t know how to say=” (Lines 30). It seemed that Joon was also using the term, Konglish, in the same way Da-in was using the term: He uses Konglish while talking in Korean, when he does not know how to say certain words and replaces them with English words. It also seems that Konglish is sometimes sanctioned by his mother, as he says, “my mom *scolds* me sometimes [when I speak Konglish] but anyway” (Line 32). His last two words, “but anyway” reflects his nonchalant attitude about using Konglish, which becomes more evident in later interactions and his interview.

When Joon brings up the term Konglish (“And sometimes I use Konglish,” Line 26), Yoon-ho immediately picks it up and comments, “Sometimes? Sometimes? You
always speak in Konglish” (Lines 27, 29). Yoon-ho’s metacommentary is rather blatant with the use of pronoun, “You,” and an adverb “always” which starkly contrasts with the adverb “sometimes” used by Joon. Yoon-ho continues to comment on Joon’s use of Konglish when Joon tries to explain what Konglish is later in the research session. In the following excerpt, after all the students shared their daily language use, I asked them to provide their own definitions of Konglish, and Yoon-ho and Joon first chimed in.

Except 4. Joon: Discussion on Konglish

33 Siwon: How do you guys define Konglish?
34 Yoon-ho: Konglish is what=
35 Joon: =Konglish is basically replacing words, what you don’t understand with another language.
36 Yoon-ho: Konglish is what Joon 형 hyǒng [lit. brother—referring to an older male friend] talks in. ((laugh))
37 Joon: So, 그러니까, 만약에 토크 그렇게 말할 때= [So, if you say like to.kǔ=”]
38 Yoon-ho: 토크, 토크, 토크 [to.kǔ, to.kǔ, to.kǔ]
39 Joon: =토크가 미국말인데= [=to.kǔ is American language, but=]
40 Yoon-ho: That’s Konglish right there.
41 Joon: =한국말 sentence 했을 때 들어가는 거예요. [=it is inserted when you make a Korean sentence.]
42 Siwon: 섞을 때, Konglish 라고 생각해요? [Do you think it’s Konglish when you mix?]
43 Joon: 네 섞을 때. [Yes, when you mix]

Responding to my prompt, Joon reiterates his previous definition of Konglish: “Konglish is basically replacing words that you don’t understand with another language [English]” (Line 35). Then, immediately switching to Korean, he provides an example of Konglish in Lines 37, 39, and 42: So, 그러니까, 만약에 토크 그렇게 말할 때 토크가
미국말인데 한국말 sentence 했을 때 들어가는 거예요 [So, so, if you say like to.ğu, to.ğu is American language, but it is inserted when you make a Korean sentence ]

(underlined phrases originally said in English). 토크 to.ğu, referring to ‘talk’ in English, is an English loanword incorporated into Korean language. Vowel ữu is added at the end, because Korean phonology does not allow a released k sound in the coda position of the syllable. Ironically, Joon’s example was closer to the definition of Konglish used in Korea (i.e., English loanwords or Korean-accented English).

In his original definition of Konglish, Joon was referring to translanguaging practices Korean American youth engaged in, while trying to speak in Korean, and English words used in these translanguaging practices would mostly maintain phonological features of English rather than Korean. The example of this type of Konglish was inadvertently provided by Joon in the same utterance, as he said, “한국말 sentence 했을 때 들어가는 거예요” [it is inserted when you make a Korean sentence] (Line 42); 문장 [sentence] was advanced vocabulary that Joon probably could not think of at the moment and instead used English. However, it was interestingly unnoticed by all the interlocutors in this excerpt, which in a way reflects the unmarkedness of translanguaging practices among students. As the discussion unfolded, I noticed that students were using the term Konglish in conflated ways, referring to both their own translanguaging practices, as well as accented English and English loanwords used by Korean speakers.

Throughout the excerpt, Yoon-ho made explicit metacommentary regarding Joon’s use of Konglish. Amid Joon’s explanation of Konglish, Yoon-ho says, “Konglish is what Joon 형 hyŏng [lit. brother; address term for an older male friend] talks in (Line
He specifically points to Joon as the speaker of Konglish, and by doing so, he was distancing himself from Konglish. Also, fixated on the word, 토크 *to.kŭ*, Yoon-ho keeps mimicking Joon’s pronunciation (토크, 토크, 토크 *to.kŭ, to.kŭ, to.kŭ*, Line 38), and labels it as Konglish (“That’s Konglish right there,” Line 40). Ironically, Yoon-ho inadvertently uses a Korean address term, 형 *hyŏng*, while speaking in English, and does not notice Joon’s translanguaging either (“한국말 sentence 했을 때 들어가는 거예요” [it is inserted when you make a Korean *sentence*, Line 42). This again shows the prevalence of translanguaging practices among students, and it seemed that although students were aware of their own translanguaging practice, it was happening so naturally that it goes unnoticed in the moment.

What becomes obvious from the above excerpt is that Yoon-ho was distancing himself from the speakers of “Konglish.” In fact, unlike Da-in or Joon, when describing his own daily language use, Yoon-ho does not use the term Konglish. Yoon-ho’s distancing was also observed in his interview as well.

**Excerpt 5. Yoon-ho’s Interview**

1 Siwon: Do you think you speak Konglish also?
2 Yoon-ho: Um, from time to time, I think yes if I can’t think of any better words to say.
3 Siwon: Is it a positive thing or a negative thing?
4 Yoon-ho: I prefer not speaking Konglish.
5 Siwon: Why not?
6 Yoon-ho: I don’t really, I feel like when I speak Konglish, I feel like I need to learn my language more.
When asked whether he speaks Konglish, Yoon-ho admits that he speaks Konglish “from time to time” if he “can’t think of any better words to say” (Line 2). His description of his own use of Konglish starkly contrasts with Yoon-ho’s comment on Joon’s use of Konglish, that Joon “always” speaks Konglish. At the same time, Yoon-ho expresses strong urge not to speak Konglish, as he says, “I prefer not speaking Konglish” (Line 4). When probed to specify why he would not use Konglish, he explains, “I feel like when I speak Konglish, I feel like I need to learn my language more” (Line 6). Referring to Korean as “my language” (emphasis added), Yoon-ho was claiming his ownership of the language. On the other hand, rather than being regarded as a whole repertoire in and of itself, Konglish was described as a reminder for him to learn more Korean.

Contrary to Yoon-ho, in his interview, Joon said that he “often” speaks Konglish and he maintains a nonchalant attitude regarding using Konglish.

Excerpt 6. Joon’s Interview

1  Siwon: Do you think you speak Konglish sometimes?
2  Joon: Yes, I do often, ((laugh)) mostly in Korean? Because I have hard time talking. But then again, my English isn’t that perfect either. . . So, anyway my mind reacts perfectly fine when I’m trying to think of an American word and I can think of one? But for Korean, I like immediately go to my original American mindset, so yeah.
3  Siwon: Is it a positive thing, like using Konglish? Or is it a negative thing?
4  Joon: I think Konglish can be positive or negative. ‘cause like, eventually you’re gonna start learning Korean words. But anyway you’ll still be able to get the conversation going without actually- “Wait what was the word again?” Like it’ll ruin the flow of conversation. But if you’re talking in Konglish, they’ll somewhat understand you, so you keep the conversation going.
When asked whether he speaks Konglish, he says, “Yes, I do often [speak Konglish], (laugh)) mostly [when I speak] in Korean?” It is hard to definitely characterize the meaning of his laughter with this instance alone, but it seems to be in line with his careless and nonchalant attitude reflected in his verbal description that followed. In Line 2, Joon again explains his need to use English words while talking in Korean, because he has “hard time talking [in Korean].” When asked about his thoughts about using Konglish, he refuses to characterize it as either “positive or negative,” but rather emphasizes its functionality, that it “keeps the conversation going” without “ruining the flow” (Line 4). Compared to Da-in or Yoon-ho, Joon’s wording reflected that he did not care much about using Konglish as long as he can efficiently communicate with others. However, at the same time, the comment Joon makes about both Korean and English (“I have hard time talking [in Korean]. But then again, my English isn’t that perfect either,” Line 2) reflects his conceptualization of two distinct languages requiring “perfect” fluency and his perception of his own abilities not reaching the standard. In this context, Konglish is framed as an inevitable means to compensate for his lack of proficiency in Korean.

4.2.3. Rina

Rina was a pastor’s kid. At SKS, she always volunteered to help younger students and actively participated in class activities. Rina moved to the U.S. along with her parents at the age of two, as her father was appointed as the senior pastor of SKS’ host church. Since then, her brother and sister were born, and starting from when they were as young as three, they have been going to Korean school. Rina’s mother was zealous about teaching Korean to her children. She hired a Korean language and history tutor for Rina
and brought various kinds of books from Korea, ranging from storybooks, history books to magazines and encyclopedias. In such an environment, Rina grew up to be an avid reader and effortlessly used Korean. She always won the 1st place awards in the local writing contests. Being an inquisitive student, she did well in school, and at the time of this research, Rina had also started learning Chinese at a community-based Chinese school, after she visited China over the summer to see her grandmother who was a missionary there.

In the following excerpt, after hearing from Joon and Yoon-ho, I asked for more definitions by other students, and Rina offered her definition of Konglish. There was a lot of overlapping talk in this excerpt, as students excitedly shared their thoughts on Konglish.

Except 7. *Rina: Discussing Konglish*

44 Siwon: Do you guys have any other definitions? Konglish?
45 Rina: Konglish is the primary symptom of=
46 Yoon-ho: I don’t like when Joon hyŏng talks in Konglish, ‘cause he says that English ((incomprehensible))
47 Siwon: Shh
48 Rina: =non-perfect fluency, yeah, in Korean.
49 Hoon: Just, just filling in.
50 Yoon-ho: I think Konglish is kind of like, I think when some people do it, like I guess it’s hard to= when some people do it, you know how they were talking in Korean right before, you see the American ones with Korean accent, and it sounds like really weird.
51 Rina: I feel like Korean is, kind of, like getting degraded these days, because all the K-pop songs are in Konglish. Like I guess it’s considered cool to put in English words, but some of the lyrics, I don’t know.
In Lines 44 and 48, Rina defines Konglish in a concise sentence: “Konglish is the primary symptom of non-perfect fluency, yeah, in Korean.” Amidst Rina’s comment, still fixated on Joon’s use of Konglish and its pronunciation, Yoon-ho chimes in, “When some people do it, you know how they were talking in Korean right before, you see the American ones with Korean accent, and it sounds like really weird” (Line 50). Hoon makes brief metacommentary, “Just, just filling in” (Line 49), which also reflects an understanding of Konglish as a way to compensate for lack of vocabulary in Korean. Then, in Line 51, Rina makes metacommentary on Konglish used in K-pop songs: “Korean is, kind of, like getting degraded these days, because all the K-pop songs are in Konglish. Like I guess it’s considered cool to put in English words, but some of the lyrics, I don’t know.”

In this excerpt, Rina’s choice of lexical items concertedly reveals Rina’s conceptualization of separate languages and purist zeal for keeping these languages intact. In her definition of Konglish as “primary symptom of non-perfect fluency in Korean,” the phrase, “primary symptom” conjures up the image of an ill person. If the symptom is Konglish, the cause of this symptom is phrased as “non-perfect fluency in Korean.” This presupposes that there is such thing as perfect fluency in Korean, thus insinuating that a Konglish speaker would not reach that standard. While her definition points to Korean Americans’ use of Konglish (Lines 44 and 48), her following metacommentary in Line 51 is on how Koreans in Korea would use English words in K-pop song lyrics. Like other students, Rina was using the term Konglish in conflated ways. However, regardless of which Konglish she meant, Rina’s claim that “Korean is getting degraded these days, because all the K-pop songs are in Konglish” (emphasis added)
implies an assumption that the dignity of Korean language can be maintained only when it is used on its own without the influence of other languages. As she expresses tentativeness in her following comment, "I guess it’s considered cool to put in English words, but some of the lyrics, I don’t know" (emphasis added), she also positions herself apart from the indexed speakers—those who, according to her conjecture, consider putting English words in Korean cool.

Despite her distancing from Konglish or its speakers as seen from the previous excerpt, in her interview, Rina acknowledged her own use of Konglish. At the same time, her purist language ideology surfaced as the interview continued.

Excerpt 8. Rina’s Interview

1 Siwon: Would you say you use Konglish also?
2 Rina: Sometimes? Yeah, when I’m talking to my parents, it’s like, not that much, but if I can’t think of Korean word straight away, then I’m like, you know, use English words. Or if it’s like something, like if the term is only used in school, and there’s like no translation for it, then you know.
3 Siwon: Do you think using Konglish is a positive thing or a negative thing?
4 Rina: Um, I mean, though you should strive to speak in one language because that shows your fluency, but I don’t, it’s not like a sin to use English mixed with Korean if it’s for your own comfort, as long as you get your message through. But you should still try to be like perfectly bilingual in both languages, since they’re both part of your culture.
5 Siwon: What does it mean to be perfectly bilingual?
6 Rina: Um: um: I don’t know. Like native pronunciation. Um: I mean if you’re able to like read books in that language, I guess you’re pretty fluent, and you don’t feel uncomfortable when you’re talking with people that only speak that language.

When explicitly asked whether she also uses Konglish (Line 1), Rina admits that she uses Konglish: “Sometimes? Yeah, when I’m talking to my parents, it’s like, not that much (emphasis added, Line 2). However, the adverbs like “sometimes” or “not that much”
signify that it is not her usual way of speaking (Line 4). She also offers a specific example where the use of English becomes inevitable: “if the term is only used in school, and there’s like no translation for it” (Line 2). Then, when asked about her perception of Konglish (Line 3), she carefully provides a lengthy response in Line 4, which will be analyzed in greater detail in the following paragraph.

First of all, the rhetorical structure of her utterance can be examined. Her response can be broken down to three statements, which are positioned in adversative relations with one another, with the use of conjunctions, “though” and “but.” Rina first makes a case for separate bilingualism: “though you should strive to speak in one language because that shows your fluency.” Then, she makes a statement that acknowledges the functionality of Konglish: “but it’s not like a sin to use English mixed with Korean if it’s for your own comfort, as long as you get your message through.” Here, more emphasis is put on the latter statement, as the conjunction “though” structurally subordinates the former statement. However, Rina goes back to her case for separate bilingualism by adding another statement: “But you should still try to be like perfectly bilingual in both languages, since they’re both part of your culture.” Such discursive structure reveals that although Rina acknowledges the use of Konglish for one’s own comfort to get the message through, she still argues that one should strive to be perfectly bilingual, speaking in one language at a time.

Second, in all of her statements, she uses the pronoun “you.” In all cases, “you” did not refer to me, the person Rina was talking to, but a generic person “you.” This generic use of “you” (e.g., You can’t always get what you want) is reported to be used to express norms by extending the scope of utterance beyond oneself (Orvell et al., 2017), and Rina’s claims were presented in this form of dictum, assuming agreement from her audience. In
addition, Rina uses the auxiliary verb “should” in making her claims: “You should strive to speak in one language”; “You should still try to be like perfectly bilingual.” Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) suggested that modality signifies the degree of commitment a speaker expresses to his/her proposition. Rina chooses “should” over stronger modals (e.g., must, ought to, need, has to) or tentative modals (e.g., can, may, could, might). With such choice, Rina expresses her commitment toward separate bilingualism, yet carefully controls the expressed level of commitment. Lastly, in her second statement, “it’s not like a sin to use English mixed with Korean,” by using the word “sin,” a word with strong moral overtone, Rina also distances herself from extremist purism, which contributes to constructing a moderate-sounding voice arguing for “perfect bilingualism.”

With the use of these various linguistic devices, what becomes notable is Rina’s assertive yet careful voice arguing for “perfect bilingualism” or what Creese and Blackledge (2011) referred to as separate bilingualism. Although Rina was maintaining the same position in both the research session and the interview, her carefulness in the interview starkly contrasted with her choice of strong words in the research session discussion, and this might have to do with the communicative context of interview, where the interviewee tries to present a logical and moderate voice suited for academic research. Then, when asked to elaborate on the meaning of being “perfectly bilingual” (Line 5), Rina pointed out several attributes: native pronunciation and ease with reading and speaking in that language (Line 6). Reading and speaking in a language was in line with Rina’s previous argument for separate bilingualism. Also, it was interesting to note that “native pronunciation” was specifically pointed out, as it was also the linguistic feature Yoon-ho was fixated on, picking on the accented English used by other speakers of Korean. Along
the same lines, in other research sessions as well, students often commented on
pronunciations diverging from the “native” norm when discussing the linguistic practices
of other speakers:

- Yoon-ho: ((referring to Korean parents)) “Which is really cringey. They’re
like, “에 크미 가자” ae.kū.mi ka.ja [Let’s go to Acme], “Do you wanna have
some chii.kin [chicken]?”
- Rina: ((referring to Korean adults correcting other Korean adults’
pronunciation)) “Hello, I heard you say Home Dee-pot [Depot].”
- Yoon-ho: All my other friends- There’s only one friend, and he’s Korean.
And he’s the only one who says my name right. He’s like Yun.ho. But
everyone else is like “Yuun.hou,” and I’m like ((making nonchalant face))
- Joon: And then like after he asked what my Korean name was, every time
he would see me, he go “Juun,” and I’m like “Oh gosh.”

Although the contexts of use differ in each instance, these commentaries
foreground the marked pronunciation of individuals attempting to speak the language
(framed as) belonging to others, while reflecting students’ conceptualization of an ideal
native speaker who speaks (and enunciates) the language perfectly. Rina’s purist ideal was
not her own, but as seen from the cases of other students in this section, it was a widely
circulating ideology among students at SKS, and it was expressed through a range of
metacommentaries discussed in this chapter.

4.3. Conclusion: What Does It Mean to be Bilingual?

In this chapter, I attended to the ways students described the linguistic practices of
themselves and others by closely analyzing their metacommentaries. I specifically focused
on metacommentaries on “Konglish.” While students used the term to refer to English
words used while speaking in Korean, the ensuing discussion and follow-up interviews
further revealed that students were using the term in conflating ways, referring to largely
two kinds of repertoires: Konglish spoken by Korean Americans when they cannot think of a word in Korean, and Konglish phonologically and semantically incorporated into Korean language, often used by Korean speakers from Korea.

Students characterized the former as a learning experience (Da-in, “We make it into a learning experience”), a communicative strategy (Joon, “to get the conversation going”; Rina, “for efficiency,” “to get your message through”), or a sign of lacking proficiency in Korean (Da-in, “They would think I’m not good with Korean, and I don’t understand that well.”; Rina, “the primary symptom of non-perfect fluency”; Yoon-ho, “I feel like I need to learn my language more.”). Despite varying degrees of affinity students expressed toward Konglish in these metacommentaries, they were grounded on a common assumption that Konglish is not a whole repertoire in and of itself, but a secondary tool or strategy, or even a deficiency, pointing to a whole, ideal language that one should eventually strive to achieve. Describing Konglish, students also commented on English words used by Korean speakers (e.g., Yoon-ho, “토크, 토크, 토크”[to.ŭ, to.ŭ, to.ŭ], “you see the American ones with Korean accent, and it sounds like really weird”; Rina, “Like I guess it’s considered cool to put in English words, but some of the lyrics, I don’t know.”). Yoon-ho’s metacommentary on Konglish pronunciation analyzed above, as well as other students’ comments discussed in the latter part of the chapter, picked on the “non-native” pronunciations of bilingual speakers. These metacommentaries reflected students’ conceptualization of an ideal native speaker who effortlessly communicates in one language at a time with “native” pronunciation.

