

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Children and Teachers in Two-Way Immersion Programs

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5mb9k4pd>

Author

Sun, Hala

Publication Date

2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Children and Teachers
in Two-Way Immersion Programs

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Education

by

Hala Sun

Committee in charge:

Professor Jin Sook Lee, Chair

Professor Mary Bucholtz

Professor Richard Duran

September 2022

The dissertation of Hala Sun is approved.

Professor Mary Bucholtz

Professor Richard Duran

Professor Jin Sook Lee, Chair

June 2022

Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Children and Teachers

in Two-Way Immersion Programs

Copyright © 2022

by

Hala Sun

iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, 하나님 감사합니다. Soli deo gloria.

그 다음으로 내가 사랑하는 남편에게, 이 논문은 당신이 아니었으면 못 끝냈을지도 몰라. 늘 응원해주고, 함께해주고, 사랑해줘서 고마워.

To my dissertation committee members: Dr. Jin Sook Lee, 존경하는 교수님, 늘 저를 믿어주시고, 시간을 내주시고, support 해주시고, 기다려 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다. You have always pushed me to excel and helped me see the world more critically. 정말 교수님과 함께했던 시간들이 너무 소중한데, 늘 감사하며, 앞으로의 더 함께할 시간들이 더 설렙니다.

To Mary, you have been my inspiration to do the work in hybridity. Thank you for always passionately supporting me and being an advocate against all the social injustices in this world.

To Dr. Duran, your mentorship and your work in equity and social justice have influenced my work and perspectives in life. I will always remember your advice about being like a shark and staying deep in the ocean water.

To my dearest friend, Tiange, who met with me weekly via Zoom. 谢谢你一直在我身边. You have encouraged me all through the ups and downs, and I feel so blessed to have you in my life. To all my church and college best friends (you know who you are!), thank you for loving me for who I am. And to Ye for helping me organize a lot of things!

To my family, 엄마 아빠, 늘 그립고 죄송하고 감사드립니다. Tec and Taylor, I can't wait to spend time with you both!

To all UCSB and MIIS professors that have influenced my Ph.D. journey: Jeff Hanson, who have always rooted for me in the Writing Studies program, Dr. Peter DeCosta and Dr. Kathi Bailey, who both motivated me to pursue this journey in the first place. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Last, but not the least, to me. 하라야, 정말 수고했다.

Hala Sun

EDUCATION

PhD	Education (Dual Emphases: Applied Linguistics and Writing Studies)	2022
	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA</i>	
MA	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	2013
	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey</i>	
MPA	Public Administration (Specialization: International Management)	2010
	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey</i>	
BA	Political Studies and Spanish	2008
	<i>Dordt University, Sioux Center, IA</i>	

TEACHING

Instructor - Writing Studies		01/2015 – 08/2020
Writing 2, “Academic Writing.”		<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Instructor - Education/Linguistics		03/2015 – 06/2015
Education 187, “Language, Power, & Culture.”		<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Instructor - Feminist Studies		03/2014 – 12/2014
Feminist 40, “Women, Representation, and Cultural Production”	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>	
Feminist 20, “Women, Society, and Culture.”		
Instructor - ESL & Education		01/2021 – 06/2022
ESL Level 1, 2, & 3: Reading, Speaking, Listening, & Writing		<i>International Reformed University</i>
Instructor - ESL & Education		01/2017 – 12/2017
Introduction to Education		<i>International Reformed University</i>
Research Methods		
Instructor - ESL (Intensive English Program)		01/2013 – 03/2013
U.S. Culture	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies</i>	
Current Events		
Instructor - Korean (Custom Language Services)		03/2013 – 04/2013
Advanced Korean (OPI Assessment)	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies</i>	
Instructor - Korean (BUILD Program)		01/2012 – 12/2012
Language & Culture	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies</i>	

RESEARCH

Lead Research Analyst / Program Evaluator Institutional Effectiveness (IE), STEM & Student Success Programs	07/2014 – 01/2019 <i>Oxnard College</i>
Consultant Public Sector Governance / Poverty Reduction & Economic Management	01/2010 – 08/2010 <i>The World Bank</i>
Curriculum & Assessment Content Analyst English Language Arts / English Language Development	03/2013 – 04/2015 <i>CTB/McGraw-Hill Education</i>
Researcher South Coast Writing Project, Teacher Education	11/2021 – 06/2022 <i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Assessment Specialist Critical Language (Korean)	10/2015 – 06/2016 <i>American Councils for International Education</i>
Market Research Consultant User Experience (UX) Research: Health, AR/VR, Online Learning Platforms	11/2019 – 05/2021 <i>Hankook Research</i>
Graduate Student Researcher Dr. Jin Sook Lee lab & Dr. Laura Romo lab	09/2013 – 06/2022 <i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Editorial Assistant Editor: Dr. Leo van Lier	09/2013 – 06/2022 <i>The Modern Language Journal</i>

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN / E-LEARNING

Director of Distance Learning & Instructional Tech Online courses & learning platform management; Faculty training	01/2017 – 06/2022 <i>International Reformed University</i>
Instructional Design Assistant Faculty & staff workshops; Platform testing	07/2020 – 11/2021 <i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>

AWARDS

ANC Merit Scholarship (2022)	<i>ANC Foundation, Los Angeles, CA</i>
Graduate Division Summer Research Grant (2021)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
President's Work Study Award (2020–2021)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Dorothy M. Chun Fellowship, Applied Linguistics (2019-2020)	<i>External Fellowship</i>
Centrally Administered Dissertation Fellowship (2018-2019)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Dissertation Fellowship, Education Department (2017-2018)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Priscilla and Susan Drum Memorial Endowed Fellowship (2017)	<i>External Fellowship</i>

GSA Excellence in Teaching Award (Nominee, 2016, 2020)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Gevirtz Graduate School of Education Block Grant (2013-2021)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Chicano Studies Institute Dissertation Fellowship (2016)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
The National Honor Scholarship (2016)	<i>The Embassy of South Korea</i>
Ford Foundation Pre-doctoral Fellowship (Honorable Mention, 2014, 2015)	<i>Ford Foundation</i>
Academic Senate Outstanding Teaching Award (Nominee, 2015)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Dean's Ambassadors Circle Fellowship (2013)	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Full Merit Scholarship for MATESOL (2012-2013)	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies</i>
Full Merit Scholarship for MPA (2008-2010)	<i>Middlebury Institute of International Studies</i>
Presidential Full Merit Scholarship (2004-2008)	<i>Dordt University</i>

PUBLICATIONS

- Lee, J. S., Lee, W., & **Sun, H.** (2020). Raciolinguistic positioning of language models in a Korean-English dual language immersion classroom. In N. Flores, N. C. Subtirelu, & A. Tseng (Eds.), *Bilingualism for all? Raciolinguistic perspectives on dual language education* (pp. 177-198). Multilingual Matters.
- Sun, H., Lee, J. S., & Yuan, Y. "Don't look down on us": Analyzing perceptions toward hybridized language practices of Korean Americans. Manuscript in revision.
- Sun, H., Lee, J. S., & Yuan, Y. Finding legitimacy: Kyopo-mal in the making. Manuscript in revision.
- Sun, H., & Lee, J. S. Emergent bilingual children's use of hybrid semiotic practices in two-way immersion programs. Manuscript in review.
- Sun, H., & Fang, V. How to test for validity and reliability when designing ESL language assessment. Manuscript in review.
- Sun, H. ESL learners' motivation through engagement in regular goal-setting and reflection activities. Manuscript in revision.
- Sun, H., & Fang, V. Needs assessment in ESL curriculum. Manuscript in writing.
- Sun, H. Pathways to success: Preparing emergent multilingual high school students with soft skills. Manuscript in writing.

PRESENTATIONS

- Sun, H., & Lee, J. S. (2016, April). Emergent Bilinguals' use of hybrid semiotic practices in two-way immersion (TWI) programs. Paper presented at AERA, Washington, D.C.
- Sun, H. (2017, April). Preparing Emergent Bilinguals to become successful: Filling the gap through practical, non-cognitive skills. Paper presented at the K-AERA conference, San Antonio, TX.
- Sun, H., & Lee, J. S. (2016, April). How Emergent Bilinguals create learning opportunities during classroom interactions. Paper presented at AAAL, Orlando, FL.

- Sun, H., & Lee, J. S. (2015, August). Equitable learning opportunities for Emergent Bilinguals. Paper presented at the 2015 KATE International Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Sun, H., & Lee, J. S. (2015, April). Creating equitable learning opportunities for English language learners. Poster presented at the business meeting of AERA, Div. E, Chicago, IL.
- Sun, H. (2013, March). Enhancing students' learning through fun communicative activities. Poster presented at the meeting of the Monterey Bay Symposium, Monterey, CA.
- Sun, H. (2012, September). ESL learners' motivation through engagement in regular goal-setting reflection activities. Poster presented at the meeting of the CATESOL, Fullerton, CA.