Students’ metacommentaries on Konglish thus reveal an ideology of discrete languages, or monoglossic ideology (García, 2009); to them, an ideal bilingual speaker
meant two monolinguals in one person (Grosjean, 1989). As will be seen in the following chapters, students oftentimes exhibited ambivalent attitudes in learning Korean in the classroom; monolingual ideologies motivated students to pursue learning Korean on one hand, but at the same time, they subjugated students to see themselves as deficient bilinguals and discouraged their learning. Ortega (2018) argued that an essentialist ontology of language is so prevalent in today’s world that in many contexts of research and teaching, bilingual speakers are benchmarked against an ideal monolingual native speaker model—an illusionary and unattainable goal for any individual.

I conclude this chapter with an anecdotal definition of Konglish, offered by a Korean American writer, Kyung Mi Lee, who contributed an article on Konglish in Yale Daily News (2017). She starts the article with an anecdote of her sister using Konglish:

“Umma! I’m ddonging!” My sister Kyung Eun shouts through an open bathroom door. Ddong, the Korean word for poop, is a verb in our household. We like to add the present participle -ing to Korean words. We like to Konglicize communication.

Maintaining a playful tone throughout the article, she later defines Konglish as “the native language of diaspora children, masters of geological brilliance.” In fact, Konglish is a repertoire shared among Korean families living in America, and as Lee (2017) writes, it is often used as a way to bridge the widening gap between parent and child generations, and it is a natural and fun way of speaking among Korean American youth, which needs to be celebrated and promoted. From this perspective, instead of filling the gaps, learning Korean can be conceptualized as the process of expanding their inventory of semiotic resources to even further their “geological brilliance.” As a researcher and language educator myself, I keep wondering how we can help empower
students’ existing communicative repertoires yet positively motivate them to expand their repertoires in language classrooms, like Lee (2017) does, and it is the question I will constantly go back to in the remainder of this dissertation.
CHAPTER 5. EXPLORING THE CLASSROOM ECOLOGY

Language materials are one of the key elements that affect the ecology of language classrooms, mediating the practices of teachers and students in the classroom. Particularly in the context of SKS, textbooks played a significant role guiding the curriculum of Korean language classes. At the time of my research, with the support of the South Korean government, teachers at SKS were allowed to choose between Korean language textbooks developed for HL students and Korean language arts textbooks used in secondary schools in South Korea. While one might assume most teachers would choose textbooks developed for HL students, Ms. Shin, who was Korean language teacher of the focal group students, chose Korean language arts textbooks, which provided ample resources and detailed guidelines much needed by teachers working in community-based school settings. The observation of her lessons further revealed that while the Korean language arts textbook dictated the overall sequence of materials covered in class on the one hand, the de facto curriculum focused heavily on writing and reading practices, which were partly affected by Ms. Shin’s teaching beliefs, students’ nuanced motivation, as well as the overall curriculum of SKS.

In this chapter, I will first explain the policy chain through which the South Korean government offered Korean textbooks to HL schools, and Ms. Shin chose Korean language arts textbooks for her Korean HL class in the local context. Then, I will discuss moments in Ms. Shin’s class when focus on writing and reading became prominent in how Ms. Shin and students worked with the material and each other to engage in Korean teaching and learning practices. In conclusion, I will discuss how such focus on written practices may be interrelated with power relations among different repertoires in the
ecology of SKS and the broader U.S context, and suggest how the implementational space opened up with the provision of materials could be fully utilized to help students expand their existing repertoires.

### 5.1. Using Korean Language Arts Textbooks for a Heritage Language Class

Many HL researchers and practitioners have suggested that one of the challenges in HL education is the lack of appropriate teaching materials (Kagan & Dillon, 2008; Lee, 2002; Son, 1995). Compared to the cases of other HLs, Korean HL educators have received relatively more support in this respect, as the South Korean government has consistently invested in developing HL textbooks for Korean students attending community-based HL programs outside of South Korea. According to Yu and Won (2018), although textbook development for overseas Koreans started from the 1970s, focus was more on Korean ethnic identity development rather than HL education, and textbooks developed and distributed during this period were mostly textbooks on Korean language arts, Korean history, and the lives of Koreans, which were not too different from secondary school textbooks used in South Korea. During the 1980s and 1990s, Korean HL textbooks were developed in multiple levels and according to students’ first language, such as Japanese, English, German, Russian, Spanish, and Chinese. However, these textbooks were criticized for being mere translations of Korean language arts textbooks used in South Korea, and many scholars called for developing Korean language textbooks tailored to the needs of HL students.
Table 5.1. *Korean HL Textbooks Developed by the South Korean Government for Overseas Koreans (2001-2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>The languages of the targeted students</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Han.gu.gŏ 1, 2</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Han.gu.gŏ Conversation 1, 2</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>KICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>Han.gu.gŏ 3, 4</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Han.gu.gŏ 1, 2 Teacher’s Guidelines</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>KICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><em>Han.gu.gŏ 5, 6</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Han.gu.gŏ 3, 4 Teachers’ Guidelines</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>KICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>Han.gu.gŏ 7, 8</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Han.gu.gŏ 5, 6 Teachers’ Guidelines</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NIIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td><em>Han.gŭl Basics High, Mid, Low</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NIIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td><em>Han.gŭl Hak.kyo Han.gu.gŏ 1-6</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EFKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td><em>Mat.chum Han.gu.gŏ 1-6</em></td>
<td>Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Indonesian, Portuguese, Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese</td>
<td>NIIE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above table, the 2000s was the period when more systematic textbook series were developed for HL students. Korea Institute of Curriculum
and Evaluation (KICE) under the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) commissioned a study aimed at developing Korean language curricula and textbooks for overseas Koreans (Ryu, 2002), and based on this study, KICE developed 한국어 Han.gu.gŏ [Korean Language] Levels 1-8 from 2001 to 2004, later adapted to six levels and by students’ first language. MEST also commissioned the Educational Foundation for Koreans Abroad (EFKA) to develop 한글 학교 한국어 Han.gŭl Hak.kyo Han.gu.gŏ [Korean Language for Korean HL Schools] Levels 1-6 (2008-2009). From 2008, due to policy changes within MEST, the National Institute for International Education (NIIE) took over the role of KICE in terms of textbook development and revision for overseas Koreans. In 2011, NIIE developed 맞춤 한국어 Mat.chum Han.gu.gŏ [Tailored Korean] Levels 1-6 by students’ first language.

Around the same time, under the agreement among the ministries that had offered educational support for overseas Koreans, it was officially decided that the Overseas Korean Foundation under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) would direct general educational support for overseas Koreans, while NIIE under MEST would be specifically in charge of textbook development. The role of MEST in textbook support is also currently mandated in Article 35 of the Act on the Educational Support, etc. for Korean Nationals Residing Abroad:¹

Article 35 (Manufacture and Distribution of Textbooks)
(1) The Minister of Education may compile, publish or manufacture books for school subjects and educational materials necessary for the education of Korean nationals residing abroad. <Amended by Act No. 8852, Feb. 29, 2008; Act No. 11690, Mar. 23, 2013>
(2) The Minister of Education may provide books for school subjects and educational materials for free under paragraph (1) and books for school subjects under Article 29 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to educational
institutions abroad or educational organizations abroad. *Amended by Act No. 8852, Feb. 29, 2008; Act No. 11690, Mar. 23, 2013*

Under this act, EFKA is commissioned by MEST to distribute Korean HL textbooks to Korean language education centers, Korean schools, and Korean language schools in about 100 countries around the world. In addition to HL textbooks, EFKA also provides Korean language arts, social studies, and math textbooks approved for use in elementary and middle schools in South Korea. Each semester, educational institutions for overseas Koreans individually request textbooks through an online application system ([www.efkabook.com](http://www.efkabook.com)), and EFKA decides the number of textbooks provided to each program based on the annual budget of MEST, the requested number of textbooks by the program, the number of textbooks provided to the program for the most recent three years, and Overseas Korean Foundation’s annual statistical data on educational institutions for overseas Koreans (school size, the number of teachers and registered students) (EFKA, 2018).

Despite the support of the South Korean government discussed so far, one of the perennial issues discussed in annual Korean HL teachers’ seminars and conferences is lack of appropriate HL materials. HL programs generally use four types of textbooks: HL textbooks developed by the South Korean government for use in overseas HL programs, Korean language arts textbooks developed for use in secondary schools in South Korea, HL textbooks developed by private institutions and universities in South Korea, and HL textbooks and materials developed by local organizations and individual teachers (Yu & Won, 2018). However, most community-based HL programs lack financial resources for the latter two options, and most teachers tend to work with the former two with the support of the South Korean government. There is little research on the use of Korean
language arts textbooks in HL programs; the majority of previous studies have conducted textual analysis and survey on HL textbooks developed by the South Korean government. These studies have suggested that HL textbooks do not fully consider the needs of HL learners, the main criticisms being that the textbooks do not align well with local curricula, materials are not engaging enough for young learners, and there is not sufficient coverage of cultural contents (Kong & Bu, 2016; Kang, 2012; Kwon, 2013; Ryu, 2011; Refer to Yu and Won, 2018 for more detailed review).

At the time of my research, SKS, like many other HL programs, was offered Korean HL textbooks and Korean language arts textbooks through EFKA; and SKS teachers made individual choices about which textbooks to use for their classes. Ms. Shin, the Korean language teacher of the focal group of students, decided to use Korean language arts textbooks for her intermediate-level class. It is in fact not uncommon to see teachers use Korean language arts textbooks for students at/beyond intermediate level in community-based HL programs. When asked about her choice of textbook towards the end of the semester, Ms. Shin said she was “100 percent satisfied with the textbook.” There were particularly two aspects of the textbook she emphasized. First of all, she felt that the language arts textbook was a good fit for “students beyond a certain level,” and that it makes students “think constantly.”

Excerpt 1. Ms. Shin’s interview

지문은 많이 포함되어 있지 않지만 아이들을 자꾸 생각하게 만들어요. 예전에는 자꾸 생각을, 내가 생각한 거를 주입해서, 이건 이거야, 이건 이거야, 했다면, 그 시기를 넘어가서 이게 이건지 아닌 예들한테는 생각하게 하는 게 너무너무 좋더라구요. 아, 그, 제가 어린

Text is not included as much, but it makes students think constantly. Before, I tended to feed students my ideas, like this is that, and that is that. But beyond that stage, for students who already know this is that, it's really good to have them think. Ah, I haven't seen younger
Secondly, she felt that the textbook and the accompanying teacher guidelines provided a specific frame of the whole lesson she could work from, whereas before she had to think of the organization of the whole lesson and complement the textbook with other activities or materials. In her interview, she said:

Excerpt 2. Ms. Shin’s interview

Right now, it [lesson panning] is very easy, since I use textbooks from Korea. There's this, this teacher guidelines. It presents important points that need to explained, and these books are very well organized, so that I can easily pick up and summarize these points. Then, I pick and choose things from the book according to the needs of my students. It was very easy to do so because a specific frame is presented.

Before, I used to organize everything. How I did it= for example, if I used Machum Hangugeo, I planned from number 1, introduction, body, and then conclusion, how to connect these and what activities should come next. I thought about all these things, and I organized them according to topics. Then, it took quite a lot of time, and I always needed ideas. Also, I did it that way, since there were no set things.
She repeatedly emphasized that the textbook and guidelines presented a set frame of the lesson, so she did not need to take too much time planning the lesson. This time efficiency was crucial in the context of SKS, in that all the teachers had their own jobs and taught at SKS part-time, and they always struggled with spending extra time preparing for classes. Thus, one of the greatest merits for Ms. Shin was extra resources and activities provided in the teachers’ guidelines, which allowed teachers to “pick and choose” appropriate activities for their students without needing to search for outside resources. When asked about the difficulties she had while teaching at Korean school, Ms. Shin said “the difficult part was preparing for lessons.” She further elaborated:

**Excerpt 3. Ms. Shin’s interview**

Shin: The difficult part was preparing for lessons? ((laugh)) We don't have much time. But teaching at Korean school is honestly almost volunteer work. You teach because you have a sense of mission, like I need to teach these children, I really need to teach Korean language, and the culture, and the sentiment, I need to take an initiative, sort of thing. But we really don't have time. We also have our own lives, and spending several hours [preparing for lessons each week] and teaching is really hard.

Compared to HL textbooks, Korean language arts textbooks, developed for Korean students in South Korea, hypothetically should not meet the needs of HLLs.

However, for Ms. Shin, the above two merits—making the students think and offering a
whole lesson frame for teachers—surpassed other shortcomings Korean language arts
textbooks might have.

5.2. Learning to Use Korean in a Proper Way: Reading and Writing

After my research session with the focus group, Ms. Shin comes up to the front of
the classroom with a Korean language arts textbook, student workbook and
teacher guidelines in her hands. She puts down her books on the table and opens
up the pages of the main textbook and the teacher guidelines. She moves the
whiteboard closer to her and copies text from the teacher guidelines. Then, she
starts the class. She asks students to read text on the board and discuss the
dilemma it presents. This leads to her introduction of the main reading material in
the textbook. This is exactly the sequence of the lesson presented in the guidelines.
(Fieldnote 16/09/24)

Ms. Shin always came to class with the textbooks and the teacher guidelines in
her hands. There were hardly other materials she brought to class, except scrap papers for
writing activities. She covered each textbook chapter in four class hours across two
weeks. Overall, although she did not implement every activity suggested in the teacher
guidelines, Ms. Shin always seemed to refer to the guidelines as she planned her lessons,
which was confirmed in her interview as well as my comparison of her lessons with
suggestions in the guidelines. She faithfully followed contents presented in the
textbook—particularly the reading materials which she covered in the order they were
presented in the textbook. In this respect, the textbook was heavily mediating teaching
and learning practices in the classroom. As is often the case in many educational
contexts, it can be said that the textbook was the de jure curriculum of Ms. Shin’s class.

However, at the same time, Ms. Shin also had her own learning objectives for her
class, which were made clear in the first week of the semester as she was introducing the
textbook to her students.
Excerpt 4. Ms. Shin introduces the textbook (0917)

((After reading the table of contents to students))

1 Shin: 이번 학기에는 많이 많이 읽고, 많이 많이 생각하고, 많이 많이 써야 돼.

2 Da-in: ((frowning her face)) 쓰는 거 싫어요.

3 Shin: 쓰는 거 싫어요? 그래도 생각을 또 잘 글로 표현할 줄 아는 게 중요해. 자, 누가 한번 읽어 불가. 네모난 박스에 있는 거 읽고 한번 읽어보자.

As Ms. Shin says in Line 1, her focus was on reading and writing, which was in contrast with the curriculum objectives stated in the teachers’ guidelines. The objectives presented in the guidelines encompassed language activities (listening, speaking, reading, writing), the Korean language (grammar), literature, and culture. Regarding the objectives of Korean language arts subjects, the guidelines state the following:

국어 활동과 국어와 문학을
총체적으로 이해하고, 국어 활동의
맥락을 고려하여 국어를 정확하고
효과적으로 사용하며, 국어를
사랑하고 국어 문화를 누리면서
국어의 창의적 발전과 국어 문화
창조에 이바지할 수 있는 능력과
태도를 기른다.
가. 국어 활동과 국어와 문학에 대한
기본적인 지식을 익힌다.
나. 다양한 유형의 단화와 글을
비판적이고 창의적으로 수용하고
생산한다.

Students will gain a comprehensive understanding of Korean language activities (listening, speaking, reading, writing), the Korean language (grammar), and Korean literature, consider the context of language activities, use the Korean language in an accurate and effective manner, appreciate the Korean language and culture, and develop abilities and attitudes for the creative growth of the Korean language and culture.

A. Gain basic knowledge about Korean language activities, Korean language, and literature.
B. Critically and creatively understand and produce various types of discourse and text.
As these objectives highlight, each chapter of the textbook included various types of discourse and activities, ranging from reading and writing poetry, essays, and short stories to discussion and skits. In contrast, as she explicitly said in the beginning of the semester, Ms. Shin’s class focused more on written practices, as the majority of class time was indeed spent on reading and writing. Although, on the surface, it might seem like the textbook was dictating the curriculum in Ms. Shin’s class, a closer analysis of her classes revealed that Ms. Shin was exercising her agency as a teacher by “picking and choosing” what she deemed important for her learners within the context of SKS. Students also responded to Ms. Shin’s teaching and the textbook in complex ways.

Below, I will discuss moments when Ms. Shin’s focus on reading and writing became prominent, how students responded to such teaching practices, and what these interactions might imply for constructing and negotiating the repertoires of being, doing, and knowing Korean.

5.2.1. Focus on Writing

Ms. Shin’s focus on writing became particularly prominent in the weeks when she covered a chapter titled “토의의 방법과 절차” [the Methods and Procedures of Discussion]. The learning objective of the chapter was stated in the teacher guidelines as the following: “알맞은 절차와 방법으로 토의를 하고 그 결과를 글로 나타낼 수 있다” [Students will be able to have discussion by adopting appropriate procedures and
methods, and explain the result of the discussion in writing]. In line with the learning objective, the guidelines outlined the following timeline for teachers.

Table 5.2. *Chapter Timeline Presented in the Guidelines*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbooks</th>
<th>Class schedule</th>
<th>Main learning activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Main textbook      | 1-2 (pp. 44-51) | • Chapter introduction  
                    |                  | • Understand what discussion is                                |
| Main textbook      | 3-4 (pp. 52-58) | • Understand how to have discussion following appropriate procedures |
| Main textbook      | 5-6 (pp. 59-63) | • Have class discussion and write an essay suggesting [solutions based on the result of the discussion]  
                    |                  | • Chapter wrap-up                                              |
| Students’ workbook | 7-8 (pp. 26-69) | • Have discussion by selecting a topic of interest from the class resource book |

The chapter was supposed to be covered in 8 class hours, and the chapter culminated in class discussions and follow-up writing in Classes 5-8, with scaffolding provided in each step to prepare students for the final activities. Considering that Ms. Shin usually covered one chapter in 4 class hours, she had to selectively cover certain parts of the chapter, and she chose to follow the first half of the class schedule provided in the guidelines. She covered pages from 44 through 58, explaining the procedures and methods of discussion and implementing writing exercises in the textbook, and wrapped up the chapter without having the final activities. It was ironic that writing became the focus of the lesson even in the chapter that was intended to expand students’ oral repertoire.

In her interview and class instructions, Ms. Shin expressed that she wanted students to “think constantly” and “express their ideas in writing,” and this point was repeatedly emphasized throughout the semester. In the textbook, writing activities often
accompanied certain types of reading text, and students were asked to analyze the text and share their reflections and experiences in an extended scope. Ms. Shin would also emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers, and students should write their own interpretations and reflections based on their analysis of text. However, in this process, a significant amount of guidance was provided by Ms. Shin, as students struggled with putting their ideas in writing. Sometimes, Ms. Shin would have students write their ideas on their own and go around the room to individually give feedback about the sentences. At other times, after hearing students’ ideas, Ms. Shin would re-phrase these ideas in concise sentences, and students would write down these sentences on the textbook. Either way, much time was spent on writing the sentences correctly and accurately in terms of grammar and spelling, and this writing practice entailed various emotions and reactions by the students.