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP & SERVICE

- Legislative Liaison, Graduate Students Association (2018-2019) *University of California, Santa Barbara*
- Vice President - External Relations, EDU Dept (2014-2015) *University of California, Santa Barbara*
- Invited Member, Provost Search Committee (2007) *Dordt University*
- Invited Member, Cross-cultural Advisory Committee (2005 – 2008) *Dordt University*
- Class Representative, Student Government (2006 – 2007) *Dordt University*
- President, International Students Club - "Students Without Borders" (2007 – 2008) *Dordt University*

PROJECT MANAGEMENT SPECIALIZED TRAINING

Development Project Management Institute Certificate (DPMI), Monterey, CA 05/2009

Managing Development Projects

Project/program design, logical framework, results framework, problem tree, and CMAP tools

Social Entrepreneurship & Strategic Partnering

Social network analysis, core competency mapping, strategy canvas, partnership strategy matrix

Facilitating Participatory Development

Participatory assessment, stakeholder negotiation, conflict mitigation, and conducting training programs

LANGUAGE SKILLS

English, Korean, Tagalog: Native (Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening)

Spanish: Advanced (Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening)

Chinese: Intermediate (Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening)

ABSTRACT

Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Children and Teachers in Two-Way Immersion Programs

by

Hala Sun

This qualitative study examines how multilingual children and multilingual teachers in Korean-English and Spanish-English two-way immersion programs utilize their linguistic, semiotics, and cultural resources to communicate, interact, and make meaning of the world. I build on previous studies on “translanguaging” (García, 2009) and “hybrid language practice” (Gort 2015; Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Martínez 2013) to include semiotics, such as gestures, sounds, and affective expressions, as well as sociocultural values that transfer and embed into the communicative practices.

In line with understanding “what [multilinguals] actually do with language, what language does to them, and what language means to them” (Blommaert, 2010, p. 188), this study presents multiple contextual and discourse evidence of how creative and strategic multilingual speakers are, as they purposefully use all their affordances and resources (linguistic, semiotic, and cultural), to effectively communicate their ideas, to show accommodation of other interlocutors’ language/speech, and to show agency/confidence in

their own language practice(s) tied to their identity and culture. In addition, this study contributes to the expansion of the corpus of a linguistic variety, spoken by Korean Americans, who are part of the larger multilingual speaker group (Sun et al., forthcoming). Finally, this research sheds light on teacher education practices, in line with the TWI goal of “critical consciousness” to re-examine and take caution of ways that may create cultural misunderstandings and gaps, as their hybridized semiotic practices reflect ideologies, values, and norms that stem from their own complex linguistic training and cultural background.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction
- II. Literature Review - Multilinguals and their Everyday Language Practices
- III. Theoretical Framework
 - 1. Interaction, Sociocultural Theory, and Affordances
 - 2. Legitimacy of Hybrid Practices
 - 3. Frameworks to Examine Multilingual Speakers' Language Practices
- 1. Code-switching, Translanguaging, and Hybrid Language Practices (HLP)
- 2. Hybrid Semiotic Practices (HSP)
 - 1. What is Hybrid Semiotics?
 - 2. Why do Multilinguals Practice a Hybrid Language?
- 3. Attitudes toward Monolingualism and Hybrid Semiotic Practices
- IV. Multilingual Teachers' use of Hybrid Semiotic Practices
- V. Multilingual Children's use of Hybrid Semiotic Practices
- VI. References
- VII. Appendices

Chapter 1: Introduction

Currently, among the 50 million students enrolled in the K-12 public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015), nearly one out of four (12 million) children speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Among these students, there are 4.8 million are English learners (ELs), also known as “emergent bilinguals” (García, 2009a; García, 2009b; García & Kleifgen, 2010) or “multilingual” students (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; U.S. Department of Education, 2015a). Specifically, in California alone, there are currently about 2.1 million multilinguals, which constitute one-third of the total enrollment (6 million) in California public schools (California Department of Education, 2021). Interestingly, even those students who have been reclassified to be proficient in English are still referred to as “Ever-ELs”(California Department of Education, 2021). While recent research (García & Kleifgen, 2010; García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008) refer to these students as “emergent bilinguals/multilinguals” to capture learners’ capacity and potential as developing speakers of multiple dialects and languages, in my study, I refer these students as “multilinguals” to avoid seeing them as any lesser than what we perceive as a multilingual in the linguistic proficiency spectrum. The notion of ‘emergent’ could potentially create another block needing to be overcome in the education system, just as ELs are required to pass the next level in the system (e.g., assessment) to avoid being referred to as Ever-ELs. Most importantly, I do not refer to them as ELs because this term not only ignores students’ multiple, diverse, and rich language resources, but it also feeds into the deeply rooted hegemony of English as it emphasizes English as the most important, if not, the only language that matters (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Considering that multilinguals have been the fastest growing student population (Fry, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2017; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013), there is a continuous need for more research that seeks to understand these learners' diverse identities, cultures, and language abilities, as well as acknowledge their unique contribution to the larger society. For example, various studies support that children who speak a second language (L2) have the capacity to think more flexibly (Kuhl, 2011), as they can effectively use their linguistic resources and sociocultural knowledge to negotiate and understand meaning and to strategically learn and solve problems (Genessee, 2009; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990), which are deemed critical for success in college and career in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). But despite the rich linguistic resources and sociocultural knowledge these students possess, the State of California continues to identify multilinguals solely as “a child who does not speak English or whose native language is not English” and is ““limited English proficient” according to California Education Code, Article 2, Section 306-a (California Legislative Information, 2017). California Department of Education (2022) also continues to describe multilinguals as students requiring “help” as they are those “who do not speak, read, write, or understand English **well as a result of English not being their home language**” (emphasis added). Not only does this official definition emphasize the importance of English language, but this deficit definition places multilinguals who speak other languages in addition to English, regardless of their ability to speak English in ‘native’ fluency, as deficient in classroom performance.

Another concern that may hinder the valorization of diverse multilinguals' language practice is the legal designation of “English” as the only medium of instruction in many public schools in the U.S. In California, although Proposition 227 of 1998, which eliminated most “bilingual” classes in public schools, is now repealed and replaced with

the California Multilingual Education Act of 2016 (“Proposition 58”) to allow multilingual instruction in public schools, English still remains to be the “official language” of the state. That is, “standard English” continues to be the required and the only medium of instruction in most public schools in the U.S. (31 states), including California (California Department of Education, 2012). In fact, the state claims English to be the “*common* language of the people of the United States of America and the State of California” (emphasis added) and that the state shall “strengthen the English language,” as well as “take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of the State of California is preserved,” (The Constitution of California, 2021, p. 175). Even the CCSS implicitly emphasizes English as the language of “success” for college and career, and that multilinguals are to be “included” in meeting this literacy standard of English reading, writing, speaking, and listening (“National Governors Association,” 2010b). Nowhere in this research-based education standard mentions the multilingual children’s diverse linguistic and sociocultural background as a resource for academic learning, despite the standard’s underlying goal of fostering students to become “globally” competitive (“National Governors Association,” 2010a). CCSS claims that it is “beyond the[ir] scope” to define the support needed for multilinguals (“National Governors Association,” 2010b). Thus, public schools end up prioritizing one language proficiency, and aim to foster “good English,” which can be met by achieving the state’s average score in the standardized testing of English vocabulary, reading, and writing (California Department of Education, 2012). When students do not perform well in these standardized exams that assess mostly their receptive English language abilities, the schools they attend receive less support from the government, which essentially penalizes multilingual children for having multiple linguistic competencies.. As we watch the

education system continue to include and exclude multilinguals in various ways, leaving them vulnerable, achievement gaps soar higher each year.

As of 2018, California has transitioned its assessment for reclassification of the “EL” status—from CELDT (California English Language Development Test) to ELPAC (English Language Proficiency Assessments for California) (California Department of Education, 2018a). Along with the need for research in the area of assessment to ensure equity of all learners, especially immigrant multilinguals (Duran, 2020a), we also need more research to know what is happening inside the classroom. California Department of Education (2015b) reports that 65% of multilinguals are considered "below proficient" in English Language Arts/Literacy, yet there is still lack of research to understand the pushout crisis amongst multilinguals (Sugarman, 2019) and minimal improvement to reduce this crisis (Callahan, 2013; Glick & White, 2003; Ima & Nidorf, 1998; Rumberger, 2011; Walqui, 2000). In the 2017-2018 academic year in California, among 72,887 multilingual students, 32.1% (24,039) did not graduate high school. In comparison to the previous year, there was a minimal improvement (0.8%). In 2016-2017, 32.9% of multilingual students did not graduate from high school (California Department of Education, 2018b).