In the following excerpt, students had just finished discussing what qualifies as a good topic for discussion. Then, students were given the following comic strip on the textbook and asked to write answers to a series of questions presented below the comic strip.
2. This is what Ji-ho thought after PE class. Come up with a discussion topic based on Ji-ho’s thoughts.

“Why is it that running became harder than last year, although I became older and gained more weight?”

((Reading “Decreased stamina despite improved physicality” on newspaper)) “There are many others who also became taller and gained weight, but lost stamina.”

(1) What is the problem Ji-ho is thinking of?

(2) Is Ji-ho’s problem appropriate for discussion? Why do you think so?

(3) Come up with a discussion topic.

(4) Reflect on the appropriateness of the topic decided in (3) for discussion.

The strip includes two scenes. The first scene shows the character Jiho running and thinking to himself, “Why is it that running became harder than last year, although I became older and gained more weight?” Then, in the second scene, Jiho is reading a news article that says “decreased stamina despite improved physicality” and thinks to himself, “There are many others who also became taller and gained weight, but lost stamina.” Ms. Shin first asked students to read the strip aloud, and asked what problem Jiho was thinking of. After hearing responses from two students, Ms. Shin asked students to summarize Jiho’s thoughts provided in the strip, which would answer the first question.
in the textbook. Students started writing, and Ms. Shin started going around the room to give individual feedback.

In the following excerpt, after giving corrective feedback to Da-in, Ms. Shin moves on to Yoon-ho. Yoon-ho misspelled 달리기가 dal.li.gi.ga. [Running+subject particle ga] as 다리가 da.ri.ga [legs+ subject particle ga], and Ms. Shin was trying to give corrective feedback on the spelling. Yoon-ho’s misspelling of 달리기 dal.li.gi [running] as 다리 da.ri happened to signify “legs,” and this coincidence triggered Da-in to laugh throughout the interaction between Yoon-ho and Ms. Shin.

Excerpt 5.³

1 Shin ((Reading Yoon-ho’s sentences aloud)) “작년보다 체력이 떨어지고 몸무게가 들었는데, 왜 다리가” ((laugh)) “다리가” 뭐라고?

2 Yoon-ho ((Self-correcting his spelling on the textbook)) “달리기가”

3 Shin ((Smiling)) “달리기가”

4 Da-in ((Looking at Yoon-ho’s writing)) “다리가.” ((laugh))

5 Yoon-ho “달리기가 더 힘든=”

6 Shin 야, 이거=

7 Yoon-ho ((Embarrassed laugh))

8 Da-in ((Laugh))

Da-in, sitting next to Yoon-ho starts looking at Yoon-ho’s writing.
Shin: “작년보다 더 크고 몸무게가 더 늘어났는데”

Da-in: “왜 달리기가 dal.li.gi.ga [running]”

Shin: “왜 달리기는 게=”

Yoon-ho: I wrote it wrong. ((Laugh))

Da-in tries to take Yoon-ho’s book.

Shin: 아니야. ((To Da-in)) 왜 그래.

Da-in: 아, 나 읽고 싶어서 그런 거에요.

Shin: 가만 있어.

Da-in: (To Yoon-ho) I support you. ((Laugh))

Yoon-ho: 무슨 support야. ((Laugh))

Da-in: ((Laugh))

Yoon-ho erases the whole sentence.

Shin: 윤호야, 팬참아. 왜 다시 써? 선생님이 뭐라고 하는 게 아닌데. 왜 다시 써?

Da-in: 왜 다시 써?

Shin: 팬참아. 선생님이 너가 어떻게 하는지 보고 그걸 고쳐주려고 하는 거야.

Yoon-ho: ((Embarrassed laugh))

Shin: 그게 채피한 게 아니야. 선생님도 영어 영망으로 쓴다고 얘기했지?

Da-in: ((Laughs out loud))

Shin: 신다인, 너 오늘 왜이래?

Da-in tries to contain laughing.
In Line 1, Ms. Shin notices Yoon-ho’s spelling error as she reads his sentence, and with a short laugh, she gives feedback by asking an elicitation question, “‘다리가 da.ri.ga [legs],’ what is this?” She asks the question in a friendly and playful manner, and Yoon-ho takes up Ms. Shin’s feedback and tries to self-correct his writing (Line 2). However, tensions start to arise as Da-in, who was sitting next to Yoon-ho, tries to look at Yoon-ho’s writing. In Line 4, Da-in starts laughing as she says “‘다리가 da.ri.ga [legs].’” As Ms. Shin continues to give feedback to Yoon-ho, Da-in intervenes and offers a correct form to Yoon-ho (Lines 9, 10). As Yoon-ho admits his mistake in Line 12, Da-in becomes even bolder and tries to take Yoon-ho’s textbook and read his sentence. Despite Ms. Shin’s warning (Line 15), Da-in jokingly says to Yoon-ho, “I support you”
in English (Line 16). Yoon-ho laughs with Da-in, but he also disapproves Da-in’s comment (“What support is this?” Line 17).

Although Yoon-ho does not express his embarrassment verbally and laughs with Da-in throughout, his laughter shows slight signs of embarrassment, and this becomes more evident when he erases the whole sentence as Da-in tries to take his textbook. Ms. Shin also notices Yoon-ho’s reaction, and in Lines 19 and 21, she addresses it by explaining that she is not rebuking him, but that she just wants to check how he is writing the sentence and help him correct errors. She also shares her experience as an English writer to identify with Yoon-ho’s difficulty (Line 23). In the meantime, Da-in’s laughter continues to escalate, and she laughs out loud when Ms. Shin says, “Didn’t I tell you my English writing is a mess too?” (Line 23). Ms. Shin seriously warns Da-in of her behavior (Lines 25 and 28) and encourages Yoon-ho to try writing the sentence again (Line 26). While Da-in becomes sullen, tearing up, Yoon-ho seems encouraged and voluntarily asks Ms. Shin to check his writing again (Line 29). He still misspells the word as 달이가가 달이가가 dal.igi.ga instead of 달리가가 달리가가 dal.li.gi.ga. However, this time, no one laughs, and Ms. Shin corrects his spelling.

Various emotions surface in this short exchange, and it is worth noting Yoon-ho’s attitude toward writing practices. Yoon-ho was the class clown, always making jokes and livening up the mood of the class. He also actively participated in classroom discussions, as he enjoyed sharing his ideas and experiences. However, he showed signs of insecurity and discomfort when it came to writing. This excerpt was just one of the instances when Yoon-ho expressed his insecurity. Earlier in this class, Yoon-ho was covering the textbook page with his hand as he was writing, so other students might not see it.
seemed that his sense of insecurity was being intensified in relation to other students in
class, particularly Da-in. Da-in was in the same age as Yoon-ho, and she also actively
participated in class discussions. However, when it came to writing, she had better
accuracy and exhibited more confidence. Preceding the excerpt, Ms. Shin’s feedback to
Da-in was brief, and now done with her writing, Da-in started to intervene in Ms. Shin’s
feedback time for Yoon-ho. At one point, it seemed that she wanted to assume the
authority of the teacher, trying to give Yoon-ho corrective feedback (Line 10).

In this relational dynamic, Ms. Shin, as the authority of the class, was quick to
mediate tensions by encouraging Yoon-ho to write and discouraging Da-in from
intervening. Da-in, who always took pride in her writing skills in class, was also
emotionally affected, however, when her attempt to correct Yoon-ho’s writing (and partly
just having fun with the coincidental word play between 달리기 dal.li.gi. [running] and
다리 da.ri [legs]) was discouraged by Ms. Shin. This dynamic is in keeping with Jo
(2001)’s suggestion that heritage students’ self-evaluation of their own linguistic
performance is “complicated, relational, and subjective” (p. 39). Students in Jo (2001)’s
study constantly felt they were incompetent compared to better users of the language, and
their self-positioning was continuously negotiated in relation to more fluent Korean
speakers in and out of their classes.

At the same time, Yoon-ho also exhibited desires to become a better writer, as he
volunteered to ask for Ms. Shin’s help in the excerpt, after he had rewritten the word
(Line 31). In one of the research sessions with me, during a writing activity which
allowed students to write in whatever language they preferred, Yoon-ho wrote his
reflections in English and raised his hand to ask for my help with Korean writing. While
he explicitly said, “I can’t write, I can’t write in Korean” before asking for help, he
nevertheless wanted to write Korean sentences accurately when he finally got to writing.
His insecurity about writing would oftentimes lead him to resist writing entirely, but at
the same time, he was relying on the teachers to help him write better, which showed his
motivation to expand his written repertoires. This ambivalent attitude toward writing was
observed in other students as well. Whenever Ms. Shin asked students to write, students
would often express their unwillingness to write or incompetence in writing. However, at
the same time, when they got to writing practices, they volunteered to ask for the
teacher’s help to refine their sentences.

On the surface, it seemed that Ms. Shin was pushing the learners to write, but
students also reacted to these writing practices with a certain level of motivation. There
was a shared understanding between Ms. Shin and students that they needed to work
more on writing, which required more practice for HLLs whose existing verbal
repertories partly become a hindrance in correctly spelling words as they tend to write as
they are pronounced. While students wanted to avoid such toil on one hand, when the
task was at hand, they wanted to write accurately. Ms. Shin’s choice to focus on writing
was not solely her own decision, but was also implicitly accepted by her students.

Regarding the greater pressure HL students tend to experience in the process of
learning Korean compared to non-HL students, Lee and Cho (2017) suggested that it may
be related to the way ethnic Korean students and non-HL students are positioned by
others in the U.S. society. For non-Korean students, it is not expected of them to speak
the Korean language fluently, and if they do, it may become an added symbolic resource.
On the other hand, for ethnic Korean students, unless they speak both Korean and English
perfectly, their Korean language skills may not be viewed as an added resource, but rather as a deficiency—not fully owning the symbolic resource they were supposed to retain growing up as ethnic Koreans. During interviews, the students also reiterated the rationales and beliefs held by adults in SKS, as most of them stated that they should be able to use Korean fluently because they are Koreans. Such desire was reflected in various emotional reactions they exhibited during writing activities.

5.2.2. Extended Oral Reading

Ms. Shin covered each textbook chapter for four class hours across two weeks, and within these four hours, an average of 2.5 hours was spent on reading. Korean language arts textbooks included text in various genres ranging from poetry to nonfiction essays and short stories, and Ms. Shin would spend a significant amount of class time having students take turns reading the text aloud.

Considering the levels of HL learners, most reading materials (with the exception of poems) were long, ranging from 7 to 10 pages, and they also included much vocabulary that required additional scaffolding for HL learners. However, Ms. Shin covered all the reading materials as is, without any adaptation of text length or vocabulary. One of the constant constraints that prevented Ms. Shin from adapting materials was lack of time and resources allowed for teachers at SKS. On another note, it was partly Ms. Shin’s deliberate choice to use the textbook as is, as she liked the fact that the textbook was advanced enough to provoke students’ thinking and believed that students needed to “endure” the boring parts that required them to think, which could include the advanced level of reading materials (interview).
Additionally, it also seemed that Ms. Shin believed in the benefits of extended reading based on her observation of fluent HL students in SKS. In her interview, as well as on other occasions, Ms. Shin talked about Rina, the most fluent Korean speaker and writer in SKS who had won first-place awards in many regional and nationwide speech and writing contests. Whenever other parents asked Rina’s mother about secrets behind Rina’s fluent Korean, one of the tips she shared was that she tried to provide as many Korean books as possible, and Rina enjoyed reading these books from a very young age. Rina’s mother told me, in an interview, that Rina not only read fairy tales or children’s books, but she also enjoyed reading different genres of text such as autobiographies, magazines, novels, and encyclopedias.

Ms. Shin was also a parent of three children, and she had tried her best to teach them Korean by using only Korean at home and introducing Korean vocabulary and expressions whenever they used English words. However, in her interview, Ms. Shin said that one of her regrets as a parent is that she could not afford buying more Korean books for her children and did not also encourage them to read more, as Rina’s parents did. Although her children were fluent speakers of Korean compared to other HL students at their age, Ms. Shin felt that they did not reach the level that Rina was at, which could only be achieved through extensive reading, rather than informal conversations in family settings. Although Ms. Shin did not explicitly link her regret as a parent to her decision to implement extended reading exercise in class, her teaching practice was in line with her belief that extensive reading is an important vehicle for moving HLLs onto the next level.
In the beginning of the semester, Ms. Shin explained to her students the purpose of reading stories in the textbook, and it shows how much importance Ms. Shin placed on extended oral reading.

Excerpt 6. The purpose of oral reading

1 Shin 이제는 이야기야. 옛날 이야기. 옛날부터 전해 내려오는 이야기. 자, 굉장히 길어. 굉장히 길어. 자, 여기 뭐. 하나, 둘, 셋, 넷, 다섯 페이지. 이제 너희가 이길, 빨리 빨리 읽을 수 있는 수준이 된 거야. 한을 반에 올라왔으면.

Now it's a story. Old-day story. A story that has been transmitted from old days. Okay, it's really long, really long. Okay, look here. One, two, three, four, five pages. Now, you’ve reached a level to read this quickly, if you got into Han.ul class.

2 Yoon-ho 난 못 읽어요.

I can't read.

3 Shin 떨듬더듬 읽으면 안 되겠지.

You shouldn't read haltingly.

4 Da-in ((To Yoon-ho, mimicking the teacher’s tone)) 떨듬더듬 읽으면 안되요.

((To Yoon-ho, mimicking the teacher’s tone)) You shouldn't read haltingly.

5 Shin 자, 이제 그림면 떨듬더듬 읽는 친구라면 해도 괜찮아. 친구가 읽는 걸 갖다가 눈으로 빨리 따라오면 돼.

Okay, now then, it's okay even if you read haltingly. You can just quickly follow what your friend is reading with your eyes.

6 Da-in ((To Yoon-ho, in the teacher’s tone)) 빨리 따라오면 돼요.

((To Yoon-ho, in the teachers’ tone)) You can just follow quickly.

7 Joon ((To Yoon-ho)) 빨리빨리빨리빨리.

((To Yoon-ho)) Quick, quick, quick, quick.

8 Shin 자, 그러면 누가 읽어 볼까? 선생님이랑 눈이 마주친=

Okay, then who will read this? The person who met my eyes=

9 Da-in ((Squinting her eyes))

((Squinting her eyes))

10 Shin 예인이? 예인이부터 읽어보자. 잘봐.


11 Da-in ((To Yoon-ho)) Popcorn. Popcorn.

((To Yoon-ho)) Popcorn. Popcorn.
In this excerpt, Ms. Shin stresses three points. One is that students are now at a level to read long text quickly (Line 1). Secondly, students should be able to read aloud fluently (Line 3, “You shouldn’t read haltingly”). Although in Line 5, she seems to contradict herself as she says that reading haltingly is okay, this seems to be a kind encouragement for students who feel insecure about reading. In actuality, as will be shown later in the excerpts from other classroom interactions, Ms. Shin put much emphasis on fluent and accurate oral reading. The last point Ms. Shin stresses is that students should be able to track what other students are reading (Line 5). She highlighted this point more than once in the semester, saying that “following reading with eyes is as important as oral reading” (field note). Whenever students were distracted while another student was reading, Ms. Shin often admonished them to pay attention or sometimes just pointed to the paragraph they were at. Considering all the three points Ms. Shin emphasized, her approach may have been that students may start from silently following others’ reading, which should eventually lead to fluent and accurate oral reading.

It is interesting to note that oral reading is not discussed throughout the fifth-grade Korean language arts curriculum. Instead, oral reading appears as one of the main objectives in the first-grade language arts curriculum. In the 2009 curriculum, among the five areas of Korean language arts, the learning objective for the reading area for first grade is stated as the following: 글을 소리 내어 유창하게 읽으며, 읽기의 즐거움을 경험하고 글을 즐겨 읽는 태도를 지닌다. [Students will be able to read aloud text fluently, experience the joy of reading, and nurture an attitude for reading for pleasure].
Under this overarching objective, six sub-objectives are presented, four of which are on oral reading:

(1) 글자의 쌓임을 이해하여 글자를 읽고, 읽기에 관심을 가진다.
(1) Students will be able to read characters by understanding the structure of characters and take interest in reading.

(2) 낱말과 문장을 정확하게 소리 내어 읽는다.
(2) Students will be able to read aloud individual words and sentences accurately.

(3) 의미가 잘 드러나도록 글을 알맞게 쪼개어 읽는다.
(3) Students will be able to appropriately chunk and read text to deliver its message effectively.

(4) 글의 분위기를 살려 효과적으로 낭독하고 읽기의 재미를 느낀다.
(4) Students will be able to effectively read aloud according to the tone of text, and experience the joy of reading.

(5) 글의 내용을 자신이 겪은 일과 관련지어 이해한다.
(5) Students will be able to understand text in relation to their own experiences.

(6) 글을 읽고 중요한 내용을 확인한다.
(6) Students will be able to read text and identify its main ideas.

According to Hasbrouck and Glaser (2012) and many other scholars in the field of literacy, reading fluency is defined as “reasonably accurate reading, at an appropriate rate, with suitable expression, that leads to accurate and deep comprehension and motivation to read” (p. 13). The objectives (1) and (2) address the accuracy of oral reading on the level of individual characters, words, and sentences; (3) addresses the rate of reading, stressing the importance of text chunking and comprehensibility; and (4) promotes expressive oral reading, befitting the overall tone of reading materials.

Although on the surface, it seemed that Ms. Shin was staying very faithful to the curriculum presented in the textbook without any adaptation of reading materials, she was actually bringing the elements of first-grade and fifth-grade language arts curricula
together to fit the specific needs of her learners who had relatively little exposure to
Korean literacy compared to their peers raised in Korea.

On another note, although oral reading is emphasized in the first-grade language
arts curriculum officially, this practice continues to higher grades in secondary schools in
Korea as well. There is even a phrase, “국어책 읽는 듯 읽는다” [You read as if you’re
reading a Korean language arts textbook] to refer to someone who reads text in a
monotonous tone. Oral reading in higher grades in Korea seems to have the purpose of
having all the students on the same page in teacher-centered instruction, rather than
having students practice oral reading and improve literacy skills, and oral reading in Ms.
Shin’s class also partly served such purpose as well, as students were often distracted
when they were asked to read silently in class.

The following three excerpts show interactions in a lesson where students were
asked to read a series of poems in the textbook, figure out what the narrators might have
felt or experienced, and share their own experiences in relation to the poems, and these
interactions reflect how oral reading practices typically unfolded in Ms. Shin’s class. The
objective of the lesson was stated as the following in the teachers’ guidelines: 작품을
읽고 인물의 생각에 대한 자신의 생각을 표현할 수 있다 [Students will be able to read
a piece of literature and express their reflections on the thoughts of characters [in the
literature]]. Although oral reading was never mentioned throughout the lesson either in
the textbook or the teachers’ guidelines, one of the main activities in this lesson was the
oral reading of poems, which entailed detailed form-focused feedback as well as the
introduction of an oral reading genre, 시낭송 Shi nang.song [poetry reading] by Ms.
Shin.
In the first excerpt (Excerpt 7), after reading the lesson objective, Ms. Shin asked Joon to read a poem titled “종우의 화분” [Jong-woo’s flowerpot] (Picture 2). Joon was a student who had the most difficulty in oral reading in the class, and the excerpt shows a typical interaction pattern between Joon and Ms. Shin during oral reading practices. The words or phrases Joon incorrectly read are bolded in the excerpts below.