This is not a simple language-related policy issue, but an equity and social justice issue that impacts multilinguals’ opportunities to learn and succeed at school (Nieto, 2010). Considering the country’s immediate and long-term educational crisis, along with ever growing economic and social disparities, especially amongst immigrant, multilinguals (Duran, 2020b), we need to purposefully recognize and address these “equity and social justice concerns” (Duran, 2020b, p. 229). To do so, one of the first steps is to learn more about this population, especially the interconnectedness of their language/language practices and their identity and environment.

To learn more about multilinguals, I chose the context of a two-way immersion (TWI) program, as this educational setting not only focuses on the academic achievement (which is one of the goals of the program), but it also emphasizes enriching students' full competence as a multilingual and multicultural speaker (Christian et al., 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). This context provides a rich setting to closely examine how multilinguals interact with other speakers, as they utilize their linguistic and semiotic repertoire to make meaning and to engage in cultural practices. Unfortunately, multilinguals are frequently perceived as not learning or deficient, because they are frequently code-switching or translanguaging (García, 2009a), and use all of their resources when interacting in the classroom (e.g., linguistic and semiotic embodiment, such as gestures) (Bucholtz & Hall, 2016; Zentella, 2007), and . According to Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, and Turner (1997), while teaching strategies and approaches are often discussed in the literature, but there is still a great need of concrete, positive evidence of multilingual children's competencies—not necessarily through proficiency assessments, but in a holistic view of their unique aspects, such as their language practices that are highly creative, systematic, collaborative, and strategic. Aside from language, more studies need to be done in regards to multilinguals' semiotic practices (e.g., use of gestures and sounds) and other nonverbal participations, as they are also falsely interpreted as an absence of learning.

In addition to exploring multilingual learners' practices, we also need to look at teachers who interact with and teach these learners on a daily basis. Specifically, as teachers serve as learners' model in their identity, cultural, and language development, we ought to examine how they are influencing these children's learning inside the classroom. In TWI settings, learners not only learn languages, but they also learn about the sociocultural values that are tied to language. In other words, students do not only learn

languages but they also learn cultural norms, values, and practices. TWI teachers play a huge role in this “transfer” process, as their teaching and classroom management practices may embed such norms and values. However, as TWI teachers themselves are often multilingual and multicultural, they hold a hybridized version of norms, values, and practices (e.g., having a blend of Korean and Western style of teaching). Because TWI teachers, similar to the multilingual children, hold a complex background, this study includes an inquiry of how these teachers portray and embed their hybridized ideologies and practices into the classroom when interacting with the children. The significance of this inquiry of teachers is mainly to become aware of how they enact hybridity in the classroom, as they themselves hold the identity of a multilingual speaker. This inquiry seeks to re-examine classroom practices that could potentially create a gap in learners’ cultural understandings. Specifically, TWI teachers may bring in a ‘hybridized’ practice, which could include traditional ways that learners may not be familiar with or choose not to agree with or conform in. These traditional ways, in the context of multilingual classrooms, include disciplining practices that stem from ideologies that were embedded in and through their education, cultural experiences, and societal expectations in the world they live in.

Therefore, in this study, I present both multilingual teachers and multilingual learners’ practices, specifically their linguistic, cultural, and semiotic practices and the enactment of these in hybrid ways, addressing the following main question:

How do multilingual speakers use hybrid language, cultural, and semiotic resources (“hybrid semiotic practices”) when communicating and interacting with others?

Upon presenting a review of relevant literature to support the aforementioned question and provide which frameworks I ground my research, I present the following findings chapters:

Chapter 4: Multilingual Teachers' Hybridity

How do multilingual teachers utilize linguistic and semiotic hybridity when communicating with multilingual children?

Chapter 5: Multilingual Children's Hybridity

How do multilinguals use linguistic and semiotic hybridity when communicating with their peers and teachers?

The format of these chapters are written as an individual study, a journal style genre in mind, having its own literature, methods, and discussion. The Discussion section within each journal piece provides a summary of the findings and how these findings connect and contribute to the current literature on multilingual speakers. Further, I discuss recommendations and a cautionary note as to how we can move forward, as we continue to challenge the deficit views of multilingual speakers' use of linguistic and semiotic hybridity when interacting, and the systems (e.g., assessment, education policies, TWI policies) that perpetuate these stigmatizing views. Additionally, the Literature Review (Chapter 2) and Theoretical Framework (Chapter 3) sections provide an overarching theme for these two pieces, which is grounded through the lens of "hybrid semiotic practices"--a framework I have termed and operationalized in Chapter 3, upon exploring a variety of language practices related to multilinguals.

In line with understanding "what [multilinguals] actually do with language, what language does to them, and what language means to them" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 188),

this study presents multiple contextual and discourse evidence of how creative and strategic multilingual speakers are, as they purposefully use all their affordances and resources (linguistic, semiotic, and cultural) to effectively communicate their ideas, to show accommodation of other interlocutors' language/speech, to show agency, confidence in, value of their own language practice(s) tied to their identity and culture. In addition to research contribution on bilingualism and multilingualism, this study expands the corpus of a linguistic variety spoken by Korean American "Kyopos" (a Korean word referring to overseas ethnic immigrants; M. Song, 2005), who are part of the larger multilingual speaker group (Sun et al., forthcoming). Finally, this research also sheds light to teacher education practices, in line with the fourth pillar of TWI goal of "critical consciousness" (more discussion in chapter 4) to re-examine (and take caution of) ways that may create misunderstandings and gaps, through their own hybridized practices as multilingual/multicultural individuals, that may impact multilingual learners' identity, cultural, and linguistic development.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I present a review of relevant literature that have guided my understanding of multilingual speakers and their linguistic, cultural, and semiotic practices.

Multilinguals and their Everyday Language Practices

There have been numerous studies that observed the everyday language practices of multilinguals' both in communities (e.g., Reynolds & Orellana, 2009; Sánchez, 2007; Zentella, 1997) and in classroom settings (e.g., Hornberger & Link, 2012; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Martínez, 2010; M. Reyes, 2012). However, scholars advocate the need to further explore how these learners use, mix, or move between languages (Dworin, 2003; Fránquiz, 2012; Gort, 2012; Hornberger, 1989; Martínez, 2013; Mercado, 2003). Further, more studies analyzing how these learners interact using language through classroom-based and evidence-based studies are greatly needed (Cuban, 2013). Although learners interact outside the classroom daily, the classroom is a unique context where learning is the primary goal, in which participants hold the social identity of a “learner.”

In my review of literature on multilinguals' language practices, I have found that each study attempts to observe the characteristics of their language/language use, thus expanding our understanding of how they learn, think, interact, self-identify, and make sense of their world (Cole, 1996; Gee, 1990; Ochs, 1992; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1985). In Table 1 and 2 below, I present an overview of selected literature on the language practices of multilingual learners/speakers and have organized the list according to what each study highlights. It is important to note that each study is not limited to the focus I have mentioned or marked in this table; also, there may be other

studies not included on this list that focus on the themes listed in these tables. The purpose is to provide an overview as a guide to explore common themes across, and find similar and different points highlighted in each study. Note that in these two tables, “L” stands for language and “LP stands for language practice:

Table 1
An Overview of Multilinguals’ Language Practice

Multilinguals...	Research Studies
Use entire linguistic repertoire	García, 2009 Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiente, 2015 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999 Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez, 2009
Maximize performance / communicative effectiveness through language practice (LP)	Bourdieu, 1991 Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiente, 2015 Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999 Li, 1998 Poplack, 1980 Zentella, 1997
Make sense of their world / experiences through LP	García, 2009 Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiente, 2015
Use multiple languages with fluidity / flexibility	García, 2009 García & Leiva, 2014
Use language (L) to index identity, social status, etc	Gort & Sembiente, 2015 Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997 Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007 Li, 1998 Martínez, 2013 Sayer, 2013 Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013 Zentella, 1997
Perform L (bilingual performance) that is readily observable	García, 2009
Practice L as an everyday mode of communication	García, 2009 Garcia, 2011 García & Wei, 2014

	Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999 Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez, 2009 Martínez, 2013
Integrate diverse literacy practices	Bourdieu, 1991 Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999 Li, 1998 Poplack, 1980
Perform a dynamic discursive exchange (multiple L varieties)	Garcia, 2013 García & Wei, 2014 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008 Martínez, 2013
Use LP for learning or to learn meanings or academic concepts	García, 2009 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997 Martínez, 2010 Reyes, I., 2004 Sayer, 2013
Use LP to develop / maintain multiple L competence	Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999 Martínez, 2013
Draw from their linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge when using language	González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997 Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992 Reyes, I., 2004
Use L in action / as an act	Canagarajah, 2013 Flores & Schissel, 2014 García, 2009 Gort, 2015 Heller, 2006 Martínez, 2013 Pennycook, 2010 Sayer, 2013 Urciuoli, 1985
Possess one linguistic repertoire	García, 2009 García, 2011 García & Wei, 2014 Makoni & Pennycook, 2007