Figure 5.2. Textbook Page: Jong-woo’s Flowerpot

Excerpt 7. Joon’s oral reading

1 Shin 자, 그러면 이제 종우의 화분, 종우의 화분을 한번 읽어보자. 이 친구가 어땠는지, 마음이 어땠는지, 기분이 어땠는지. 준호가 한 번 읽어봐. 처음부터. 종우의 화분.

2 Joon (in a low voice) "종우의 화분. 김하루." Okay, then let's now try reading Jong-woo's flowerpot, Jong-woo's flowerpot, [and see] how this boy felt, what his mind was like, what his feelings were like. Joon, please read, from the beginning, "Jong-woo's flowerpot."

Jong-woo's flowerpot
Haru Kim

On the classroom window, Jong-woo’s flowerpot sits next to my flowerpot side by side.

After Jong-woo transferred, I watered them. Every time I watered my flowerpot, I also watered his. Competing with each other, my flower and Jong-woo's flower grew taller.

When the teacher told us to move the flowers and plant them in the school yard, I also took Jong-woo's flowerpot.

I planted Jong-woo's flower right next to mine side by side. Next to me, Jong-woo is sitting.
What is evident in the excerpt is Joon’s struggle with oral reading. Joon’s exclamatory “eh” and gesture of brushing his hair with his hands at the end (Line 14) show his frustration with reading. Joon makes an error in every line of the poem he reads,
and Ms. Shin gives recasts, which seems to be an efficient way of giving feedback without much explanation. The following table summarizes the types of reading errors Joon made, along with the corrections made by either Ms. Shin or Joon himself.

Table 5.3. *Joon’s Oral Reading Errors and Corrective Feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error type</th>
<th>Original form</th>
<th>Joon's reading</th>
<th>Corrective feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misreading intervocallic ㄲ</td>
<td>나란히, Na.ran.hi [side by side]</td>
<td>날란히, nal.lan.hi (Line 4)</td>
<td>Joon’s Self-correction (Line 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>자랐다, cha.rat.ta [grew]</td>
<td>잘랐다, chal.lat.ta (Line 6)</td>
<td>Recast by Ms. Shin (Line 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing to read a wrong consonant between two consonants at the bottom of characters</td>
<td>옮겨, om.gyŏ [move]</td>
<td>옮겨, ol.gyŏ (Line 8)</td>
<td>Recast by Ms. Shin (Line 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>앉아, anجا [sitting]</td>
<td>앉이, : (Line 12)</td>
<td>Premature recast by Ms. Shin (Line 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping the coda consonant [consonant in the syllable-final position]</td>
<td>전학, chŏn.hak [transfer]</td>
<td>저학, chŏ.hak (Line 4)</td>
<td>Self-correction by Joon (Line 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>똑같이, ttok.ga.chi [same/also]</td>
<td>또가, tto.ga= (Line 4)</td>
<td>Premature recast by Ms. Shin (Line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misreading a complex vowel</td>
<td>염에, yŏ.pe [next to]</td>
<td>염, 염, 염, yep, yep, yŏp (Line 10)</td>
<td>Self correction by Joon (Line 10) and recast by Ms. Shin (Line 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joon’s errors are made with understandably difficult words to read, which require rather sophisticated phonological knowledge in Korean. For instance, when reading ㄲ, the reader needs to know the allophones of ㄲ: ㄲ is read as /ɾ/ in the onset [syllable-initial] position, and as /l/ in the coda [syllable-final] position. 나란히 [side by side], for instance, is read as *na.ran.hi*, not *na.lan.hi*, and 기말 [final] is read as *ki.mal*, not *ki.mar*. The only time ㄲ is read as /l/ in the onset position is when the coda in the preceding syllable is also ㄲ. For example, 걸라 [split] is read as *kal.la*, not *kal.ra*. By misreading ㄲ as /l/ in the onset position, Joon read 나란히 *Na.ran.hi* as 날란히 *nal.lan.hi*, and
자랐다 *cha.rat.ta* as 잘랐다 *chal.lat.ta*. Reading a character with two consonants at the bottom also requires phonological knowledge for the reader to choose a right consonant to read, as Korean phonology only allows one consonant in the coda position. Perhaps with his implicit knowledge of Korean syllable structure, Joon reads one consonant at the bottom, which ends up being a wrong consonant (e.g., misreading 옮겨 *om.gyŏ* [move] as 옮겨 *ol.gyŏ*). Although this is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is interesting to note that Joon’s errors not only reflect what he is lacking, but also what he already knows about the Korean language.

As for the pattern of error correction, Joon manages to self-correct two of his errors in the beginning, and Ms. Shin waits for Joon to make the corrections: Joon corrects 남란히 *nal.lan.hi* to 나란히 *Na.ran.hi* [side by side], and 저학 *chŏ.hak* to 전학 *chŏn.hak* [transfer] (Line 4). However, for the error that followed, as Joon stammers, “또가, 똑, 똑=tto.ga, took, ttok=,” Ms. Shin does not wait longer and provides a recast (Line 5). In the following line, Joon does not notice his error as he says 잘랐다 *chal.lat.ta* (Line 6), and Ms. Shin immediately provides a recast, 자랐다 *cha.rat.ta* [grew] (Line 7). From this point on, when Joon stammers, Ms. Shin provides recasts, not waiting longer for Joon to fully pronounce the words (Lines 9, 11, 13). All of Ms. Shin’s feedback (Lines 5, 7, 9, 11, 13) is taken up by Joon’s repair, as he re-reads the words in correct forms (Lines 6, 8, 10, 12, 14).

Although it is known that recasts are a type of corrective feedback with a low success rate because of their ambiguity (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Carpenter, Jeon, MacGregor, & Mackey, 2006; Lyster, 1998), in the context of Ms. Shin’s class, they were rather successful, partly because oral reading itself was a controlled task with much focus
on form, and also this pattern of form-focused error correction was a routinized practice between Ms. Shin and the students, and students knew what was expected of them when given recasts. Oral reading lent a good opportunity for Ms. Shin to give form-focused feedback to students, which was directed toward improving the accuracy of students’ oral language. Also, in some respects, such form-focused feedback was analogous to Ms. Shin’s focus on spelling and grammar in writing exercises.

After Joon’s reading, Ms. Shin asked Da-in to read the poem again. Da-in was a more fluent reader and hardly made errors in reading individual words. This time, Ms. Shin’s feedback was more focused on the performative aspect of oral reading, as she introduced a speech genre called 시 낭송 shi nang.song [poetry reading].

Excerpt 8. Da-in’s oral reading

15 Shin 음, 잘 했어. 그 다음에 어, 다인이라 가
음어 뿐, 다시. Um, good job. Next, um, Da-in, read it again.

16 Da-in ((At a fast pace)) 교실 창가에= ((At a fast pace)) on the classroom

17 Shin 다시, 처음부터. ((in a solemn voice)) 
"종우 화분" 이렇게. Again, from the beginning. ((In a

18 Da-in "종우 화분. 교실 창가에 내 화분과 
나란히 있는= 

19 Shin "자, 김하루. 이걸 누가 만들었는지. "김하루라는 사람이 만들었다는
거야. 그것까지 읽어줘야 돼. 시 낭송. 한국에서 보면 시 낭송이라는 거가 있어. 시 낭송. 읽나면 음악을 꽉 들어 쥐. 그러면 ((in a solemn
voice)) "종우의 화분" 맡 아리면서 "김하루" 이렇게 하면서 맡 잇는
거야. 시를 생각하면서 맡 잇는 거야. 이걸 뭐라고? 시 낭송. 시 낭송. 어, "Okay, Haru Kim. Who wrote this. It indicates that a person named Haru Kim wrote this. You should read this as well. 시 낭송 shi nang.song. In Korea, there's a thing called shi nang.song. Shi
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시 낭송하듯이 한번 읽어봐. 음악은
들지만, 읽어봐.

시 낭송하듯이 한번 읽어봐. 음악은
없지만, 읽어봐.

read, like you're thinking about the
poem. What do you call this? Shi
nung.song. Shi nang.song. Um, read
this as if you're doing shi
nung.song. Although there's no
music. Try reading it.

20 Da-in  ((Da-in starts reading at a slower pace.))

When asked to read, Da-in starts reading the poem without the title or the author
in a rushed, monotonous tone (Line 16), and Ms. Shin interrupts and explains how poems
should be read, introducing a speech genre, 시 낭송 Shi nang.song. She not only talks
about what should be read (e.g., title, author), but also how it should be read by
demonstrating the tone herself (Line 19): “You read like, ((in a solemn voice)) "Jong-
woo's flowerpot," like this. You read, like you're thinking about the poem.” This
feedback is taken up by Da-in, and she reads the poem at a slower pace.

In the following excerpt, after discussing “Jong-woo’s flowerpot,” the class
moves onto the following poem, titled “함께 쓰는 우산” [The umbrella you share].

Yoon-ho reads the poem aloud, and Ms. Shin compliments his reading. Yoon-ho, who
showed insecurity in writing practices, exuded more confidence in oral reading, and his
performance was immediately acknowledged by Ms. Shin.

Excerpt 9. Yoon-ho’s oral reading

1 Shin

함께 쓰는 우산: 저기 누가
읽어 불까? 윤호. 윤호 읽어
봐. 자, 시작. 음악이 나오느
것 처럼, 시 낭송 하는 것
처럼. 읽어 보자.

The umbrella you share. Who will read
this? Yoon-ho. Yoon-ho read it. Okay,
start. As if music is playing. As if you're
doing poetry reading. Let's read it.

2 Yoon-
ho

함께 쓰는 우산.

The umbrella you share.
Yoon-ho reads the poem in a solemn voice at a slow rate with slight exaggeration.

Particularly when Yoon-ho reads the name of the poet, he gives a short pause between each syllable for a dramatic effect (Line 4). Ms. Shin compliments Yoon-ho, saying that he is “feeling” the poem as he is reading it (Line 7). This kind of expressive reading was emphasized in other instances as well. The following fieldnote shows one such instance, where Ms. Shin encouraged Joon to read as if he was speaking:

"Following Ms. Shin's direction, students take turns reading the story aloud. . . It’s now Joon's turn, and he says "I can’t read fast." Ms. Shin still encourages him to read. Perhaps as a sign of resistance, Joon reads the text in an exaggeratedly slow pace, and Ms. Shin warns, "Read it right. If you read as if you're speaking, you can do it. You guys are really good at doing the skits right?". Joon then tries to act in the voice of the character in the story as if he is speaking. Although his reading is still not accurate, he reads at a faster pace and sounds more fluent. When a monk appears in the story, he also makes the sound of a wooden gong, instead of just reading onomatopoeia. Ms. Shin smiles and compliments him."

(Fieldnote 16/10/01)

To promote expressive reading, Ms. Shin points to students’ existing repertoires in their spoken language. She particularly mentions their strength in doing the skits. For
end-of year-events at SKS, students in upper level classes performed a play in front of other students, parents, and teachers. Students enjoyed acting, and they read their lines much more fluently in a lively manner, than they would do when reading the textbook. When Ms. Shin reminded Joon of these play performances, her strategy worked, and Joon’s reading became instantly better.

As can be seen from the above three excerpts, oral reading time was marked with Ms. Shin’s intensive feedback and students’ immediate repairs, and Ms. Shin’s feedback touched upon all three elements of fluent oral reading—that is, accuracy, rate, and expression (Hasbrouck & Glaser, 2012). For Joon, Ms. Shin’s frequent recasts were geared toward improving the accuracy of his oral reading, making sure he reads individual words correctly. For students like Da-in who had achieved sufficient reading fluency in terms of accuracy, Ms. Shin’s feedback was much more focused on the manner of reading, which encompassed reading at an appropriate rate and with suitable expression or tone, befitting the genre of text at hand.

Students responded to these oral reading practices in ambivalent ways. On the one hand, extended oral reading time was when students were most distracted. While they responded to Ms. Shin’s feedback with immediate repairs during reading, when it was not their turn to read, they were usually unfocused. The following fieldnote (16/10/15) shows common ways students responded to extended reading:

*After Joon’s turn, Ms. Shin asks Da-in to read the next paragraph. Da-in starts reading. Hunched over the desk, Ye-in is scribbling something on the page. Yoon-ho is leaning his head against his hand on the desk, but I am not so sure whether he is paying attention or distracted [Later as I play the video-recording, it turns out that Yoon-ho was trying to pay attention but dozing off occasionally]. Joon keeps rubbing his eyes with his hands, and then blankly looks at the front of the classroom.*
Students were trying to be respectful to the teacher, trying to follow reading and not disturb other students. It seemed that Yoon-ho could not fight boredom and fatigue, even though he tried to stay focused, and Ye-in and Joon, both distracted, were doing their own things, trying not to disrupt Da-in’s reading. While oral reading was partly implemented to have all students on the same page when covering long reading materials in class, it was ironic that all the students were on different pages, disengaged.

Particularly in the case of Joon, Ms. Shin always had to point to where they were reading when it was his turn to read.

At other times, students would dramatize reading materials to liven up the mood of classroom. In the following excerpt, students were asked to read aloud a comic strip on miscommunication involving a polysemous word, 손 son [hand], and students made fun of the comic strip by acting in the exaggerated voice of characters.

Figure 5.3. Textbook Page: A Polysemous Word, 손 son [hand]

Except 10. Students’ dramatization of reading materials

1) Mother: We will finish preparing food soon, as we have many hands. Thanks for helping us, Taewon and Minjeong. Minjeong: Mom, we have two hands, and where are other hands? Taewon: Minjeong, what do you mean by other hands?

2) Taewon: Chulsu, let’s hold hands and do our best in our next soccer competition. Chulsu: Taewon, what do you mean? It will hinder our game if we hold hands with our teammates.

1) Ms. Shin ((Reads from the textbook)) "손이 많으니 음식 장만이 빨리 끝나겠어요. 태원이랑 민정이도 도와줘서 고맙다." 그리고 ((Reads from the textbook)) “We will finish preparing food soon, as we have many hands. Thanks for helping us, Taewon and Minjeong.” Then, what
Minjeong says? Yoonho? What did she say?

Mom ((laugh))

Stupid.

Mom, where’s my other hand? Mom, I have two hands. Where’s my other one? ((laugh))

Now, in the second picture, “Chulsu, let’s hold hands and do our best in our next soccer competition.” Then, what did Chulsu say?

((Whispering)) I’m not gay. ((laugh))

“It will hinder our game if we hold hands with our teammates.”

I’m not gay!

((Laugh)) Oh shut up.

Oh, I’m not gay. Please stop. I’m not gay. Stop flirting. It’s so weird.

But in Korea, even if men hold hands together, people don’t think they’re gay.

((Ss laugh))

They think they’re close friends.

Yeah, and girls hold hands and go to the restroom together.

We do that here too. ((Laugh))

In the first comic strip, responding to Mother’s utterance in Line 1 (“We will finish preparing food soon, as we have many hands.”), Minjeong says, “Mom, we have two hands, and where are other hands?” taking “many hands” literally when it actually meant “many people to help.” Minjeong’s line evokes mockery among students. Da-in
bluntly says, “바보 같아” [stupid], and Yoon-ho translates Minjeong’s line to English and says it in a panicky tone with repetition, “Mom, where’s my other hand? Mom, I have two hands. Where’s my other one?” which increases, borrowing Da-in’s words, the “stupidity” of the utterance.

In the second comic strip, when Taewon says, “Chulsu, let’s hold hands and do our best in our next soccer competition,” meaning “let’s work together,” Chulsu also takes it literally and says, “It will hinder our game if we hold hands with our teammates.” To Chulsu’s line, Ye-in and Yoon-ho add their own interpretations of “holding hands,” and Ye-in whispers, “I’m not gay” in English. Yoon-ho then follows up with her idea, and makes up Chulsu’s line in Korean, also with repetition, “난 gay 아니야. 야, 좀 그만해. 나 gay 아니야. 장난 좀 치지 마. 이상해, 야.” [Oh, I’m not gay. Please stop. I’m not gay. Stop flirting. It’s so weird.].

Helmer (2013) reports a similar phenomenon in a Spanish HL class, where students were mimicking characters in a Spanish language learning telenova in an exaggeratedly slow speech, as a sign of resistance against the teacher’s choice of materials. Blackledge and Creese (2009) also reported similar linguistic practices in complementary schools in Britain. Students in their study used what Bakhtin (1994) referred to as the language of carnival—various parodic expressions to flout tradition and authority, which often involved “slight exaggerations of the usual, either in terms of intonation or frequency of reiteration” (Blackledge & Creese 2009, p. 250). In Ms. Shin’s class, students often engaged in carnivalesque language play when reading quoted speech in short stories or comic strips, by either making up their own lines or reading the materials in an exaggerated tone. Yoon-ho’s dramatic poetry reading in Excerpt 9 was
also done with slight exaggeration in terms of tone and speech rate. Rather than being passive recipients of teacher-centered instruction, students often flouted the authority of the teacher and the textbook by parodying the voices of others with their own interpretations.

Ms. Shin did not discourage students from this kind of playful manipulation of reading materials. In the above excerpt, when students make fun of Chulsu, Ms. Shin swiftly leads students to discuss intercultural differences between Korea and the U.S. regarding holding hands between same sexes. More often, Ms. Shin encouraged students to read as if they were speaking and act in the voice of characters in the reading material, and students’ dramatic oral readings, albeit with slight exaggeration, were complimented. For both students and Ms. Shin, playfulness also meant active participation and engagement in reading materials and expression of their own interpretations, which was one of the objectives set forth by Ms. Shin in the beginning of the semester when she repeatedly explained to her students that students should be able to think and express their reflections on readings.

5.3. Conclusion

In this chapter, I analyzed how Korean language arts textbooks were provided, selected, and used by various language planning actors involved in Korean HL education. In particular, in contrast with the language arts textbook’s varied foci on different modalities of the Korean language, the analysis of classroom activities revealed the prevalence of writing and oral reading practices in the local context, which were in line
with the teacher’s beliefs, as well as students’ nuanced motivation toward improving their written repertoires in Korean.

These classroom practices and interlocking beliefs among participants can be understood within the context of SKS and the broader context of U.S. The overall curriculum of Korean language classes at SKS was also geared toward improving students’ written repertoires in Korean. Although specific curriculum objectives were not explicitly stated in official school documents (except the list of topics and materials covered each semester), the vice-principal and all the Korean language teachers mentioned reading and writing as one of the main goals of their classes when asked about how they planned and organized lessons and curricula. The following table shows an outline of Korean language curricula at SKS based on the school documents and the teachers’ interviews.

Table 5.4. Korean Language Classes Offered at SKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Curriculum objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>새암 Sae.am</td>
<td>Beginning 1 (Age 3-5)</td>
<td>Holistic development of children’s social, emotional, cognitive and physical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한별 Han.byŏl</td>
<td>Beginning 2</td>
<td>To read and write basic words using Han.gŭl [Korean alphabet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나래 Na.rae</td>
<td>Beginning 2 (for students with less exposure to Korean at home)</td>
<td>To read and write basic words and compose short sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다슬 Ta.sul</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>To compose short sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>가람 Ka.ram</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>To read short text and compose connected sentences and paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한울 Han.ul</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>To read and write extended text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The objectives are summarized according to the oral description of the vice-principal and Korean language teachers.
Except for *Sae.am* class which resembled pre-K and kindergarten curricula in South Korea, the other six classes focused on improving Korean literacy, progressing from learning *Han.gŭl* [Korean alphabet] and reading and writing discrete words and sentences to reading, writing, and translating extended text. For instance, one of the common classroom activities observed in lower-level classes (*Han.byŏl*, *Na.rae*, and *Ta.sŭl*) was dictation exercise, a form-focused activity aimed at improving the accuracy of spelling. The main textbooks differed each year depending on who taught the class and who the students were, but the overall tendency was to use HL textbooks in lower levels and to use Korean language arts textbooks and other authentic materials in upper level classes. Regardless of the textbook curricula, literacy was consistently emphasized throughout Korean language classes offered at SKS.

Pak (2003) also reported a similar emphasis on the production of written Korean in Korean language classes offered in a church-affiliated Korean HL program in the U.S. Pak argued that Korean churches and HL programs in the U.S. provide a unique context where Korean monolingualism and literacy are privileged, in opposition to the privileged status of the English language and literacy in the U.S. society in general. In fact, many community-based HL programs in the U.S. are established with the aim of language shift reversal against the ideology of English monolingualism in the mainstream society. Tse (2001) suggested that one of the first signs of intergenerational language shift seems to be

---

3 Although it is worth examining varying definitions of literacy, for the scope of this chapter, here I am adopting a narrower definition of literacy, which refers to the ability to read and write in the language.
the loss of literacy skills, in that even in the cases of non-English languages that seem resilient to language shift, ongoing shift is reflected in the decline of literacy ability over time. This is presumably why many HL programs focus on developing literacy in the language, and such tendency was observed in the choices made by the teachers at SKS in terms of curriculum design and classroom activities, as discussed in this chapter.

Students responded to these curricular choices in ambivalent ways and displayed various emotions during reading and writing activities. On one hand, they showed signs of insecurity and oftentimes boredom during writing or oral reading practices. Formal, literary, or written Korean was a set of repertoires they had little exposure to in their homes or local community, and students might have felt discomfort when they were constantly pushed to use these repertoires in the classroom. At the same time, students exhibited playful attitudes by engaging in carnivalesque language play with the language used in the textbook (Blackledge & Creese, 2009). Such playfulness was not interpreted by the teacher or the textbook as a sign of resistance or disengagement, but part of students’ effort to overcome learning challenges and expand their repertoires. Also, the occasional emotional stress or frustration observed during writing and reading activities ironically reflected the students’ desire to live up to the expectations that others had of them, or they had of themselves, as young Korean Americans (Lee & Cho, 2017).

Hornberger’s continua of biliteracy framework (1989, 2003) offers a useful heuristic to analyze the implementational and ideological spaces (Hornberger, 2005) utilized through the provision, selection, and use of the language arts textbook in the local Korean language classroom, school, and the broader U.S. context from an ecological perspective. Based on the assumptions that there is an “unequal balance of power across
languages and literacies” and that “one language and literacy is developing in relation to one or more other languages and literacies” (Hornberger, 2002, pp. 37-38), Hornberger provides the following continua that reflect emerging power relations across different languages and literacies in a given context.

Figure 5.4. *Power Relations in the Continua of Biliteracy* (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000)

Based on this framework, the relations of different repertoires could be understood in the context of SKS as well as in the U.S. in general. In the U.S. context, HL programs like SKS are the product of grassroots efforts to promote the bilingual end
of the continuum against the dominant ideology of English monolingualism. The provision of Korean textbooks by the South Korean government offers significant support to such local effort. In the context of SKS, the local effort to fight against English monolingualism ironically creates its own macro context privileging Korean monolingualism and literacy, while subjugating not only the use of English repertoires—as discussed in Pak’s study (2003), but also the vernacular repertoires of Korean. In this context, the pedagogic choices made by Ms. Shin tend to address traditionally powerful ends of the continua, promoting the production of written, literary repertories by selectively implementing and adapting the guidelines suggested in the textbook with emphasis on reading and writing.

The textbook provided implementational space in the classroom—ample materials the teacher and students would work from to potentially develop a set of repertoires that they felt lacking. However, the space was only partially utilized, as there was an evident gap between the receptive, oral, and vernacular repertoires students already possessed and the productive, written, and literary repertoires the classroom activities demanded. This gap was oftentimes bridged with carnivalesque language play and translanguaging practices that were initiated by the students. However, on the level of curriculum and lesson planning, there was not sufficient scaffolding that addresses both ends of the continua, utilizing and validating the students’ existing repertoires to promote more learning and engagement. This scaffolding could potentially take various forms, and as discussed in the beginning of this chapter, it should be provided by considering the resources and time allowed in the local context as well. In the following chapter, I will discuss the notion of translanguaging pedagogy—one form of scaffolding that emerged
during class discussions, which may help the teachers and students fully utilize implementational space allowed in the local context.
CHAPTER 6 TRANSLANGUAGEING PEDAGOGY AS A TOOL FOR CO-LEARNING

Along with students, teachers are one of the key actors that influence classroom language ecology through their linguistic practices and pedagogic choices (Creese & Martin, 2003; Hornberger, 2002; van Lier, 2006). Regarding the classroom practices of teachers in community-based heritage language (HL) schools, a significant number of studies have highlighted their monolingual practices and ideologies, which are often challenged by youth (Wei & Wu, 2009; Lo, 2009; Pak, 2003). One of the common patterns I found in SKS was the teachers’ predominantly monolingual instruction in Korean language classrooms, which seemed to corroborate previous study findings. However, a closer analysis of classroom discourse revealed a more nuanced picture of the teachers’ linguistic practices and their interactional positioning toward students’ linguistic practices.

By analyzing the discourse of two Korean language classrooms led by Ms. Cha and Mr. Hyun respectively, this chapter shows how Korean-only policy in Ms. Cha’s classroom ironically directed students’ attention to the use of English rather than Korean, while the lack of such a policy in Mr. Hyun’s classroom created space for creative language play among students. In the former classroom, although Ms. Cha, a 1.5-generation immigrant, shared the youth’s translanguaging practices outside of the classroom, she banned using English in class, which restricted the students’ chances of expanding their repertoires. In the latter classroom, although Mr. Hyun, a 1st-generation immigrant, appeared at first glance to resort to monolingual uses of Korean, a closer look revealed he was actively translanguaging with the students, and his alignment with the
students as both language learners and experts created a *co-learning community* where students and teachers drew on their full repertoires to engage in meaning negotiation and learned from one another. This suggests a discrepancy between students’ and teacher’s repertoires does not necessarily lead to tensions or conflicts, but rather opportunities of learning through the acknowledgment of each other’s repertoires.

Based on these findings, I question the validity of separate bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Heller, 1999; Hornberger, 1989) and explore the possibilities of translanguaging pedagogy (Anderson, 2008; Arthur & Martin, 2006; Bailey, 2007; García, 2009; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lin & Martin, 2005). I suggest that translanguaging pedagogy is not simply the teachers’ verbal use of translanguaging practices in classrooms, which prevents many HL teachers from trying to even understand what translanguaging pedagogy is. Rather, I suggest the scope of translanguaging pedagogy extends to the teacher’s identity positioning and alignment with students, thus inviting HL teachers to experiment with translanguaging pedagogy in their classrooms.

6.1. Translanguaging Pedagogy in Language Classrooms

According to Wei and Wu (2009), many HL schools, as well as various bilingual instructional programs, impose so-called One Language at a Time (OLAT) or One Language Only (OLON) policy, by designating specific times, spaces, or teachers for using particular languages. Especially in the cases of teaching immigrant and Indigenous languages, Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, and Henderson (2014) suggest that these policies can be seen as an attempt to secure space for minoritized languages, which are in danger
of shift toward the dominant language of the society. In fact, a significant number of researchers and practitioners advocate the monolingual instruction of minoritized languages based on the rhetoric of language protection or language rights (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Gomez, Freeman, & Freeman, 2005; Howard & Sugarman, 2007; Lindholm–Leary, 2005). Teachers often worry that their students might resort to using their dominant language if they are once allowed to translanguage in the classroom.

These beliefs and fears are not without grounds, in that there certainly exists a strong push toward monolingualism and little space for bilingual youth to draw on their full communicative repertoires. However, recent scholarship has argued that monolingual policies in language instructional programs may not be the most effective way to nurture the linguistic and cultural resources of bilingual youth. For the mission of protecting minoritized languages, bilingual youth may be subjugated by the same monolingual norms that have undermined their linguistic resources in the first place. In fact, Palmer (2009) reported how OLAT policy in a Spanish-English two-way immersion gave more voice to a certain group of students in the classroom, while having others face negative emotional and symbolic consequences. Such monolingual instructional practices are based on a false assumption of “two solitudes” (Cummins, 2007, 2008) or “two monolinguals in one person” (Grosjean, 1989)—an assumption that two languages should be kept strictly separate for bilinguals to achieve the ideal linguistic competence of monolingual speakers. Research has shown that the separatist approach does not reflect the natural developmental patterns of bilingualism, as bilinguals do not learn one language at a time (Lee, Hill–Bonnet & Gillespie, 2008; Reyes, 2001).
To promote bilingualism in its true sense, many scholars have suggested using flexible bilingual instructional strategies that encourage students to draw on whatever communicative repertoires at hand to make meaning, not restricted to the distinction of one language or the other (Canagarajah, 2011b; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2007; García, 2009; Gutiérrez, Bien, Selland & Pierce, 2011; Hornberger, 2003; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Lee, Hill–Bonnet, & Raley, 2011; Martínez, 2010; Tamati, 2016; Mori, 2007; Reyes & Vallone, 2007; Valdés, 2005). Drawing on their research in complementary language schools in the U.K., Creese and Blackledge (2010) called for a flexible bilingual pedagogy through which teachers and students engage in translanguaging practices to perform their identities and facilitate the processes of language learning and teaching in the classroom. Based on the analysis of translanguaging strategies employed by a Saudi Arabian graduate student in her writing, Canagarajah (2011a) argues that teachers should respect students’ funds of knowledge (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) and develop their instructional strategies based on the translanguaging strategies students use.

García has suggested concrete ways teachers can implement translanguaging pedagogy in classrooms, as part of her ongoing research project with emergent bilinguals in New York public schools (Celic & Seltzer, 2012; García, Herrera, Hesson, & Kleyn, 2013). Palmer et al. (2014) suggest tranalanguaging pedagogy can be implemented if the teacher models dynamic bilingualism and positions students as competent bilinguals by encouraging them to translate for their peers, make metalinguistic commentaries and teach one another. Translanguaging pedagogy is also reported to benefit bilingual youth.
in linguistic, educational, affective, and sociocultural aspects, as Gort and Sembiante (2015, p. 9) write in the following:

As a pedagogic resource, bilingual teachers draw on translanguaging to expand language boundaries; to create multiple opportunities for language learning; to represent authentic situations that reflect the multilingual communities within and outside the classroom; to transmit information; to model and scaffold comprehension, vocabulary, and metalinguistic strategies; and to perform identities using the linguistic signs at a learner’s disposal.

A consensus in previous literature is that translanguaging pedagogy involves both the teacher and students engaging in translanguaging practices and utilizing students’ multilingual resources for the purposes of identity development as well as teaching and learning. However, although translanguaging pedagogy may be theoretically and empirically sound as an educational approach, one challenge it faces is that many practitioners may still find it overwhelming, as a burdensome task that requires them to go beyond their comfort zone and invest a great deal of time and effort in transforming the existing language ecology of the classroom and the institution. This may be particularly true in HL school settings, where the majority of teachers are first-generation immigrants who may not necessarily share the same translanguaging practices as students. For these teachers, engaging in translanguaging practices may be conceived as an act of crossing (Rampton, 1995) and a potential threat to their teacher authority putting themselves in a vulnerable position. In addition, the minoritized status of the HL in the broader society often becomes good justification for claiming exclusive space for HL and maintaining the status-quo in HL classrooms.

Thus, what I question in this chapter is whether it is feasible, and even necessary, to implement translanguaging pedagogy in HL programs and how translanguaging pedagogy should be defined and promoted in certain teaching contexts where teachers are
faced with linguistic and social barriers against translanguaging practices. To answer these questions, I will first examine linguistic practices in two Korean heritage language classrooms run by Ms. Cha and Ms. Hyun respectively, which will lead to the discussion of the scope and implications of translanguaging pedagogy for practitioners working with bilingual youth.

6.2. Language Ecology of Sarang Korean School and the Two Teachers

In her study on language practices in a Korean immigrant church school in the U.S., Pak (2003) describes the language ecology of the school as a space where English monolingualism in the broader society is replaced with Korean monolingualism, writing about her own experiences of feeling marginalized in the church as an English-speaking adult. The overall language ecology of SKS can be described similarly to that of the church school depicted in Pak (2003)’s study. Classroom walls were decorated with students’ Korean writings, official school events were conducted in Korean, and most adults used Korean to communicate with one another. Although students translanguaged among themselves, they tried their best to use more Korean when talking with teachers at SKS.

However, some efforts have been made to accommodate bilingualism at SKS over the recent years. From the year before my fieldwork started, the vice principal decided to make all the official documents sent out to parents bilingual, while before individual teachers translated documents for a few English-speaking parents. Also, when I started my fieldwork, the vice principal decided to have two Korean history classes taught in English, so that students could better understand the content. This was partly made
possible by Ms. Cha and Ms. Lee, two young teachers who had joined SKS beginning that semester. Both were college students who had come to the U.S. before their adolescence and reported being comfortable teaching in English, as their academic repertoires were mostly built in U.S. school settings. As for the other five teachers at SKS, they were more comfortable with using Korean in the school, as they had come to the U.S. at later ages (Table 6.1). Although there was no explicit school-wide language policy at SKS, except the two history classes, Korean seemed to dominate most interactions that involved teachers, including Korean language classes, school events, and teachers’ meetings.

Table 6.1. Teacher Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role at SKS</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of stay in the U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kim</td>
<td>Teacher (Sae.am/ Ha.rang)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Moon</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.byŏl)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cha</td>
<td>Teacher (Na.rae, history II)</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lee</td>
<td>Teacher (Ta.sūl, history I)</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kyung</td>
<td>Teacher (Ka.ram)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shin</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.ul)</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hyun</td>
<td>Teacher (Han.ul)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first and second weeks of classes, I decided to observe all the seven Korean language classes to get an overall sense of the classroom ecology at SKS. Contrary to my expectation that class interactions would be mostly in Korean, there was a spectrum of bilingualism observed in terms of students’ linguistic practices (c.f., Hornberger, 1989, 2003). In this chapter, I will particularly focus on the classrooms of two teachers, Ms. Cha, one of the two young teachers who taught Na.rae (Beginning 2) class, and Mr. Hyun, one of the older teachers who taught Han.ul (Intermediate) class. These two
particular classes were chosen as each of these classes was at the end of spectrum in terms of students’ bilingual practices in classroom. While Ms. Cha’s students were encouraged to use Korean only in the classroom, translanguaging practices were frequently observed in Mr. Hyun’s class. Although these two classrooms are not directly comparable because of students’ ages and class levels, each case nonetheless shows how a teacher’s language policy may influence the ensuing interactions and students’ learning in the classroom.

Ms. Cha was a junior in a local university at the time of my research, and although she was busy catching up with her coursework and applying for internships, she was dedicated to spending her weekends in church as a Korean school teacher as well as a member of the young adult Christian group. She told me she had been going to Korean schools ever since she came to the U.S. when she was eight, and she was still learning a lot, now teaching Korean language and history at SKS. Although Ms. Cha spent her secondary school years in Atlanta, one of the areas with a sizable Korean population in the U.S., she said that she lived in a neighborhood far from Koreatown and quickly picked up English. During breaks and lunch hours, students loved to hang out with Ms. Cha, who seemed more like an older sister with her big, happy laughter, and I would often see her translanguaging effortlessly with the students. This was not a typical teacher-student interaction at SKS, as the other teachers, mostly 1st generation immigrants, would talk to students primarily in Korean. That was why it took me by surprise, when I observed Ms. Cha’s Korean language class, run by a Korean-language-only policy. In the following section, I will describe how this policy unfolded in the class I observed and discuss the ironies foregrounded by the Korean language only policy.
implemented by Ms. Cha, who was certainly a well-meaning teacher who wanted to maximize students’ learning in Korean.

In contrast to Ms. Cha who moved to the U.S. at an early age, Mr. Hyun came to the U.S. in his thirties in 2015, when he was admitted to a seminary school in Philadelphia. In Korea, he used to be a math teacher at a private institute for middle school and high school students. He had also been a Sunday Bible school teacher for more than twenty years, and he was now leading a youth group in the host church in Philadelphia. He felt that students at SKS were very different from the students he used to teach in Korea, and he was often caught by surprise when students did not understand what he readily assumed they would know, such as simple jokes and subtle nuances of Korean language. During his interview, he said he was still in the process of “부딪혀 보고 알아가는 중” [lit. learning things by bumping up against them; learning by doing], as a teacher. Mr. Hyun was particularly insecure about his English language skills, and he would often tell me how difficult it is for him to follow lectures and write papers in English. Being aware of his background, I expected that he would lead a heavily monolingual classroom. However, my expectation turned out to be true only partially, revealing more complex patterns of teacher-student interaction, as I will discuss following the analysis of Ms. Cha’s classroom. The analysis in the following two sections will particularly attend to the two teachers’ pedagogic and linguistic choices in terms of their instruction and teacher talk, as well as the influence of their choices upon the ensuing classroom interaction.

One important note to make here is that while I observed Mr. Hyun’s classroom every week throughout the semester as the focal participant group of my research, I
observed Ms. Cha’s Korean language classroom only once in the second week of the semester. While what was captured in Mr. Hyun’s classroom in this chapter was reflective of general dynamics of the focal participant group, I do not make any general statements about Ms. Cha’s classroom, although she said she occasionally used Korean-only policy in her Korean language class. Thus, all the discussion in this chapter is squarely based on the classroom interactions that I observed, and it is not meant for assessing the two teachers’ teaching abilities or expertise, but rather for demonstrating how a certain set of pedagogic and linguistic choices by the teacher might influence the classroom language ecology and students’ learning experiences.

6.3. Ms. Cha’s Class

I observed Ms. Cha’s class in the second week of the semester, and it was just two hours before lunch when I entered Ms. Cha’s classroom. There were five students in class, all in grades 1-3, and all considered ‘English-dominant’ at SKS. Ms. Cha was in charge of this class, as the vice-principal thought that Ms. Cha, being a fluent bilingual herself, would communicate best with the children. As the students had just learned how to read and write 한글 han-gŭl [Korean alphabet] in the previous semester, Ms. Cha’s class mostly focused on having students practice writing and reading in Korean as well as learning basic sentence structures.