	Pennycook, 2010 Urciuoli, 1985
Use LP to interact and develop relationship	Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997 Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013
Use gestures / body to communicate and interact	Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999 Bucholtz & Hall, 2016
Mix L for aesthetic preference	Martínez, 2013
Practices L not out of deficiency	García, 2009 Martínez, 2013 Toribio, 2004 Woolard, 1998 Zentella, 1997
Develop their language while their identity, language, and beliefs about self, community/culture are shaped through socialization	Lee & Bucholtz, 2015
Maintain heritage/cultural identity and ties	Lee & Wright. 2014

Table 2
Framework & Discussions on Language and Language Practices

Framework / Discussions	Research Studies
L as multiple / complex / interrelated	García, 2009 García, 2013 Gort, 2012 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008
Agency of users when practicing L	Gort, 2015 Jørgensen, 2008 Pennycook, 2010
Restrictions/ limitations in Two-way immersion programs	Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Reynolds & Orellana, 2009
Challenges L compartmentalization policy	Baker, 2010 Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Durán & Palmer, 2014 García, 2009 Gort, 2012 Gort & Pontier, 2013 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Reynolds & Orellana, 2009

Description of who the bilinguals are	García, 2009 García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008 Gort, 2006 Gort, 2012 Gort, 2015 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Reyes, I., 2006
LP as a pedagogic resource for learning & teaching	Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009 García, 2013 Gort & Pontier, 2013 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997 Martínez, 2010 Palmer, Martínez, Mateus, & Henderson, 2014 Sayer, 2013 Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013 Zentella, 1997
LP in communities	Reynolds & Orellana, 2009 Sánchez, 2007 Zentella, 1997
LP in classrooms	Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Flores & Schissel, 2014; García, 2009 Gort, 2012 Gort & Pontier, 2013 Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999 Hornberger & Link, 2012 Martín-Beltrán, 2014 Martínez, 2010 Reyes, M., 2012
Code-switching framework	Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007 Poplack, 1980 Poplack, 1981 Reyes, I., 2004 Woolard, 1998 Woolard, 2004
Translanguaging framework	García, 2009 García, 2011 García, 2013 García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008 García & Leiva, 2014 García & Wei, 2014 Gort & Sembiante, 2015 Makoni & Pennycook, 2007
Hybrid LP framework	Gort & Sembiante, 2015

Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu, 1999
Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999
Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997
Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez, 2009
Martínez, 2013

One of the highlights in Table 1 is when scholars describe multilinguals' language use as "multiple" (García, 2013; García & Leiva, 2014; García & Wei, 2014; Gort & Sembiente, 2015; Gutiérrez, 2001; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). When referring to the term "multiple," scholars associate it with interlocutors' use of languages, varieties, codes/registers (Gutiérrez, 2001), or discursive practices (e.g., García & Wei, 2014)--which are all different framings. Scholars agree that their language is "constantly adapting" to diverse emerging conditions, and thus making their language practice as "dynamic" (García et al., 2012; Gort, 2012; I. Reyes, 2006; Martínez, 2013; Woolard, 2004).

When trying to understand why multilinguals use language in their current dynamic ways, we need to approach it as both part of their normal and natural life and self, as well as their strategy to best learn and communicate. As these learners are equipped with rich and diverse resources (e.g., their linguistic and cultural "funds of knowledge"; González et al., 2005), it is quite natural (García, 2009) for them to draw from each language resource (Ruiz, 1984) or use their entire linguistic repertoire (Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez, 2009) for learning and communicating. We should see their language use as an everyday practice (Gort & Sembiente, 2015), as it reflects their social, linguistic, and cultural background and history (Martínez, 2013). Further, it is also problematic that our education system only assess multilingual children's English proficiency, including all the subject/content areas in English; we are missing the opportunity to foster their multilingual competence by assessing their bilingual and

multilingual ability, which includes the various language practices (e.g., translanguaging, code-switching, hybrid language practices, etc.). Categorizing these children by the system as “limited” and their language practice as “deviant,” pulls them into the monolingual realm of learning (of English). By depriving them to use their linguistic and cultural resources as part of their learning and daily interaction is similar to denying their sense of identity (Lee & Suarez, 2009).

Overall, multilinguals’ dynamic language practice should not be misinterpreted as a random act, but instead as a strategic move (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999). Among many reasons, they use language or they practice “linguaging” (Jørgensen, 2008; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Shohamy, 2006) to (1) make sense of their worlds or shape their experiences (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986; Wertsch, 1985); (2) to maximize communicative effectiveness and performance (Bourdieu, 1991; Li, 1998, Poplack, 1980); and (3) to index or perform their identity or social membership (Rogoff, 1990; Cole, 1996; Ochs, 1992). The concept of “linguaging,” defined as “a form of verbalization used to mediate solution(s) to complex problems and tasks” (Swain et al., 2009, p. 5), is key to understanding multilinguals, because when they interact, they use language to constantly make sense of their surroundings, make meaning, and shape their experiences and knowledge (Swain, 2006)

When multilingual learners use their entire linguistic and semiotic repertoire, they are trying to achieve their communicative goals (Martínez, 2010). For instance, they could mix languages or use other semiotic embodiment such as gestures to show comprehension (Gort, 2012), to further support their understanding (Gort & Sembiante, 2015), to perform cognitively demanding tasks (I. Reyes, 2004), and/or to better convey their intended meaning (Zentella, 1997). When scholars discuss their multilingual learners’ identity, they are not just indicating their identity (e.g., their multicultural

identity; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007), but learners are actually performing (Sayer, 2013) and maintaining identity (Martínez, 2013) to interact (Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson, 2013), and to accomplish literacy tasks (Gee, 1990; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner, 1997). Moreover, they shape their identity, language, and beliefs about self, community, and culture, as they develop and use language (and vice versa), through language socialization (Lee & Bucholtz, 2015).

In addition to understanding from a normative yet purposeful language perspective, multilinguals practice a hybrid language (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999), translanguaging (García, 2009), or code-switching (Freeman, 2000; Hornberger, 2005; Pérez, 2004; Woolard, 2004); more will be discussed in the theoretical framework section. Zentella, 1997) claims that such practices are not out of deficiency (Woolard, 1998), but as a choice to maintain their culture and dual language competence and for aesthetic preferences, such as “enhanced sound of utterance” (Martínez, 2013, p. 283). This concept of taking agency to choose how they use language aligns well with the understanding that language goes beyond a set of system to learn, but it is something that is practiced and acted upon (Canagarajah, 2013; Martínez, 2013; Pennycook, 2010; Sayer, 2013; Urciuoli, 1985). In the next section (theoretical framework), I present a more in-depth discussion of how the aforementioned language practice theories fit into my current research.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

Interaction, Sociocultural Theory, and Affordances

When analyzing multilingual speakers' language learning processes, especially in a classroom setting, where learning is supposed to happen and expected, it is important to carefully examine how interactions are encouraged to make these meaningful. By understanding Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory (SCT), which discusses how speakers use language to mediate with our physical and social environment, we recognize that interaction needs to be contextualized and carefully constructed. For instance, in language classrooms, opportunities for interaction should be guided and be meaningful to "push" the learners to reach their potential through the zone of proximal development (ZPD)—a gap between what learners can do on their own and what learners can accomplish with assistance, such as peers, teachers, or even books (Vygotsky, 1978). Through the lens of SCT, in which learning and development stem from meaningful collaborations and interactions, learners mediate (Halliday, 1993; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978). Learners' discourse and the processes that they use to jointly construct their knowledge and language also serve as critical evidence for their learning and development (Swain & Lapkin, 1995, 1998).