6.3.1. No-English Game: Focus on the Language Codes

As I discreetly sat down at a chair at the back of the classroom, I immediately noticed a list of names along with strikes beside them on a piece of paper, which reminded me of a typical classroom practice in South Korea, where the teacher would
As I settled into my seat, Ms. Cha asked S3 to explain for me what they were doing in class. S3 described the Korean-only policy, explaining “we can’t speak English language” (Line 4) instead of “we should speak Korean,” and S2 chimed in, interpreting strikes on the paper as bombs, explaining that students will get “a bomb” (Line 6) every time they speak in English. Most of the students were laughing as they were explaining,
and it seemed like they considered the Korean-only policy (or no-English policy) as a fun game. The competitive nature of this no-English game became evident in interactions that followed, as students were excitedly reporting their classmates’ use of English to Ms. Cha, playing the role of ‘language cop.’

After their explanation of the policy, Ms. Cha and students quickly returned to their writing exercise, which required students to write sentences with the structure, 가/이 싫어요 – ka/i si rhọ. yo [I dislike -]. They were particularly focusing on the verb 싫어요 si rhọ. yo [hate], as students would often misspell it as 싫어요 or 시려요, both nonsense words pronounced as si rhọ. yo.

Excerpt 2. Language cop: “Huh, he’s speaking English!”

1 S1: 어, 어, 선생님!
3 S3: Wait, wait.
4 S1: 허, 영어 써요!
5 T: 너 wait 했어요. 선생님이 지금 들었어요.
6 S3: 아니, 왜 했어요.
7 T: 아니 너 wait 했어요. 선생님이 들었어요.
8 S2: ((whispering-unintelligible))
9 S1: 그, S2 가, 그 영어 써어요.
10 T: 무슨 말 했어요?
11 S1: 아니, 나 말할 수 없는데 나 말해도 돼요?
12 T: 한국말로 해야지.
13 S1: 아니, 나 몰라요 근데.
14 T: 그거 몰라요? 그럼 어떻게.
15 S1: 아 진짜 좋다, 그런거 영어로 말했어요.

1 S1: Oh, oh, teacher!
2 T: What did I tell you to do when you call teacher? Didn’t I say you should raise your hand first? “I hate garlic.” Please write that down.
3 S3: Wait, wait.
4 S1: Huh, he’s speaking English!
5 T: Oh, you said “wait.” I just heard it.
6 S3: No, I said 왜 wae [why].
7 T: No, you said “wait.” I heard it.
8 S2: ((whispering-unintelligible))
9 S1: Eh, S2 used, eh, English.
10 T: What did she say?
11 S1: Ah, I can’t say it. Can I say it?
12 T: You should say it in Korean.
13 S1: Oh, I don’t know how.
14 T: You don’t know? Then what can I do?
15 S1: something like “oh, really good,” she said in English.
In this excerpt, S1 is reporting two of his classmates, S3 (Line 4) and S2 (Line 9), for using English. S1 is one of the most outgoing students at SKS, and he also loves to get attention from his teachers by actively participating in classroom discussions. However, teachers would often ask S1 to calm down and follow the class rules, as Ms. Cha was doing when she told S1 to raise his hand first in Line 2. S1 first reports S3, who inadvertently said, “wait, wait” (Line 3) as he was chatting with his classmates. S3 immediately refutes S1’s accusation, claiming that he said a Korean word, “왜 wae [why],” which sounds similar to the English word, “wait” (Line 6). This was one of the creative attempts made by S3 drawing on his communicative repertoires to get away with the Korean-only policy. S3’s clever attempt is not acknowledged by the teacher (Line 7), and he gets his name marked on the list. Immediately following this incident, S1 again reports S2 for whispering to her classmate in English (Line 9). However, this time, the teacher would not acknowledge S1’s report, unless he translates what S2 said into Korean (Line 12). This can be interpreted as Ms. Cha’s pedagogical attempt to encourage S1 to use more Korean, and her attempt indeed succeeds as S1 reports S2’s words in Korean in Line 15. However, whether this can be considered a truly successful learning moment merits further discussion, which will be presented later in this section.

In the following excerpt, students were having difficulty coming up with new words, as the activity required them to think of the things they dislike. It was not quite clear whether they could not come up with the things they dislike, or they did not know
how to say them in Korean. Then, Ms. Cha started offering some examples, one of which was the word, 당근 tang.gŭn [carrot].

Excerpt 3. Special exception: “This one, you can speak in English.”

| # | T: 그, 뭐지? 당근? 당근 좋아해요? | 1 | T: Um, how do you call that? Tang.gŭn [Carrot]? Do you like tang.gŭn? |
| 2 | S5: 네. | 2 | S5: Yeah. |
| 3 | T: 당근 좋아해요? 어, 그러니까 당근 좋아해요? | 3 | T: You like tang.gŭn? Um, then- |
| 4 | S2: 당근 뭐예요? | 4 | S2: What is tang.gŭn? |
| 5 | T: 당근 뭐예요? 당근 뭐지 가르쳐줄 사람. 이건 영어해도 돼. 당근 뭐예요? | 5 | T: What is tang.gŭn? Who can tell her what tang.gŭn is? This one, you can speak in English. What is tang.gŭn? |
| 6 | S3: Carrot. | 6 | S3: Carrot. |
| 7 | T: Carrot. | 7 | T: Carrot. |
| 8 | S1,2: 오! | 8 | S1,2: Oh! ((Pointing to S3)) |
| 9 | T: Tang.gŭn, I said it’s fine. | 9 | T: Tang.gŭn, I said it’s fine. |

When Ms. Cha asks students if they like tang.gŭn (Line 1), S2 asks what it means (Line 4). Then, Ms. Cha asks S3 to offer an English term for S2. When S3 says “carrot” in English (Line 6), the other students excitedly point to him (Line 8). However, Ms. Cha defends him for using English for a legitimate reason (Line 9). In Excerpt 2, Ms. Cha asked the student to translate an English sentence into Korean, whereas this time she asks S3 to translate a Korean word into English for his classmate. This was another pedagogic attempt she made to direct students’ attention to Korean language, this time with the aid of an English word. In both excerpts, students were encouraged to think of specific Korean phrases or words, i.e., how to put S2’s words into Korean (Excerpt 2) or what the word tang.gŭn meant in English (Excerpt 3), by engaging in translation practices. These translation practices would not have happened, had it not been for the Korean-only policy. However, again, it is worth considering how these learning opportunities might
have prevented much more opportunities for meaning negotiation and learning if students were allowed to translanguage throughout this writing exercise. Indeed, throughout the class, the students’ attention was focused on the language codes themselves—whether someone speaks English or not, rather than engaging in meaningful conversations.

6.3.2. Meaning-Making Through Translanguaging

Although Ms. Cha prohibited using English in class, it also became evident that translanguaging was a more natural way of communication for Ms. Cha as well, as the following excerpt demonstrates. It is also worth noting that the following excerpt shows one of the most extended meaning negotiations that happened between Ms. Cha and a student in the classroom.

Excerpt 4. “I really love comic book[s].”

1 S1: 나는 엄마가 책 많이 못 봐면 진짜 슬퍼요.
2 T: 아, 엄마가 책
3 S1: 책, 볼수, 볼수 없다고.
4 T: 엄마가 책 볼수 없다고 해요?
5 S1: 네.
6 T: 왜요?
7 S1: 왜냐면 나 comic book 너무 많이 보니까.
8 T: 아, comic book 너무 많이 읽어서 그런가요.
9 S1: 나 comic book 너무 좋아해요.
10 T: 그러면은 S1 가 regul.. ((checks her own mark)) 아, 일반책을 읽으면 엄마가 좋아할 것 같아.

1 S1: I am really sad when mom says no books.
2 T: Oh, your mom says you shouldn’t-
3 S1: -shouldn’t read the books.
4 T: Your mom tells you not to read books?
5 S1: Yes.
6 T: Why?
7 S1: Because I read too many comic book[s].
8 T: I see. Because you read too many comic book[s].
9 S1: I really love comic book[s].
10 T: Then if you read regul. Ah ((marks her own name on the list)) il.ban ch’aeq [regular books], your mom would like that.

Here, students were still working on writing the sentences about the things they disliked, and one of the examples Ms. Cha brought up was ‘books.’ Then, S1 started
talking about his mother who would not let him read books (Line 1). This sparks Ms.
Cha’s curiosity. She probes S1 to explain further (Line 4, 6), and she finds out that S1’s
mother would not allow S1 to read too many “comic book[s]” (Line 7). As they are fully
engaged in this conversation, Ms. Cha does not comment on the fact that S1 was
translanguaging in Line 7, with the English word “comic book,” although there is a
commonly-used equivalent term in Korean, 만화책 man.hwa.chaek. She also
translanguages, adopting the same word in Line 8. However, in the turn that follows, she
again translanguages by attempting to use the English word, “regular books” and quickly
corrects herself (Line 10).

There were also many other instances where Ms. Cha inadvertently
translanguaged, some of which she did not appear to notice. When she did notice, she
marked herself on the list, and students would burst out laughing. By participating in the
game, Ms. Cha was trying to set a model for the students. At the end of the class, Ms. Cha
ended up getting the most marks among all the students in class. This episode ironically
reveals that Ms. Cha, who is considered a successful bilingual speaker, cannot but
translanguage in her most natural conversations. Also, the fact that S1 engages in the
most extended conversation with Ms. Cha as he translanguages also hints at the
possibility of translanguaging pedagogy, and I will go back to this point later in the
discussion.

6.3.3. Silenced Voice: The Consequences of Korean-Only Policy

Throughout this classroom interaction, one student, S4, remained almost
completely silent. S4 was a mixed heritage student who had a Korean immigrant mother
and a U.S. born Caucasian father. She naturally, sometimes deliberately, used English
with her teachers and peers, as she grew up speaking English at home. She was a soft-spoken girl with a shy smile, but I also often saw her giggling and chatting with her girl friends during breaks and lunch time. Korean school and church were probably the only places where she was exposed to Korean repertoires, and this Korean-only policy in the classroom seemed to have silenced her. In my fieldnote, I noted:

*S4 seems very frustrated. Resting her head on the desk, she keeps scribbling on her notebook and occasionally pokes at Ms. Cha to show what she wrote, which looks like a few English words. However, Ms. Cha is busy managing the classroom and leading the exercise. She occasionally looks at S4’s notes and does her best to help her complete the sentences. However, she quickly turns to the other students whose voices were much louder and clearer. At one point, S4 says “도와줘” [Help], and Ms. Cha responds, “미안해, S4 아.” [Sorry, S4] with a quick sign of compassion in her eyes. But Ms. Cha is still busy with the other students. S4’s frustration becomes more evident. (Fieldnote 16/09/24)*

S4’s frustration was so evident that I was tempted to break out of my observer position and help her out. In the following excerpt, despite her repeatedly failed attempts to get Ms. Cha’s attention, S4 makes yet another attempt to speak up towards the end of the class.

Excerpt 5. “I don’t understand, I don’t-”

1 S4: ((Wants to say something)) 어디..
2 T: Time out 아직 안됐어. 2 분.
3 S?: 배고파요.
4 T: 미안해요.
5 S1: 배고파. 배고파.
6 S4: 어디, 어디, 어디.. 어디.. 열!
7 T: 열 말해. 자, 선생님 따라해봐. 열한시.
8 S4: 열한시.
9 T: 열한시 십분. 십분. 십분.
1  S4: ((Wants to say something)) Ah: Ah:!
2 T: Not time out yet. 2 more minutes.
3 S?: I’m hungry.
4 T: I’m sorry.
5 S1: Hungry! Hungry!
6 S4: yǒ, yǒ, yǒ, ah, yǒ!
7 T: You said yǒl [ten]! Okay, repeat after me. Yǒ.rhan.sì [lit. ten one o’clock; eleven o’clock].
8 S4: Yǒ.rhan.sì.
9 T: Yǒ.rhan.sì sip.pun, sip.pun, sip.pun [Eleven o’clock ten minutes, ten minutes, ten minutes].
S4’s first attempt to participate in the conversation, “Ah, ah” in Line 1, is ignored, with the other students complaining and chatting in the background. In Line 6, S4 makes her second attempt, and this time, Ms. Cha recognizes that S4 was trying to say 열한시 십분 [eleven o’clock ten minutes], and helps her to tell time in Korean.

However, as S4 continues to say “Uh, uh!” after saying 열한시 십분 yŏ.rhan.si sip.pun in Line 10, it turns out that the time was just part of the message she wanted to deliver. However, her “Uh, uh,” brief interjections are probably not recognized as a verbal sign by Ms. Cha, and S4 is again ignored, as Ms. Cha goes on with her classroom business (Line 11). As soon as the break begins, Ms. Cha encourages S4 (Line 13, 15), and S4 bursts out in English to Ms. Cha (Line 16). Then, although it was not audio-recorded, S4 asks her if she could share candies with her classmates. Probably, this whole time, S4 wanted to ask if she could share her candies once the break started, because her friends were saying
they were hungry. However, her voice was only recognized during the break when the Korean-only game ended.

S4’s case resembles the Spanish language classroom in a two-way immersion program reported in Palmer’s (2009) study, where Spanish-only policy gave more voice to a certain group of students, while others remained silent. Although Korean-only game may have been implemented as a careful pedagogic choice to encourage students to use more Korean, the policy was not only restricting students’ use of English in the classroom, but also their voice—a full expression of who they are, what they are like, or what they would like to do.

6.3.4. The Ironies of Korean-Only Policy

From these classroom interactions, several implications can be drawn with regards to the Korean-only language classroom. The Korean-only-policy was in some aspects effective, in that students were pushed to say certain things in Korean, which they would have probably expressed in English, had it not been for the policy. Most students also seemed to be having fun, playing the role of language cop. However, their conversation was mostly limited to the basic sentence forms at hand, and the words students and Ms. Cha came up with—the things they dislike—were typical things many children would not like, such as garlic, carrot, or books. This makes us wonder if the conversation would have played out in a completely different direction if students were allowed to translanguage. All the students, including S4, might have become more excited, and they would have talked not only about what they actually liked or didn’t like but also their reasons why as well as their related experiences and feelings. This meaningful conversation might have motivated students to learn how to express their
personal tastes in Korean writing as well, which would have resulted in more opportunities for expanding their repertoires.

However, in reality, while constantly monitoring each other’s language use, students were ironically paying more attention to the use of English, rather than Korean, which was the whole point of this Korean-only policy. Furthermore, by focusing on the codes themselves, students were prevented from meaningful interaction, which would facilitate the expansion of their repertoires. When students’ bilingual practices are sanctioned, the complex and creative ideas they could contribute to class are also sanctioned. Despite a wealth of ideas and linguistic resources they have, students could not but speak in a very limited way, oftentimes like a very young child, just as S4 did when she was trying to express herself with intermittent interjections (e.g., ah, uh).

The discussion so far suggests that students may learn and engage more if they are allowed to draw on their full repertoires through translanguaging practices, and this is the consensus among scholars who support translanguaging pedagogy. However, questions still remain as to how translanguaging pedagogy actually leads to more opportunities for learning and, specifically thinking of the context of immigrant communities, how this translanguaging space can be created in a heritage language classroom, which is often led by 1st generation immigrant teachers whose communicative repertoires may be quite different from those of students. In the following section, I will look into the Korean language classroom led by Mr. Hyun, a 1st generation immigrant teacher who was particularly insecure about his own English skills. I discuss how he performs translanguaging pedagogy in his own ways despite his insecurities and discomfort and
how this opens space for students to participate in active meaning negotiation and 
creative language play.

6.4. Mr. Hyun’s Class

Mr. Hyun was teaching Korean language classes to the focal group of students in 
my research. While Mrs. Shin taught the students in the beginning of the semester, she 
had to take an unexpected leave, and Mr. Hyun came to substitute for Mrs. Shin. The 
excerpts I discuss in this section come from his first and second weeks of classes which 
covered a lesson unit on polysemy from the 5th grade Korean language arts textbook from 
South Korea. There were four students in class, Da-in, Ye-un, Yoonho, and Joon. The 
students were already familiar with Mr. Hyun, as he also taught them at SKS in the 
previous year and met them in church on Sundays.

6.4.1. Beyond the Codes: Expressing Voice Through Translanguaging

In the following excerpt, Mr. Hyun started the lesson by asking students what 
다의어 ta.i.ő [polysemous word] is, and students engaged in an extended discussion 
regarding its possible meanings. The discussion in Excerpt 6 happened very fast in less 
than a minute, and all the students were actively responding to Mr. Hyun’s question in 
their own ways, drawing to the best of their abilities and available resources in the 
classroom. The excerpt below shows how lack of Korean-only policy, or lack of attention 
to the language codes, allowed students to freely and creatively engage in a seemingly 
simple task of guessing the meaning of a word.

Excerpt 6. “What is ta.i.ő?”
1 T: 자, ((Writing in the air)) 다의어, 다의어라는 걸 배웠어. 다의어가 뭐야?
2 Yoonho: Diamond.
3 Da-in: ((Looking at T)) 다이, 다이, 다요?
4 Ye-un: ((Smiling)) Diamond. 다의어.
5 Yoonho: 달력, 달력.
6 Da-in: To be continued.
7 T: ((Writing on the board)) 다, 의, 어라는 걸 배웠어요, 지난 시간에.
8 Yoonho: ((Glances at the board)) 다의어. 토의?
9 T: 다의어라는 게 무엇이었나?
10 ((From Line 7, intently looks at the word on the board, then starts flipping through the textbook. Following Yoonho’s contribution in Line 8, whispers to himself with a faint smile, still flipping through the book)) 토의.
11 Yoonho: ((describing with action)) Tire=
12 Da-in: 다같이.
13 Yoonho: ((describing wheels with action)) =바퀴, tire.
14 Joon: ((Stays on one page for a while, then looks up)) Meaning. 아, 한말이, 한말이 meaning 이 더 많은 거요. 의미가 다양한거.
15 T: 어.
1 T: Okay, ((writing in the air)) you learned about ta.i.ŏ, ta.i.ŏ. What is ta.i.ŏ?
2 Yoonho: Diamond.
3 Da-in: ((Looking at T)) ta.i, ta.i, ta.yo?
4 Ye-un: ((Smiling)) Diamond. Ta.i.ŏ.
5 Yoonho: talryŏk, tal.ryŏk [calendar].
6 Da-in: To be continued
7 T: ((Writing on the board)) We learned about ta, üi, ŏ, last time.
8 Yoonho: ((Glances at the board)) ta.ŭi.ŏ. T’o.i [discussion]?
9 T: What was ta.ŭi.ŏ?
10 ((From Line 7, intently looks at the word on the board, then starts flipping through the textbook. Following Yoonho’s contribution in Line 8, whispers to himself with a faint smile, still flipping through the book)) t’o.ŭi.
11 Yoonho: ((describing wheels with action)) Tire=
12 Da-in: ta.ga.ch’i [altogether].
13 Yoonho:((describing wheels with action)) =pak’wi [wheels], tire.
14 Joon: ((Stays on one page for a while, then looks up)) Meaning. Oh, when one word, one word has many meaning(s). Various meanings.
15 T: Yes.
Joon: So, here it says like ((reads examples from the textbook)) “mŏk.ta [eat], pa.bŭl mŏk.ta [lit. eat rice; have meal], ma.ŭ.mŭl mŏk.ta [lit. eat mind; determine], na.i.rŭl mŏkta [lit. eat age; get old], ko.rŭl mŏk.ta [lit. eat a goal; get scored]” ((Then, looks at the teacher))

T: ((Smiling)) Thanks for remembering that! Although I didn’t teach it.

Joon: ((smiles back))

When Mr. Hyun asks what 데의어 ta.i.ŏ is (Line 1), Yoonho first comes up with an English word, “diamond” (Line 2) which resembles 데의어 ta.i.ŏ in terms of its consonant and vowel combination. Almost simultaneously, Da-in asks Mr. Hyun for clarification, trying to enunciate 데의어 ta.i.ŏ: “다이, 다이, 다요? ta.i, ta.i, ta.yo?” (Line 3). Ye-un, a shy student who hardly volunteers to participate in the classroom discussion, seems to be amused by the phonetic similarity between diamond and 데의어 ta.i.ŏ, as she smiles and repeats, “Diamond. 데의어 ta.i.ŏ” (Line 4). Yoonho excitedly makes another contribution, this time with a Korean word, “달력 tal.ryŏk” [calendar] (Line 5). Da-in also chimes in in a loud voice, “To be continued” (Line 6). At this moment, I did not see any connection between “to be continued” and “데의어 ta.i.ŏ.” However, it was only later when I closely read the transcript that I realized the Korean translation of “to be continued” is 다음에 ta.ŭ.me, which also sounds similar to 데의어 ta.i.ŏ.

Then, Mr. Hyun writes down 데의어 on the white board in Line 7, and the addition of this visual medium seems to affect part of the interactions that follow. As
Korean words are spelled on a morphophonemic basis, rather than a phonemic basis, the written form of ta.i.ŏ maintains the original phonemic forms of its three constitutive morphemes, 다 [many], 의 [meaning], and 어 [word or language]. In reality, the second morpheme 의 ēi is usually pronounced as i as it becomes unstressed in the middle of the word. In Line 7, as he writes down the word on the board, Mr. Hyun stresses each syllable, “다, 의, 어 ta, ēi, ŏ” perhaps to emphasize each constitutive morpheme. When students see the word with the middle syllable spelled as 의 ēi instead of i, both Yoonho and Joon respond. Yoonho immediately comes up with a word, “토의 t’o.i” [discussion] (Line 8), whose second syllable is also spelled as 의 ēi instead of its actual pronunciation, i. Almost simultaneously, after gazing at the board for a while, Joon starts flipping through the textbook, while also repeating Yoonho’s suggestion, “토의 t’o.i” to himself (Line 10). While Joon was flipping through the textbook, Yoonho continues to suggest another similarly pronounced English word, “tire” which is accompanied by his gesture describing wheels and the word’s Korean translation, “바퀴 pak’wi” [wheels] (Line 11, 13), and Da-in suggests “다같이 ta.ga.ch’i” [altogether], which starts with the same syllable with 다의어 ta.i.ŏ (Line 12). Then, Joon finally stays on a page of the textbook for a while, then looks up at the teacher, and confidently says, “meaning,” further explaining that “one word has many meaning[s]” (Line 14) and citing examples of 다의어 ta.i.ŏ from the textbook (Line 16). Although it was not clear whether Joon first said “meaning” (Line 14) because he explicitly knew the meaning of the constitutive 의 ēi [meaning], it seemed that the spelled out word on the board triggered something in his mind and helped him to find the
page in the textbook. This is followed by Mr. Hyun’s acknowledgement, as Mr. Hyun and Joon exchange affirming gaze and smile (Line 15-18).

More importantly, translanguaging became so engrained in this interaction that no one cared who used which language. The students drew on their repertoires beyond the legitimized boundaries of languages, as all their attention was on the possible meanings of 다의어 \( ta.i.\ddot{o} \), and coming up with the best, or funniest, guesses they could make in relation to the target word. Yoonho and Da-in made a number of creative attempts by offering English words (e.g., diamond, tire) or Korean words (e.g., 달력 \( tal.ry\ddot{o}k \), 다같이 \( ta.ga.chi \)) that have similar vowel and consonant combination to 다의어 \( ta.i.\ddot{o} \). The word “tire” was not only presented in English, but also in Korean (바퀴 \( pak\'wi \)) and through motion. In addition, Yoonho came up with 토의 \( t'o.i \), a Korean word that resembled 다의어 \( ta.i.\ddot{o} \) not only in terms of pronunciation but also in terms of spelling. Da-in also suggested a similarly pronounced Korean phrase, 다음에 \( ta.\ddot{u}.me \), but only presented its English translation, “to be continued.” Although Ye-un and Joon did not provide any specific words, they were also drawing on their repertoires by closely listening to the other two students’ contributions, echoing them, and laughing with them.

One of the striking features of this discussion is the level of excitement and participation exhibited by the students. Mr. Hyun only initiates the interaction by asking what 다의어 \( ta.i.\ddot{o} \) is in the beginning (Line 1, 7, 9), but from Line 2 through Line 16, it is largely the students who dominate the interaction, adding one idea after another. Students did not have to raise their hands or wait to be called on by the teacher to take the floor, but they excitedly participated in the discussion, which was evidenced by the fast
pace of the discussion, the echoing of others’ utterances, the loud voice volume, and the varied pitch of their utterances.

Discussing the translanguaging practices of three Chinese British college students, Wei (2011) found that the students were merely having “fun” by engaging in bilingual jokes and puns, which in turn motivated them to continually pursue language study. Similarly, these four students in Mr. Hyun’s class were having fun throughout this conversation as evidenced by their active participation, and their language play demonstrated the richness of their repertoires. Furthermore, with each contribution, students were not only drawing on their existing repertoires but also co-constructing new linguistic practices by making connections across different words in ways an average Korean speaker would not have conceived.

Considering the influence of teachers’ pedagogic and linguistic choices on the classroom language ecology, this snapshot of Mr. Hyun’s classroom makes us wonder what exactly Mr. Hyun was doing in the classroom that encouraged learners to engage in such creative language play. In terms of classroom instruction, Mr. Hyun was predominantly using Korean, even more so than Ms. Cha did in her classroom. Mr. Hyun’s teaching style resembled the “traditional teaching of Chinese” discussed in Li Wei’s studies in Chinese complementary schools in Britain (Wei & Wu, 2009; Wei, 2011). Certainly, not imposing a strict monolingual policy itself seems to have created safe space for learners to express their voice beyond the restrictions of legitimized language codes. However, Mr. Hyun was not only passively letting students translanguage in the classroom, but using his own strategies to foster translanguaging in the classroom, as I will discuss the following two sections.
6.4.2. Co-Constructing Learning Opportunities Through Translanguaging

A close reading of Mr. Hyun’s classroom discourse revealed that although Mr. Hyun appeared at first to rely on monolingual instruction in Korean, he was actually actively engaged in translanguaging practices. With their mutual engagement in translanguaging practices, both Mr. Hyun and the students were co-constructing learning opportunities in the classroom. In the following excerpt, after reading part of a novel titled ‘아들과 함께 걷는 길’ [The road father walks with his son] from the textbook, Mr. Hyun asks students to discuss the meanings of a polysemous word, 보다 po.da [see] as he cites the sentences where the word is used in the novel.

Excerpt 7. Discussing examples of ta.i.ŏ

1 T: 74 페이지 75 페이지에 보던은 "자주 못 보아도 서로 마음속에 있고." "옛말에 보던 친구는 위로 보고, 혼인은 아래로 보고," 이렇게 나와 있는데.
2 Da-in: 혼인은 결혼하는 거지요?
3 T: 응, 근데 지금 혼인 얘기가 아니지 지금. "보고"라는 게 나왔는데 "보다"라는 뜻은
4 Da-in: 보고, 눈으로 보고.
5 T: 눈으로 사물을 보는 것을 보통 "보다"고 하는데
6 Joon: 생각으로 보는 거
7 T: 첫번째 나와있는 "자주 못 본다"는 건, 그 "보다"는 의미도 있지만 만난다는 의미가 있어요. 그리고 두번째에서 "옛말에 보던"은 어때?
8 Da-in: 옛날말에 보던.

1 T: If you look at pages 74 and 75, it says, “Even if you don’t see each other that often, you are in each other’s mind” and “If you see yen.mal [old sayings], you should see higher for friends and see below for ho.nin [matrimony].”
2 Da-in: ho.nin is getting married right?
3 T: Yes, but now ho.nin is not the point. Here it says, “see.” The meaning of “see” is=
4 Da-in: =see, see with your eyes.
5 T: Seeing objects with your eyes is usually "see," but=
6 Joon: Seeing through your mind.
7 T: =the first one in “can’t see each other that often” has that meaning of “see,” but it also means to meet. And how about the second one in “if you see yen.mal [old sayings]”?
8 Da-in: If you see yen.nal.mal [sayings from the old days].
Like in Excerpt 6, students are actively participating in the discussion from the beginning. Mr. Hyun first reads the phrases from the textbook where the verb “see” is used (Line 1) and tries to explain the meaning of “see” used in the first example (Line 5, 7). However, before he poses any question, Da-in and Joon already intervene by offering the meanings of see as “see with your eyes” (Line 4) and “see through your mind” (Line 6). Also, Da-in inquires of the meaning of the noun, 혼인 ho.nin [matrimony] by asking if it means getting married (Line 2). When Mr. Hyun finally poses questions about the different meanings of “see” (Lines 7, 9), Da-in responds by translanguaging (e.g., Line 12).

What is subtler in this exchange, however, is that Mr. Hyun is also translanguaging with Da-in. The interaction in Lines 9-14 demonstrates how both Mr. Hyun and Da-in are engaged in translanguaging practices and how translanguaging practices lead to the co-construction of learning opportunities. To Mr. Hyun’s question
on the meaning of a Korean phrase “see higher” (Line 9, 11), Da-in translanguages by raising her eye brows, as well as offering an English phrase, “high standards” (Line 12). By acknowledging Da-in’s contribution (“Like you said” in Line 13), Mr. Hyun demonstrates his receptive knowledge of the gestural language and the phrase “high standards.” Then, building upon Da-in’s contribution, Mr. Hyun translates “standards” into *ki.jun* (“I have certain *ki.jun*” in Line 13). Mr. Hyun’s contribution is taken up by Da-in, as she uses the word *ki.jun* in the following turn (“with *no.p’ŭn ki.jun*” in Line 14); and as she uses the word, she adds another contribution by translating the word “high” into *no.p’ŭn*.

Here, in contrast to Ms. Cha’s classroom where students had to explicitly ask for Ms. Cha’s permission to translate certain words or sentences, translation happens organically as a way of building upon each other’s contributions to the discussion. Both Mr. Hyun and Da-in interpret each other’s contributions and turn them into different linguistic forms as they interact. While on the surface Mr. Hyun seems to resort to monolingual instruction in Korean, he is constantly traversing between various repertoires through these translation practices. Canagarajah (2011) writes that “translanguaging not only involves a person drawing from all the languages in his/her repertoire to communicate, it also involves shuttling between the languages brought by the other to co-construct meaning” (pp. 4-5). With each turn, Mr. Hyun and Da-in are building upon each other’s contributions by shuttling between languages, between verbal and non-verbal repertoires, as well as between receptive and productive knowledge of different repertoires. By doing so, Da-in and Mr. Hyun are collaboratively constructing a learning opportunity and making sense of the target phrase at hand.
6.4.3. Translanguaging Pedagogy as Interactional Positioning

Another pattern identified in Mr. Hyun’s classroom was that Mr. Hyun would often admit his own shortcomings and ask questions to students, respecting repertoires that he might not necessarily share with them. In the following excerpt, after going over the lesson unit on polysemy, Mr. Hyun asks students to imagine what they will become in 30 years and make a business card for themselves. In the excerpt, he is explaining the items to be included in the business card, which leads to the discussion of the word, 좌우명 chwa.u.myŏng [motto].

Excerpt 9. “My pronunciation is not so good.”

1 T: 자, 그래서 내가 무슨 직업을 가지고 있을지 써보고, 좌우명이라는 거는
2 Ye-un: 그게 뭐예요?
3 Da-in: 졸업했나 안 했나.
4 T: 자, 좌우명이라는 걸 잘 들어보세요. 좌우명이라는 거는 늘 내가 자기 옆에 딴 두고, “아, 나는 어떻게 살 거야, 어떤 식으로 행동할 거야”라는 걸 다짐하는 motto 라든가, proverb 라든가 이런 거를 우리가 좌우명이라고 해요. 그런 한번 잘 생각하면서 한번 써보세요.
5 Da-in: 뭐요?
6 T: 그래서 선생님이 지금 프린트를 하나 하고 올 건데, 각자 한번 직업이나 뭘가 가지고 있다고 하면은 명함을 한번 만들어 볼 거야.
7 Ye-un: 좌우명이..
8 Da-in: Wait, 좌우명이 뭐라고요?
9 T: Motto

1 T: So, now write down what kind of job you will have. chwa.u.myŏng is-
2 Ye-un: What is that?
3 Da-in: Whether you graduated or not.
4 T: Okay, listen carefully. Chwa.u.myŏng is something you carry with you by your side. The motto or proverb that you decide like , “Oh, I will live like this, and behave like this.” We call this chwa.u.myŏng. Reflect on it, and try writing one.
5 Da-in: What?
6 T: So, I’ll go print something out. Meanwhile, everyone will make a business card, assuming you’ll have a job or something by then.
7 Ye-un: Chwa.u.myŏng is. . .
8 Da-in: Wait, what is chwa.u.myŏng?
9 T: Motto ((pronounces with aspirated t))
First of all, what can be observed in this excerpt is that Mr. Hyun makes an attempt to use English words to help students’ understanding, which in fact happens occasionally during his instruction. In Excerpt 9, to explain 좌우명 chwa.u.myŏng, Mr. Hyun uses English words, “motto” and “proverb” (Line 4) in his lengthy explanation of the word in Korean. However, despite Mr. Hyun’s attempt, both Da-in and Ye-un do not understand Mr. Hyun’s explanation and ask for clarification (Lines 5, 7, 8). Mr. Hyun chooses to use just one English word, “motto” (Line 9) to remedy this communicative breakdown. However, this creates further confusion as Mr. Hyun pronounces “motto” with an aspirated t with the stress on the second syllable. There is silence for two seconds before Da-in finally responds, “Ah, your life motto” with a flap t sound, stressing the first syllable of motto (Line 10). Yoonho again plays with the word mimicking Mr. Hyun’s pronunciation and offering a similarly pronounced brand name, “Motorola” (Line 11), and Joon also chimes in by offering a similarly pronounced Korean phrase with an aspirated t, 못해 mo.t'ae [can't do it] (Line 13). Instead of being offended by the students’ language play, Mr. Hyun makes a nonchalant smile and acknowledges that his pronunciation is not so good (Line 12). While Mr. Hyun’s comment can be interpreted as
a self-deprecating act stemming from a deep-seated monolingual ideology, his
acknowledgement turns out to be his way of valuing students’ repertoires and connecting
to their learning experiences.

The following excerpt is another instance where Mr. Hyun talks about his limited
English skills, based on which he sympathizes with students’ struggle in learning Korean.

Excerpt 10. “Just like you struggle. . .”

1 T: 이렇게 파악하는 게 쉽지는 않아. 선생님도 특히 너희들이 한국 책 보면서 힘든 것처럼 선생님도 영어책을 보고 나면은 한참 읽다 보면 내가 뭐 읽었는지 잘 몰라요.

2 ((Ss laugh))

3 T: 근데, 그렇게 되면 안되겠지? 우리가 읽으면서 중요한 거는 이 내용이 뭔지 알아야 되고, 여기서 될 얘기하려는지도 알아야 돼요.

4 Yoonho: 아, 네.

1 T: It’s very hard to get the gist. Just like you struggle when you read Korean books, I often read English books, keep on reading for a while, and then I don’t really understand what I just read.

2 ((Ss laugh))

3 T: But we should prevent that, right? What matters is you should know what the essay is about and what it’s trying to convey.

4 Yoonho: Oh, okay.

Here, after a brief discussion of ta.ŏ (Excerpt 1), students are asked to read part
of the novel, “아들과 함께 걷는 길” [The road father walks with his son] and summarize
it. When students struggle, Mr. Hyun brings up his own experience of reading English
books. By sharing his own experience as a language learner, a situation that may have
easily frustrated the students turns into one that students can laugh about. At the same
time, with lightened heart, students also get to understand the purpose of reading an essay
(Line 3), instead of just considering it as a boring classroom exercise.

In both Excerpts 9 and 10, Mr. Hyun explicitly acknowledges his own struggles
with using English. However, Mr. Hyun’s acknowledgement does not necessarily become
signs of incompetence or insecurity as a language teacher. Rather, his admission
ironically brings out laughter and humor in the classroom, and more importantly, it helps him to sympathize with the students’ learning experiences. Mr. Hyun’s strategy also seems to be partly influenced by a pragmatic pattern observed among Korean speakers, as it has been reported that Korean speakers often use self-deprecating language to build solidarity and achieve egalitarian relationships with their interlocutors (Kim, M.-H., 2014; Kim, M. S., 2015).

Another strategy Mr. Hyun adopts is asking questions to students by positioning them as language experts. For instance, in the following excerpt, towards the end of the lesson unit on polysemy, Mr. Hyun wraps up the unit by asking students how polysemy works in English and encouraging them to compare it to the case of Korean.

Excerpt 10. “It applies to English as well, right?”

1 T: 자, 우리가 쓰는 말이 여러가지 뜻이 있는 거는 영어도 마찬가지지?
2 Yoonho: 네.
3 T: 영어도
4 Yoonho: 아니요. 맞나?
5 T: 어떤 단어는 앞뒤 문맥에서 왜야 되는 경우도 있지 않아?
6 Yoonho: Homo, homonyms.
7 Da-in: Homophones.
8 Yoonho: Homophone.
9 T: 그것처럼 우리가 배우고 있는 국어도, 한국어도 마찬가지라는 거를 기억을 해주시고요.

1 T: Okay, the word we use can have many meanings. It applies to English as well, right?
2 Yoonho: Yes.
3 T: In English=
4 Yoonho: No. Right?
5 T: Don’t some words need to be interpreted depending on the context?
6 Yoonho: Homo, homonyms.
7 Da-in: Homophones.
8 Yoonho: Homophone.
9 T: Like that, please remember this also happens in Korean, the language we are learning right now.

By posing the question about English in Line 1 (“It applies to English as well, right?”), Mr. Hyun shows respect toward student’s existing repertoires. Yoonho firmly says “Yes” in Line 2, and then changes his answer in Line 4 (“No. Right?”). Then, when Mr.
Hyun asks an elaborated question in Line 5, Yoonho and Da-in respond with the English terms, “homonyms” and “homophones,” which they might have picked up in school. Mr. Hyun does not directly comment on these words, and it seems likely that he did not know what these terms meant—in two more instances when students brought up these terms in this lesson, Mr. Hyun did not make any explicit comments. Regardless, he seems to vaguely understand these terms as a positive answer to his question, and explains polysemy also happens in Korean (Line 9).

In other occasions as well, Mr. Hyun would often ask students questions, such as how to say certain Korean words in English (e.g., “how do you say 채상 다리 ch'aek.sang da.ri [table leg] in English?”). These questions position students as language experts while putting Mr. Hyun in the shoes of a language learner. Such interactional positioning creates a co-learning space where it is not only the students who are learning, but also the teacher learns from his/her students. In this space, translanguage becomes an essential part of the classroom ecology.