In relation to the concept of ZPD, Donato's (1994) idea of scaffolding is also helpful in ensuring meaningful interaction, especially in a language classroom. Scaffolding is a "situation where a knowledgeable participant can create supportive conditions in which the novice can participate, and extend his or her current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence" (Donato, 1994, p. 40). The whole concept behind the two-way immersion (TWI) program (the setting of this study) is similar to scaffolding, where multilinguals have the opportunity to be 'immersed' in language

learning environments where they may either be the more advanced or the more novice speaker in the class; in such environment, scaffolding can happen on a daily basis through peer-to-peer or teacher-student interactions, as well as through explicit curricular guidance by the teacher. Through the scaffolded tasks, teachers guide students to use various resources and opportunities in the environment for learning, or what van Lier (2002) calls *affordances*. The concept of affordance is associated with language learning because affordance affects learners' possibility, capacity, and their proximity to acquire language as they interact with their surroundings (van Lier, 2000). According to van Lier (2004), affordance refers to "what is available to the person to do something with" (p. 92). In other words, affordances are students' learning opportunities (van Lier, 2004) and their surroundings (Menezes, 2011), which includes everything (physical, social, and symbolic) that provides grounds for activity. Along with the lens of SCT, this framework of affordance is important in this study, because as multilinguals use language and semiotics dynamically and creatively to interact with people and the environment (van Lier, 2000, 2004, & 2011), their language practices continuously evolve, while developing a deeper understanding of their own identity and culture. Finally, this study is also grounded on a social constructionist framework, which assumes that learners interact with one another and with teachers and jointly construct learning opportunities in various learning situations (Durán & Syzmanski, 1995; Gergen, 1999; Green & Dixon, 1993; Green et al., 2012; Gumperz, 1986; Tuyay et al., 1995).

Legitimacy of Hybrid Practices

Just as African American Vernacular English is a legitimate variety of English (Labov, 1973; Baugh, 2000; Rickford & Russell, 2000; Green, 2002; Wolfram & Thomas, 2002), I argue that when multilingual speakers use hybridity in their communication, this

language and practice should be considered as a separate legitimate linguistic practice, in which the speakers show a strategic, hybrid use of multiple languages and semiotics, reflecting systematic sociolinguistic patterns. As researchers contextually and holistically understand the interactions of multilingual speakers, the “interstices between speaker intentions and the responses of interlocutors” are carefully examined (Ortega, 2019, p. 30).

As discussed in the earlier section of this paper, multilinguals are a group that is clearly marked in the education system for their language practices, among other things, along with all the stigmatizing perceptions and the stereotypical associations between race/ethnicity and their language practices. A raciolinguistic perspective also provides an insight for my study to understand how learners’ linguistic and semiotic practices may be considered “inappropriate” or “inadequate,” not simply because of their linguistic proficiency, but because of their racialized position (Flores & Nelson, 2015). In other words, when multilinguals use a hybrid language, the reason for it being regarded as an ‘error’ instead of as an linguistic innovation may be due to the fact we live in a “society shaped by racialized hierarchies” (Flores & Rosa, 2019, p. 147).

Based on the notion of *white gaze* that “privileges dominant white perspectives on the linguistic and cultural practices of racialized communities” (pp. 150-151), multilingual speakers, who are often non-white, are questioned for the authenticity of their linguistic ability in one or more languages they speak. Multilingual speakers seem to be displaced in the linguistic proficiency spectrum, because the so-called ‘standard,’ and what is considered as ‘appropriate’ and ‘deficient’ are decided by the white listening subjects, especially when it comes to the English language. Moreover, multilingual speakers are also subject to native speaker’s gaze or *native gaze* (Harris & Lee, 2022), in which the native speakers of a language, for instance Korean, separate themselves from

Korean American *Kyopos* (“a Korean word for overseas ethnic immigrants”; Sun et al., p. 2). While Korean American *Kyopos* are racially and ethnically similar to Koreans based in South Korea, *Kyopos* are frequently considered as “other,” despite the Korean government’s effort in emphasizing the ‘one-ness’ of all diaspora Koreans by calling them ‘dongpo.’ Native listening subjects regard Korean American *Kyopos*’ language practices as a “nonstandard” Korean that is funny, cute, and/or needing correction, while stigmatizing them as deficient speakers of Korean (Sun et al., forthcoming).

Frameworks to Examine Multilingual Speakers’ Language Practices

When exploring the topic of multilinguals’ language practices, two major fields of study must be discussed—code-switching (Poplack, 1981; Woolard, 2004; Zentella, 1997) and translanguaging (García, 2009; García & Wei, 2014). When research refers to *code-switching*, the term is associated with alternation (Gort, 2012) of two or more language varieties (Woolard, 2004). One of the main critiques of code-switching framework is that multilingual speakers “are not simply going from one language to another” (García, 2011, p. 1), but instead are *translanguaging*. The notion of translanguaging posits that speakers have one linguistic repertoire, with an emphasis on their complexity and fluidity in language use (García 2009; García & Leiva, 2014).

In this section, I examine these two terms (code-switching and translanguaging) more in-depth, identifying their differences and how these concepts are operationalized in various studies. In this chapter, I also further build on and expand on these two categorically different language practices based on the following two concerns. First, the translanguaging framework sees multilinguals as having ‘one’ holistic linguistic repertoire, which is made up of a variety of resources. However, for multilingual speakers, they may see their linguistic repertoire as consisting of ‘discrete’ languages,

emphasizing the multitudes of languages. In other words, while we ought to advocate against the monoglossic view (Flores & Schissel, 2014)--that multilinguals are not two monolinguals in one body, we should also be cautious to not limit multilinguals' practices in a certain way. Instead, we ought to explore how and why multilingual speakers use (and choose to use) and valorize each language in ways they do, as their practice continues to evolve in creative, hybrid ways, reflected through this study. Another concern when it comes to using the translanguaging framework is the usage of the word "fluid" when associating multilinguals' language practices, assuming that this is the 'normative' for all multilinguals (García, 2011). In Sun and Lee (forthcoming), they have found multiple instances of multilinguals using language in ways that may not seemingly look as "fluid," showing multiple, communicative (and some failed) efforts to convey meaning.

Code-switching, Translanguaging, and Hybrid Language Practices (HLP)

Code-switching and translanguaging are the two frequently used frameworks when analyzing the language practices of multilinguals. However, a different emphasis between these two terms seem to exist on what the children are actually doing with the language. Code-switching is defined as the complex alternation of two or more languages or varieties (Poplack, 1980; Woolard, 2004) which occurs between/at/outside (intersentential) or within (intrasentential) utterances, turns, events, sentences, or clauses (Cook, 2001). Studies by Zentella (1997) and McClure (1981) show that younger multilingual learners code-switch more often at the lexical level, while the older children code-switch in various sophisticated ways strategically to meet their purpose and contextual demands (Jørgensen, 1998; I. Reyes, 2004). Research on code-switching particularly highlights the features of language or language varieties used by the learners,

as well as how these learners organize discourse systematically (Toribio, 2004). In addition, through the code-switching lens, researchers examine the connection between their language practice and how they socialize and index their multilingual and multicultural identity (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007; Lee & Bucholtz, 2015) or their membership in their linguistic communities (Freeman, 2000; Gort, 2006, 2008; Hornberger, 2005; Martinez, 2010; Pérez, 2004). Learners' use of language as a resource to communicate effectively, such as accurately delivering the intended meaning to the interlocutor (Halmari & Smith, 1994; Zentella, 1997).

Translanguaging, similar to code-switching, views multilinguals' language practice as a "complex languaging practice" (García, 2009). While both translanguaging and code-switching overlap in the idea that learners use language as a resource as they perform identity and convey intended meaning through their language practice, the main difference between these two concepts is that learners are either practicing "one linguistic repertoire," as in the case of translanguaging (García, 2011, p. 1), or that they are alternating between two or more languages or varieties, as emphasized in code-switching (Gort, 2012). Furthermore, code-switching is conceptualized from hearers' perspective where they see the speaker alternative between two separate linguistic codes; whereas the notion of translanguaging is described from speakers' perspective, where the different linguistic systems are seen as integrated into one unitary system. García (2011) stresses that translanguaging should be understood beyond code-switching because multilinguals' language practice is not about alternating two distinct monolingual codes, but instead they are communicating as if it is one language, strategically using features of two or more interconnected languages (Creese & Blackedge, 2010) from a single linguistic repertoire. Furthermore, translanguaging has a strong emphasis in the fluidity and flexibility aspect of language practice, by adapting to the communicative context as learners (García &

Sylvan, 2011). The word “fluidity” is emphasized to reflect how learners move across, draw on, and/or choose languages “to construct deeper understanding and make sense of their bilingual worlds” (García, 2009, p. 45).

While on the conceptual basis, there seems to be a clearer difference across language systems and practices (Ortheguy et al., 2015), when these terms (e.g., translanguaging, code-switching, etc.) are practiced in the context of classroom research, there is still a lack of a clear-cut differentiating picture. For example, in Gort and Sembiante’s (2015) study, they use the translanguaging framework to describe the teachers’ language practices, but they operationalize the term to include “code-switching, translation, bilingual recasting, and language brokering” (p.15). Moreover, in their examples, they show one teacher using language A and the other co-teacher using language B. Although there were two languages used in the classroom, these teachers reflected their monolingual use of their designated language.

Another example of classroom research that uses both concepts of translanguaging and code-switching together is Martínez, Hikida, and Durán's (2015) study. When referring to the multilingual teachers’ language practice, Martínez et al (2015) frame it as: “intrasentential code-switching” (p. 32), “mixing languages” (pp. 31, 36), “as a kind of translanguaging” (p. 32), and “one specific form of translanguaging” (p. 27). Thus, throughout their paper, the researchers use these three terms—mixing, translanguaging, and code-switching—in interchangeable ways.

The word “mixing” is also used throughout in another Martínez’ (2013) study, but here he defines the multilinguals’ practice as “Spanglish.” Martínez’ states that Spanglish is a term to refer to Spanish-English code-switching (see also Martínez-Roldán & Sayer, 2006; Rosa, 2010; Sayer, 2008), and that he sees Spanglish as an example of a “hybrid language practice” (HLP) (Gutiérrez et al., 1999). Martínez defines HLP as the “linguistic

phenomena such as code-switching, as this term affords an understanding of the *dynamic everyday* practice of bilingualism” (p. 277, emphasis added). According to Martínez’ definition, HLP *includes* the concept of translanguaging and code-switching. Meanwhile, García sees translanguaging as an *alternative* to the concept of code-switching.

When further exploring different perspectives on language practices of multilinguals, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejeda’s (1999) work on *hybrid language practices* (HLP) attempts to include both the concepts of code-switching and translanguaging, but highlights the language practice as a central mediating tool and artifacts, including “humor, local knowledge, personal experience, and narrative” (p. 293), “ethnic and standard language varieties” (p. 301). The authors emphasize that hybrid language is “not a random act; instead, it is the conscious use of both registers and forms of knowledge as mediating tools for language and content development resources” (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999, p. 297). The notion on hybridity is also discussed in relation to culture, space and activities (where hybrid language practices happen), yet the study lacks the portrayal of how this hybridity looked like in practice, as well as how all the hybridity in culture, space and activities are connected. Later, Gutiérrez et al (2009) expand the definition of HLP as the “strategic use of the complete linguistic toolkit in the service of learning” (p. 238). Yet even with these additional definitions, there are very limited studies that actually operationalize and use this HLP lens when describing multilinguals’ language practices. For example, in his work, Martínez (2013) mentions in the beginning that he uses the HLP lens to analyze children’s mixing and blending of Spanish and English language, but he later states that he “use[s] the term hybrid language practices to refer to linguistic phenomena such as code-switching” (p. 277). Gort and Sembiante (2015) also use the notion of HLP, but there seem to be a lack of clear definition or explanation as to how the term HLP should

be understood and how it is applied in their study; instead, their work refers the language practice back to translanguaging, and focuses on the aspect of hybridity with mostly the setting (“hybridized learning spaces”). Thus, the original intent of including semiotic practices of multilingual children for analysis is somewhat lost in the application, and has become another interchangeable word to code-switching and/or translanguaging.

When research typically calls for reconceptualization of a term, it is because there has not been a clear definition established and/or there have been limited studies conducted around the concept. With HLP, although the term has been used in more recent research as discussed earlier, there seems to be a need to expand this notion to establish how this HLP lens views multilinguals’ language and their language practices. More specifically, to better capture the essence of the dynamic use of multilinguals’ practice, I expand the notion of HLP as *hybrid semiotic practices* (HSP) to truly highlight multilinguals’ innovative and strategic use of *semiotics*. Also, through this framework, I am able to explore and capture evidence of how and why multilinguals use hybridity, as well as in what contexts.

Hybrid Semiotic Practices (HSP)

To further understand the term HLP, Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, and Tejada’s (1999) work needs to be examined as they originated this term. As discussed in the earlier section of this chapter, the term “hybrid” or “hybridity” in their study is associated explicitly with spaces, settings, contexts, or activities for learning, instead of language. HLP is introduced, but it is referred to as learners’ language that is practiced in the hybridized “Third” space, and that this practice further “promotes learning zones” (p. 288). Gutiérrez et al. also mention that HLP bridges the space between school and home, and thus functioning as a “mediating artifact” that enhances literacy learning (p. 289).

However, there is no definition of what HLP is, other than it is a language practice that can be particularly used in a hybridized space. Although there is a section titled “hybrid language practices” (p. 293) and provides a description of what the children were doing in the hybridized space, there are no explicit explanations framing around how learners are practicing a hybrid language and why. Nevertheless, Gutiérrez et al. provide a great example and an insight, portraying how learners draw from “alternative codes (English/Spanish, verbal/nonverbal) and registers (formal and informal)” (p. 294). In later studies by Gutierrez (2001), she defines HLP as the “strategic use of *multiple codes and registers* in the pursuit of learning” (p. 567, emphasis added); she expands this notion in Gutiérrez, Morales, and Martinez (2009) as the “strategic use of the *complete linguistic toolkit* in the service of learning” (p. 238, emphasis added).

Building on these notions, I reconceptualize HLP as HSP or ***hybrid semiotic practices*** and define HSP as: **speakers taking agency to innovatively and collaboratively practice diverse sets of semiotic (including linguistic and cultural) resources**. It is important to note that while I see these sets of resources as interrelated, I still want to emphasize the unique and the valuable aspects of each language and semiotic resource. As discussed, while translanguaging may see multilinguals’ practice as one, single linguistic repertoire, conceptualizing in this manner could limit the value of each individual’s resource(s) or language(s), and how each resource plays a role collaboratively. Further, translanguaging mainly focuses on the language, while HSP provides a lens that views *beyond* language—it includes other semiotics, such as culture, gestures, sounds, affective expressions, and other surrounding resources afforded). When trying to understand the word “hybrid,” I approach it as more than one. That is, in this framework, there may be new forms and practices that get created at the intersections of these linguistic, cultural, and semiotic systems. Moreover, hybrid practice is not just an

output of practice, but it should be seen as an innovative *process*, in which learners take agency to act, using all the resources they have collaboratively; these resources themselves also collaborate in the process of meaning-making and communicating. In other words, when using the framework of HSP, one should closely examine the ways all the resources are in collaboration and how these resources are utilized creatively. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, Alvarez, and Chiu (1999) discusses how HLP is a tool or a resource to build collaboration, and the result of this collaboration leads to literacy learning. However, this HLP is more than a “tool” to collaborate for learning, because even during the process of using HLP, collaboration already takes place amongst the resources, as the act itself involves collaboration. Further, this practice is beyond alternation but includes innovative yet strategic mixing and blending of linguistic and semiotic resources.

What is Hybrid Semiotics? A key feature emphasized in HSP is the inclusion of agentive use of semiotics—embodiment (e.g., gestures), resources (e.g., sounds, texts), culture/cultural references, and affective expressions. Zentella (1997) critiques that multilingual speakers and their use of hybridity in speech were often viewed in a deficit way (e.g., language ‘crutch-like’ switching), as if learners need a ‘crutch’ to support them when communicating. Therefore, it is crucial for researchers to show more evidence and documentation that multilinguals’ language interactions, which are frequently accompanied by agentive use of the body or the use of embodied semiotic resources, such as making gestures or using sounds, is not because they do not have the linguistic proficiency, but because it is in fact a highly cognitive practice to further provide an explanation to accommodate the interlocutor’s understanding. This practice is shown through the children’s hybridity data in this study, where multilingual children maximize

all of their resources to convey their message and emphasize certain points within their discourse. The notion of embodiment, which includes gestures, bodily/facial movements, and gaze, is key in my research when understanding how multilinguals talk. According to Bucholtz and Hall (2016), bodies produce language, and language produces bodies, in which bodies can become the “semiosis” of cultural discourse. Building on this notion, within the framework of HSP, multilinguals’ body and language are in constant collaboration to make meaning and to index identities. Moreover, seeing HSP in relation to embodiment help facilitate a deeper understanding of how multilinguals interact and take agency in using their linguistic and semiotic resources.

Why do Multilinguals Practice a Hybrid Language? Overall, the literature on HSP aligns well with the current field of language practices of multilinguals, particularly as to why learners would use this linguistic practice. According to Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez and Tejada (1999), multilinguals mainly use hybridity to promote, facilitate, or trigger productive literacy learning and to foster language development. Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez and Chiu (1999) point out that multilinguals use hybridity to (1) collaborate and solve problems; (2) to create mutual understanding; (3) to build relationships. In line with building relationships, Martinez (2013) discusses how multilinguals use hybridity to express identity and membership, as well as to display aesthetic preference. In addition, multilinguals practice hybridity in their speech to maintain their sociolinguistic competence and to display their practice as ‘normative’ (Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martinez, 2009).