6.4.4. Mr. Hyun’s Implementation of Translanguaging Pedagogy

Creative language play in Mr. Hyun’s classroom was made possible not just by the efforts of students alone. Mr. Hyun was implementing translanguage pedagogy to foster safe space where students can freely experiment with their repertoires and create new linguistic practices. One important aspect of translanguage pedagogy Mr. Hyun implemented was in not imposing a strict language policy for classroom discussion. Most classroom discussions were focused on meaning, and by focusing on meaning (e.g., guessing the meaning of 다의어 ta.i.ŏ, discussing the possible meanings of “see higher”), without fear of being sanctioned, students freely drew upon the repertoires available to
them and came up with various word combinations they may not have thought of, had it not been for the translinguaging space allowed in the classroom. In this process, students were clearly learning from one another and building a deeper understanding of the target expressions and vocabulary.

Mr. Hyun was also implementing translinguaging pedagogy by actively translinguaging through translation practices that happened organically as he was interacting with the students. Certainly, Mr. Hyun was not as comfortable with verbal translinguaging practices as the students were, and his classroom instruction was predominantly in Korean. Despite such repertoire differences, Mr. Hyun utilized his receptive repertoires to understand students’ verbal translinguaging and demonstrated his understanding by responding to the students’ contributions in his own ways. Through his facilitation and negotiation of repertoire differences, students were learning to express their ideas through a wider range of repertoires. For instance, discussing the meaning of the phrase “see higher” with Mr. Hyun, Da-in started from coming up with an English phrase “high standards” and a gesture of raising eye brows and got to the point of making up a Korean phrase, “높은 기준 no.p‘ûn ki.jun.”

On an affective level, Mr. Hyun’s translinguaging pedagogy involved his interactional positioning and alignment with the students’ experiences as both language experts and language learners. He used various strategies to align himself with the students, such as by asking students questions about English and sharing his own language learning experiences. These practices did not undermine his authority as a language teacher, but rather constructed a classroom community with shared learning
experiences, through which Mr. Hyun was adding more English to his repertoires while the students were adding more Korean.

6.5. Conclusion: Overcoming Fears and Creating a Co-learning Community

In this chapter, by discussing linguistic practices in two classrooms, one led by Ms. Cha and the other by Mr. Hyun, I stressed how implementing one-language policy in the classroom may restrict students’ opportunities for learning in a way, and how a teacher can implement translinguaging pedagogy by actively negotiating his/her repertoire differences with the students. I would like to conclude this chapter by considering the perspectives offered by the teachers regarding their linguistic and pedagogic choices in the classroom and presenting implications for language practitioners working with bilingual youth.

One important note to make is that Ms. Cha was a well-meaning teacher, who carefully considered the needs of her students and tried to maximize students’ learning in Korean, as seen from the pedagogic attempts she made throughout the classroom interaction discussed in this chapter (e.g., translation exercises, setting a model for students by participating in the game). In fact, when I asked Ms. Cha about her language policy in the classroom that day, she explained that it was necessary to have students practice speaking in Korean at least in the classroom, because most of her students preferred speaking in English and also because they knew that she could fully understand and speak with them in English (personal communication). What emerged during this personal communication was Ms. Cha’s fear of resorting too much to English and not teaching Korean enough, because of students’ comfort with English and her own
bilingual abilities and tendency to accommodate to their preferences. This was a kind of fear different from that of 1st generation immigrant teachers discussed in the beginning of this chapter— insecurities about their own bilingual abilities and using English to risk their teacher authority.

More fundamentally, for both groups of teachers, insistence on monolingual policies may be also part of their efforts to secure exclusive space for HL and resist a strong push toward English monolingualism in the broader society. These monolingual policies are based on an assumption of separate bilingualism or “two monolinguals in one person” (Grosjean, 1989), the belief that bilingual youth should learn one language at a time. This belief is more explicitly stated by Ms. Shin during her interview:


Using English in classroom—I mostly don’t allow that. They shouldn’t use it. I oppose that. First of all, I can’t understand it well. Even if I can, I feel like they should use Korean, because it might become a habit—half English, half Korean. Using English words in Korean sentences, like “Did you ssi.sŏ ŏl.gul [wash face]?” Then, it gets really confusing and funny, and it’s neither English nor Korean. (Interview with Ms. Shin)

Ms. Shin was worried that students may end up getting “a habit” of speaking “half English, half Korean” or a “confusing” variety that is “neither English nor Korean.” For Ms. Shin, Korean and English were conceived as separate languages, and she believed that the presence of English would only hinder students’ learning of Korean. These views about language learning are probably not Ms. Shin’s own. The ideology of separate bilingualism permeates monolingual policies implemented in a range of language
instructional programs, including HL programs, ESL school programs, and two-way bilingual programs.

However, as demonstrated by the analysis of the two teachers’ classrooms, bilingual youth do not learn one language at a time, and forcing them to do so only results in the restriction of more learning opportunities and their individual voices and identities. Efforts to maintain the minoritized languages should be certainly valued as an active stance of “not taking language inequality for granted” (Hornberger, 2014). However, by applying the same monolingual standards imposed by the broader society, monolingual policies may ironically restrict the bilingual development of immigrant youth and reinforce the existing linguistic inequality.

Mr. Hyun’s classroom suggests that students can actively engage in learning while fully expressing themselves, when their translanguaging practices are supported and embraced by the teacher. When I asked Mr. Hyun why he often shares his experiences of learning English with his students, he said:

정 개인적으로 언어가 잘 안돼요. . . ((Talks about his difficulty learning English and Hebrew)) 저도 아이들에게 가르치면서 그 애기를 해요. “선생님도 영어 너무 힘들어하고 영어 때문에 되게 스트레스 받는 사람이야, 너희들이 한국말 배우면서 숙제 내주고 뭐를 해오라고 하면은 스트레스 받는 거를 안한다. 근데 우리가 같이 이걸 이겨가야지. 물론 선생님이 안해온다고 혼나다고 해서 그렇게 하게 되면, 그렇게 너희한테 별로 도움이 안되고. 그냥 하는 데에 의해 아무리 하면서 너희들이 좀 더 생각을 하고 해야 되고, 선생님이 마찬가지로 영어를 하면서 글을 쓰면서 좀 더 생각하고 좀 더 맞춰가야지 그런거 없는지는 안된다”라고 얘기해주죠.

Personally I am not good at languages. . . ((Talks about his difficulty learning English and Hebrew)) I do tell kids when I am teaching, “I really struggle with English and get stressed because of English. So I know that you’ll be stressed if I ask you to do homework in Korean. But we need to get through this together. Of course, if you end up doing the assignment because you’re afraid of consequences, that would not really help you. Instead of doing it because you have to, you should engage in more reflection as you do the assignment. I also should think more when I’m studying English. Without these efforts, it won’t work out.” (Interview with Mr. Hyun)
Mr. Hyun’s teaching philosophy of “우리가 같이 이걸 이겨나가야지” [we need to get through this together”] seems to underlie all the pedagogic choices he made in the classroom. Because of the teacher’s understanding and respect toward students’ existing repertoires and their learning experiences, Mr. Hyun’s classroom became a safe co-learning community where it was not only the students who were learning, but both the teacher and students who took risks expressing themselves by experimenting with their repertoires and building upon one another’s knowledge.

By reporting the case of a teacher making an effort to make herself understood to students with the use of a few Spanish words that she knew, Flores and García (2013) write that “it is one thing for a monolingual teacher to encourage students to take risks, and quite another for a teacher to model what taking these risks might look like” (p. 253). Instead of imposing Korean-only policy that he might have been more comfortable with, Mr. Hyun took risks by allowing space for translanguaging, engaging in translanguaging practices drawing to the best of his ability on his and his students’ repertoires, and sharing his own struggles and learning experiences with the students. Through this modelling of risk taking, students also learned to task risks in their linguistic practices, which creates a co-learning community, where “multiple agents simultaneously try to adapt to one another’s behavior so as to produce desirable outcomes that would be shared by the contributing agents” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 112).

Thus, Mr. Hyun’s case demonstrates that adopting translanguaging pedagogy may not be such an overwhelming task that requires teachers to model the perfect example of dynamic bilingualism as an authoritative figure. In fact, such expectations only create another idealized finish line that every bilingual speaker should reach, thus making some
individuals successful and others relative failures. Rather, as Blommaert and Backus (2011) argue, every individual is constantly building repertoires throughout a lifetime, and such learning occurs as “a process of growth, of sequential learning of certain registers, styles, genres and linguistic varieties while shedding or altering previously existing ones” (p. 9). From this perspective, every individual is constantly in the process of learning, and there is no end point to this process (Hornberger, 1989, 2016; Larsen-Freeman, 2006, 2017). Thus, for the teacher to implement translanguaging pedagogy, the point is not so much about modelling a perfect bilingual speaker, but more about fostering a mindset that every individual, including the teacher and students, should learn from one another by negotiating similarities and differences in their repertoires through translanguaging practices.
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

This research set out to portray the practices and aspirations of local actors involved in community-based Korean heritage language education, and explore what it means for them to pursue teaching and learning their heritage language through a community-based language school, and ultimately, what it means for them to speak and be Korean living in the U.S. The following research questions were posed to guide this inquiry:

1. What linguistic practices do teachers and students display, promote, or negotiate in a community-based language school?

2. How do their practices construct their own definitions of “speaking and being Korean”?

Each of the three data chapters showed different aspects of the local actors’ linguistic practices in the school, ranging from students’ metacommentaries on the named languages (Chapter 4) to literacy-focused classroom activities (Chapter 5) and Korean-only policy, or lack of such policy, in Korean language classrooms (Chapter 6). These practices revealed each participant’s imagination of the ideal Korean speaker, and their imaginations often converged, yet at other times diverged from one another. In this chapter, I will discuss two major themes that emerged from this research and their contributions to existing literature. Then, I will provide this study’s implications for educational practice. Lastly, I will conclude the chapter with my final reflections.

7.1. Emerging Themes and Contribution to Literature

This dissertation is inspired by the scholarship of various scholars working from different disciplines. In particular, this study contributes to the scholarship that has
problematized the notion of languages as pure, discrete entities and suggested alternative concepts in linguistic research (Bakhtin, 1981; Bailey, 2007; Blommaert, 2009; Canagarajah, 2006, 2009; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; Jørgensen, 2008; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010; Pratt et al., 2010; Young, 2004). I adopted the notion of *communicative repertoire*, a term attending to individuals’ communicative practices beyond the boundaries of language or verbal repertoire, constantly in “a process of growth, of sequential learning of certain registers, styles, genres and linguistic varieties while shedding or altering previously existing ones” as individuals traverse different arenas of their lives (Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p. 9). At the same time, I adopted the notion of *imagined speech community*, gaining insights from Gumperz (1964) and Anderson (1991), to get at the level of ideological group formation through these practices. I argued that a sense of belonging or relatedness to a speech community is created through the practices of communicative repertoires, and these practices in turn reflect one’s sense of belonging.

The convergence of these two notions lent me an analytical tool to identify the processes of ideology formation and reification by examining one’s linguistic practices on the ground. First of all, this research revealed a deep-seated monoglossic ideology embedded in the linguistic practices of local actors. In Chapter 4, students’ metacommentaries on Konglish showed that although students recognized the linguistic features of Konglish and were able to explicitly define what Konglish is, they did not perceive it as a whole repertoire, but rather as a partial, or mixed, language, that needed to be perfected for them to become fluent Korean speakers. This ideology was also held by teachers at SKS. For instance, Ms. Cha’s Korean-only policy (Chapter 6), although intended as an instructional strategy to maximize students’ exposure to and use of Korean,
presupposed that it is possible for one to speak in ‘one language,’ which contradicted the actual linguistic practices of local actors, including the teachers who were considered fluent Korean speakers. With these acts of language planning, Sarang Korean School was conceived as a monolingual space where the Korean language was officially recognized and privileged over English (Chapter 5).

This study also showed the presence of translanguaging practices in the school, despite the widely circulating monoglossic ideology among local actors. Students and teachers were inadvertently translanguaging as they interacted with one another, even in the official space of the classroom. For instance, despite his interactional distancing from Konglish speakers (Chapter 4), Yoon-ho was one of the students who made many creative contributions to classroom discussions, drawing from his repertoires beyond the reified boundaries of languages (Chapter 6). In Ms. Cha’s classroom, while playing the no-English game, despite their efforts to speak in Korean only, Ms. Cha and students occasionally lapsed into English and did not always notice the use of English words. As Bourdieu (1991) explains, “the recognition of legitimate language is more widely accepted than it is possessed” (as cited in Heinrich, 2012, p. 18); despite the legitimacy and privilege accorded to ‘the Korean language,’ it was hardly used in its pure form in the local space.

It is worth noting that students were also reiterating monoglossic ideology held by adults in the SKS—an ideology not only circulating in the local context, but also entrenched in every sector of our society that ends up stigmatizing the linguistic practices of bilingual speakers. In this study, I also intend to argue that what ends up making these youth accepting and claiming the monoglossic conceptualization of bilingualism is just not
their own decisions or those of their parents or teachers, but is also related to the expectations they face as an ethnic minority in the U.S. As seen from a parent’s interview quoted in the beginning of this dissertation, many parents argued that because they “look different,” they would never be accepted as “the same.” Many parents also talked about the job market in the U.S., arguing that with the same qualifications, companies would hire “Americans” rather than Koreans. They believed that their children would need to speak two languages fluently to build more competitiveness on the job market, and that it is often expected of them. In this respect, although not incorporated in this study, re-examining the metacommentaries of local actors through the lens of raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) might be a useful exercise for future research to unpack the added pressure these linguistically and ethnically minoritized youth experience as they pursue learning their heritage language.

This research also contributes to the body of literature on community-based heritage language schools. Many studies have portrayed the voices and practices of immigrant youth in these schools as those of ambivalence or resistance against the imposed monolingual norms or ‘traditional’ teaching (Lo, 2009; Pak, 2003; Wei & Wu, 2009; You, 2005). In this vein, in this study, I tried to portray various emotions that students exhibited during classroom interactions and examine what lies behind those emotions. On the one hand, there were signs of shame or frustration when students encountered barriers in expressing themselves in Korean as perfectly as they wished. In Chapter 5, Yoon-ho was embarrassed when his mistake in writing was brought up by Da-in in Ms. Shin’s classroom. S4 was silenced and thus frustrated when she was asked to speak only in Korean in Ms. Cha’s classroom (Chapter 6). As I discussed above and
elsewhere in this dissertation, there may be an added pressure Korean immigrant youth may feel because of what is expected of them as ethnic Koreans in the U.S. society, a pressure they were not free of this pressure in Korean language classrooms either. Students’ imagination of a perfect bilingual speaker often motivated them to learn Korean, as Yoon-ho asked for Ms. Shin’s help with his writing despite Da-in’s teasing (Chapter 5) or as he said during his interview, “When I speak Konglish, I feel like I need to learn my language more” (Chapter 4). However, at the same it frustrated them whenever they felt that they were lacking in what is expected of them.

On the other hand, I also tried to capture the moments when students were excited and having fun in the classroom. In Ms. Shin’s classroom, students were amused engaging in carnivalesque language play when they were exaggeratedly reading the lines of characters in short stories (Chapter 5). In Ms. Cha’s classroom, during the no-English game, most students were having fun pointing out each other’s lapse of English words. Students also seemed excited when they were guessing the meaning of Korean words by coming up with similarly pronounced English words in Mr. Hyun’s classroom (Chapter 6). These were the moments when students were able to freely draw from their repertoires to make meaningful contributions to classroom activities, and it was made possible when the teachers allowed students to play with their language in the classroom.

In existing literature, much focus has been on the tensions and struggles local actors experience in community-based heritage language programs, which was indeed a big part of the continuing effort to maintain their ethnic and linguistic heritage as seen in this study. However, as I stated in the introduction of this dissertation, I argue that these community-based heritage language schools are a site of struggle but also a site of promise
for immigrant youth. While this study showed many struggles immigrant youth face as they navigate learning their heritage language, I also tried to capture their excitement, laughter, and creativity shining through various moments in the classroom, which was made possible by an older generation who continually strived to secure a safe place where their children can negotiate their varying repertoires and identities.

7.2. Implications for Educational Practice

As discussed in the previous section, one of the major findings of this research is on widely circulating monoglossic ideology in the school, and Chapter 6 in particular called for implementing translanguaging pedagogy in community-based heritage language programs. Admittedly, ‘disinventing the notion of language’ or ‘implementing translanguaging pedagogy’ might sound like a grandiose or unrealistic task for local practitioners. Indeed, implementing translanguaging pedagogy in mainstream school settings versus in community-based heritage language programs holds different significance. Heritage language programs are often established for the purpose of maintaining marginalized immigrant languages, and it might seem more eminent to expose students to as much heritage language as possible at least in local communities. While I align with such claims, what I further suggest in this study is that heritage repertoires need to be promoted in a way that embraces students’ existing ways of speaking and learning, rather than by imposing the same monolingual ideologies that have subjugated immigrant youth in mainstream schools. In this respect, this research suggests that the implementation of translanguaging pedagogy in community-based heritage language programs may not need teachers modelling fluent verbal translanguaging; rather, as Mr. Hyun’s case demonstrates, it is the teacher’s understanding and respect toward students’ existing
repertoires and their learning experiences that encourage active learning and negotiation by both the teacher and students in the classroom. By doing so, students can unload the burden of speaking perfectly in Korean, but instead actively engage in learning with the scaffolds of their existing repertoires.

However, it should be also noted that it is still challenging for individual teachers to make changes on their own, as they are situated in the ecology of the local school and communities, and more broadly the U.S. society that constantly reiterates the image of the ideal bilingual speaker. The inherent difficulty lies in the grim fact that community-based heritage language programs may continue to be positioned as marginalized educational spaces in the U.S. context. Nonetheless, in this study I strived to foreground the varied yet converging imaginations of its local actors in constantly pursuing and embracing their ethnic and linguistic heritage, while calling for denaturalizing the dominant ideology of separate bilingualism. As an educational researcher, I believe that academic discourse has power to “raise the level of linguistic awareness of the community as well as its level of confidence in the possibility of a linguistic reversal” (Ryon, 2005, p. 60), and more studies should be conducted to foreground the significance of these community efforts in the lives of immigrant youth and question the monolingual norms and practices taken for granted in many educational contexts, which may ultimately lead to institutional changes for initiating collaboration between community-based language programs and mainstream schools.
7.3. Final Reflections: What does it mean to be Korean?

I consider it [Korean identity] as a positive perspective on oneself. “You belong here, or you belong there. Make a choice.” I don’t think it’s an identity that demands loyalty. My appearance, the family I grew up with, ways of life my parents taught me, the people I am close with, the people I meet in church, the food I eat—I feel positive about all these things, and I’m proud of all these things. I don’t feel ashamed about enjoying these things. So, with my own ways of life, I am not trying take something from others or compete with them, but I am sharing things with them and serve them, and contribute to the society. How can you live for others, if you don’t see yourself as positive and lovable? “Yeah, I’m Korean. I’m Asian. I’ve got a great background.”

This is one definition of “being Korean in America” offered by Mr. Park, the principal of SKS. While the meaning of “speaking and being Korean” for each participant was too complex and nuanced to summarize just in a few sentences, it certainly meant a crucial part of their lives in America, and it motivated them to continually make efforts to maintain their ethnic and linguistic heritage. Although this research showed just a few snapshots of their local practices, I hope that this study will contribute to bringing forth the often marginalized voices of immigrant communities in the U.S. and making changes in our educational practices.
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