Table 3 below presents an alignment of these above reasons with research on language practices of multilinguals:

Table 3
Hybrid Language/Semiotic Practice Connections to the Broader Literature

Why multilinguals use HLP (or HSP)	Studies referencing HLP	Alignment with research on language practices of multilinguals
To promote, facilitate, or trigger productive literacy learning / development	Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada (1999)	Gort (2015); Li (1998); Poplack (1980); Zentella (1997)
To express identity and membership	Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu (1999); Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Turner (1997; Martinez, R.A. (2013)	Bourdieu (1991); Gort & Sembiante (2015); Kramersch & Whiteside (2007); Li (1998); Martínez (2013); Poplack (1980); Sayer (2013); Worthy, Durán, Hikida, Pruitt, & Peterson (2013); Zentella (1997)
To maintain culture and language competence	Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez (2009)	Gort (2012); Gort & Sembiante (2015); Martinez (2013)
To display as a normative practice	Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Alvarez, & Chiu (1999); Gutiérrez, Morales, & Martínez (2009)	García (2009; 2011); García & Wei (2014); Gort & Sembiante (2015); Kramersch & Whiteside (2007); Martinez (2013)

Attitudes toward Monolingualism and Hybrid Semiotic Practices

From a pedagogical standpoint, the goal of understanding learners’ hybrid semiotic practices is to enable educators to tap into emergent bilinguals’ diverse set of resources for teaching and learning purposes, as they expand their holistic understanding of who these students are and how they use language and semiotic resources. Yet, strict classroom language separation policies and teachers’ attitudes toward language compartmentalization are reflected in many bilingual/multilingual school programs (e.g., two-way immersion or “TWI”), which restrict students to mix languages (Martin-Beltrán, 2010; Palmer & Martínez, 2013). Studies on language compartmentalization views bilinguals as two monolinguals in one body/mind (Ballinger, Lyster, Sterzuk, & Genesee, 2017; García, 2009a; Grosjean, 1985), but the criticism behind this perspective is that it not only ignores the actual bilingual ability and their identity as a bilingual (Lee,

Hill-Bonnet, & Gillispie, 2008), but it also does not acknowledge that bilinguals have a dynamic linguistic system (Kroll, Bobb, & Hoshino, 2014; Kroll, Dussias, Bogulski, & Kroff, 2012). Research challenges this misconception that children raised with two languages are “disadvantaged” or that hybridity in language use is pathological (Bialystok & Craik, 2010; Byers-Heinlein, Burns, & Weker, 2010; Kroll et al., 2012). Instead, bilinguals who constantly negotiate how these two languages are used in their interaction have a high cognitive control (Kroll, Bobb, & Hoshino, 2014).

As part of this study, upon examining multilinguals' use of HSP in the classroom, I present how teachers respond to these practices and how they enact the boundaries between these two target languages during instruction time. As described in Creese and Blackedge's (2010) study, when teachers and students are allowed to translanguage between English and their heritage language, students draw from all of their linguistic resources to interact and learn. In reverse, when learners are restricted in ways they communicate, this leads to a decrease in classroom participation as they become more reluctant to speak and lose motivation to engage (May, 2014), as well as feel less confident to ask questions, as they are not able to articulate questions in the language of their choice (García & Li, 2013). Moreover, in the case when English-only is the policy in the classroom, it could lead learners to have “a dark emotional pathway of shame (in not being good enough to participate)”; “guilt (in breaking the contract of obligation to their classmates, the teacher and the institution)”; and “fear (of the impending consequences and exclusion)” (Rivers, 2014, p. 111).

Instead of this feeling of shame, guilt, or fear in the classroom, Ahmad (2009) conducted a study in Malaysia to explore learners' perception of teachers' code-switching in the classroom. According to the study, not only students felt that teachers' practice of code-switching helped them in their content comprehension, but the teachers themselves

felt that code-switching was an effective teaching strategy, as they had the agency to choose the best linguistic resource available to them when teaching. Aside from checking comprehension and explaining concepts (Ahmad, 2009; Greggio & Gil, 2007; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Tian and Macaro, 2012), this study observes other patterns, if any, of when and why, teachers, not just code-switch, but choose hybridity of linguistic and semiotic resources in interacting with the students, as well as how these choices unfold in the classroom. While the monolingual approach is still prevalent as the official policy when it comes to many language teaching contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Macaro, 2001; Phillipson, 1992), more pedagogical (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Turnbull & Daily-O’Cain, 2009) and socio- and raciolinguistic (Rosa, 2019; Rosa & Nelson, 2017) research are needed to inform the value of HSP in multilinguals’ linguistic and identity development.

Chapter 4: Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Teachers

Introduction

The Two-way immersion (TWI) program model has been widely known to lead positive academic outcome on students (Howard et al., 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010; Martín-Beltrán, 2010; Oller & Eilers, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In this unique language model, students only learn one language at a time, during the designated instructional time, with an approach to foster bilingualism, biliteracy, and bicultural competence (Christian, 2016; de Jong, 2016), as well as to protect and maintain the non-English language use (Cloud et al., 2000; Gomez et al., 2005). However, this language separation policy (Lindholm-Leary, 2011) in TWI is still heavily debated whether or not this truly benefits multilinguals, who have the ability to transfer and use all their linguistic resources simultaneously while learning (Genesee et al., 2006; Gort, 2006, 2008; Reyes, 2006). Such a policy is becoming more problematic because it promotes two ideas. First, because the TWI program encourages teachers to teach only the so-called “standard,” prescriptive language, their dynamic and diverse language practices (e.g., translanguaging; Garcia, 2009) that multilingual learners’ use everyday to interact with peers, family, and community, could be seen as lacking value (Martín-Beltrán, 2010). Such perception puts multilingual learners in a position where they feel that they ought to develop and speak similarly to monolingual ‘native’ speakers (Cook, 2008).

The biggest criticism, however, for this ‘idealized’ situation is the inequalities (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Flores, 2016) that seem to be hidden behind the glowing goals of the TWI model. Specifically, Cervantes-Soon et al.’s work points out how TWI

(and its findings) overly commodifies bilingualism/multilingualism, marketing it as an ‘additive’ tool for success in this globalized world (Rhodes, 2014), instead of focusing on the value of developing identity development and multicultural competence (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017). This framework is problematic when we ponder upon who is truly benefiting in this process, especially when the program is viewed in “enrichment” terms and for future job opportunities (Paciotto & Delany-Barmann, 2011). In other words, in this sociopolitical world, the “hegemonic Whiteness” is prevalent (Flores, 2016)--white bilinguals/multilinguals are applauded for their achievement (Muro, 2016), as they speak the ‘standardized’ English and have managed to speak another ‘foreign’ language(s). Meanwhile, the non-white bilingual/multilinguals have to prove their linguistic competency, for speaking another language other than English, due to the historically racialized deficit views. In fact, there are multiple layers of struggles that non-white bilingual/multilinguals, especially HL speakers, have to go through: (1) living up to the native speakers’ expectation to speak the non-English language well enough, especially when they share the same race or ethnicity; (2) due to race and ethnicity, having to prove to white speakers that they *can* speak the ‘standardized’ English; (3) battling the “hegemony of English” (Martínez et al., 2015) and the perceptions surrounding other non-English languages, as English is considered the ‘majority’ language, making all the non-English languages considered as a ‘minority’ language, with less importance in society and even in instruction (Tedick & Wesely, 2015; Torres-Guzmán, Kleyn, Morales-Rodríguez, & Han, 2005); and (4) constantly adjusting their everyday language to accommodate the interlocutor’s dominant language, despite the fact that they possess a full linguistic repertoire of multiple languages, and are using hybridity (e.g., mixing two or more languages) when communicating with peers, home, and community members.

Under this condition of what I refer to as the “hegemony of anti-hybridity,” an ideal multilingual is thus viewed as someone who is proficient in multiple languages, using each language separately. The irony of this idealized view is that we want multilinguals to be able to possess diverse linguistic competence, yet the expectation and assessment for their linguistic ability is not multiple—that is, instead of holistically assessing their ‘multilingual ability,’ all language assessments continue to separate each language, and assess their language ability the same way we examine the linguistic competence of a monolingual speaker. Thus, the monoglossic ideology continues to thrive in society, perceiving multilinguals as two (or more) monolinguals in one body/mind (Canagarajah, 2013; Garcia, 2009; Grossjean, 1989). As a result, not only we overlook multilinguals’ linguistic practices as systematic, agentive, and creative, but their practice is rather viewed not “balanced” and not “pure” (Attig, 2019; Kiaer & Bordilovskaya, 2017; Martínez et al., 2015; Shin, 2017).

To counter this “anti-hybridity” mindset, many studies have thus continuously examined multilingual *learners’* everyday language practices¹ and advocated these practices as dynamic, meaningful, intelligent, and a communicative norm (Auer, 1998; Blom & Gumperz, 1972; García & Sylvan, 2011; García & Kliefgen, 2010; Jaffe, 2007; MacSwan, 2000; Menken & García, 2010; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Toribio, 2004; Woolard, 2004; Zentella, 1997). Yet, there seems to be a lack of research focusing on *teachers* and their language practices as a multilingual and multicultural speaker. As teachers play a crucial role in influencing students’ learning experiences (Menken & García, 2010), not only we need more studies on how to develop bilingual/multilingual instructional strategies (Palmer et al., 2014; Valdés, 2005), but we also need to explore

¹ Examples of everyday language practices include: code-switching (Poplack, 1981; Woolard, 2004; Zentella, 1997), translanguaging (García, 2009; García & Sylvan, 2011), hybrid language practices (Gutiérrez et al., 1999), code-meshing (Canagarajah, 2011), language sharing (Paris, 2009), language crossing (Rampton, 1995, 2009), translating/interpreting (Orellana, 2009; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Valdés, 2002), and polylinguaging (Jorgensen et al., 2011).

how these multilingual teachers, who hold diverse sociolinguistic realities (Cook, 2002; de Jong, 2016; Hopewell & Escamilla, 2014), interact with the multilingual and multicultural learners. In particular, when teachers share a similar cultural heritage as the learners, they can serve as linguistic and cultural models. As a result, students, who have shared this heritage culture with their teachers, tend to grow up with less self-denial or conflict in their identity development (Erikson, 1997).

This study explores the following questions: In what ways do multilingual teachers use “hybrid semiotic practices” in the classroom when teaching and interacting with multilingual children? I define *hybrid semiotic practices* as practices in which speakers take agency to innovatively and collaboratively practice diverse sets of semiotic (including linguistic and cultural) resources. When examining these practices, I particularly take a closer look at whether teachers’ unique linguistic, cultural, and socio-ethnic background and values transfer into their teaching practice, resulting in a ‘hybridized’ practices of language and culture. Among the varied linguistic and semiotic practices, one area this paper highlights more is teachers’ interaction with the students when disciplining, as it reflected the most hybrid instances within the data, with teachers incorporating both embedding American/Western and Korean cultural ways and values, as well as integrating Korean/English linguistic and semiotic resources while teaching.

This study is significant as TWI teachers, given their own diverse and complex linguistic backgrounds, training, and ideologies, continue to face difficulties when teaching and managing classrooms in the non-English language (Amrein & Peña, 2000; Lee & Jeong, 2013). Furthermore, in the midst of strict language and school policies that reinforce the idea of keeping language and thereby cultures separate, this paper provides a telling case of how hybridity in language and semiotics (including cultures and values) is

also embodied amongst multilingual teachers and that they enact this hybridity in actual practice in the TWI classroom.

One important question to keep in mind while reading this study is whether or not TWI teachers' multilingual and multicultural practices (e.g., teaching, classroom, linguistic, semiotic) should still be based in the U.S. culture. That is, when teachers practice hybridized linguistic and cultural ways (e.g., stemming from both Korean and American/Western cultures), how should we respond to multilingual children who react to these ways either in confusion or refusal, perhaps due to being perceived as too 'traditional²,' especially in the U.S. classroom context. These immigrant, multilingual teachers may have been trained and educated in Korea, and thus these traditional practices can be assumed from this experience and background.

In the next section, to better understand multilingual teachers, who in my case are ethnically Korean teachers, I provide a brief summary of the historical and cultural values weaved into the education system in South Korea.

Literature Review

Korean Education Rooted in Historical and Cultural Values

To fully understand the relationship between Korean culture and education, it is important to know the historical and cultural background of Korean education. Adopted from China's Tang dynasty in 958, the main focus of Korean education was learning the Confucian classics, with the goal of passing the country's civil exam (Seth, 2002). This exam was mainly taken by the *yangban* ('aristocratic') class and was seen as a way to self-cultivate and to gain power and status (Choe 1974, 1987; S. Lee, 2004; Watanabe,

² I refer to these practices as 'traditional' because these may not be commonly used now in Korea, but were used heavily before.

1969). Being virtuous was at the heart of Confucian classics, focusing on the ethical and exemplar life to society (Seth, 2005). In the fourteenth century, neo-Confucianism ideology established during the Song dynasty in China influenced Korean culture and education, emphasizing “mastery of the classics, self-discipline, and correct personal conduct” (Seth, 2005, p. 5). Education achievement in Korea, thus, evolved not only as a means of social mobility but also as a personal, morally-driven aspiration for all Koreans.

This unifying goal to attain moral ‘perfection’ included the duty of parents and teachers to strictly discipline the children, even at the cost of physically striking students, typically on the head, palms of hand, or the back of the legs (H. Kang, 2001). Later, during the Japanese colonization, disciplining students evolved into an extreme, militarized education, forcing Korean students to abandon their identity and traditional culture, such as not allowing them to use their Korean names and cutting their hair short for both men and women. Humiliation was key to enforce discipline in the classroom, and those who showed any opposition to teachers and the education system were whipped or sent to prison (S. Kang, 2002). As a result, fear and shame dominated in the classrooms, which accentuated the authority and hierarchical relationship between teacher and student.

Upon gaining independence from Japanese colonization, western ideals emerged due to American influence in the education system. Specifically, ideals such as capitalism and individualism were stressed in the classroom, driving students to become more competitive. However, schools continued to use corporal punishment to push students to achieve academic excellence (S. Kang, 2002). Euphemistically called the ‘rod of love’ (Cha, 2020) or the ‘cane of love’ (Higginbotham, 2014; Yang, 2009), Korean teachers and parents used corporal punishment as the default disciplinary method to control and

manage child's misbehaviors, up until it was officially banned in Korean schools in 2010 (H. Lee, 2016).

Cultural Ideologies: Issues of Power and Respect

Instead of the broader notion of “classroom management practices,” in this paper, I frame it as “disciplining practices,” as this term is more closely reflective of the main purpose (i.e., to discipline) behind the hybridized practices TWI teachers captured in this study. The concept of discipline in the context of Korean culture is important to understand, as it goes beyond associating with mere ‘punishment.’ The culture of disciplining is closely tied to behavioral management and has evolved throughout Korean history. Yet the purpose of disciplining has remained constant, grounded in Confucianism and the Korean cultural emphasis of respect. Disciplining is part of everyday home and school cultural practice, as parents and teachers hold the burden and responsibility to train the children to be ‘well-behaved’ (Yang, 2009). A huge part of being ‘well-behaved’ in Korean (and most Asian) culture, is being respectful, studying hard, obeying parents/teachers/elders, and not offending others (Kim-Rupnow, 2001). Children grow up with the expectation to be well-behaved due to societal and cultural judgment towards their home education (가정교육 ‘family education’) and school education. These children grow up being aware of face-threatening, societal pressures to not disgrace their family for being perceived as lacking ‘basic’ education; this ‘basic’ education is not necessarily formal education, but more associated with cultural behaviors. As a result, children end up being responsible for proving legitimacy of parents’ proper parenting and teachers’ ability and credibility as a teacher. If children are deemed to misbehave at school, they not only bring shame to the family, but it also means they are not giving the respect the teacher deserves.

While this socioculturally constructed standard may be burdensome to all parties involved (i.e., parents, teachers, and children), it is quite difficult to detach from this deeply rooted Confucian ideology. In particular, a hierarchical social structure is stressed in classroom contexts, in which social harmony can only be achieved when students practice submission and compliance to teachers, who hold a 'higher' authority (Sung et al., 2011). When verbal and/or nonverbal 'disruption' happens, teachers see it as a disrespectful act and a threat to their authority (Lo, 2009; Lo & Howard, 2009). This is then proceeded with a teachable moment to 'save' the disruptive child from becoming a disrespectful individual in society. During these teachable moments, teachers reprimand and discipline children, which often includes intentional humiliation in front of peers as a precaution.

Currently, one form of disciplining in Korean culture and education that remains highly controversial in the human rights realm is the use of punishment (Sung et al., 2011). Although outwardly, it is now against the law to use pain-inducing punishment, culturally and politically, the use of this form of discipline in Korea is deeply embedded within society and culture. Traditionalists in Korea, composed of both parents and teachers, believe corporal punishment as an effective disciplinary strategy for the sake of an orderly classroom by protecting the integrity of teachers' social status, and for achieving higher academic performance (Yang, 2009); they believe that eliminating corporal punishment only exacerbates children's disrespectful behavior towards adults. Respect, again, is a major socio-ethical concern and priority in Korean culture. On the other end of the spectrum, progressives, also comprised of both parents and teachers, argue that inflicting pain and humiliation are not just human rights issues, but in educational settings, such consequences do not take into account children's opportunity to

realize what the teacher deems as ‘wrong-doings’ or ‘mistakes’ (Park, 2012; Han & Jung, 2011).

To first understand what gives teachers this ‘authoritative’ (권위) status in determining disciplinary decisions, aside from the Confucian ideology and history, the word ‘teacher’ itself shows a glimpse of the hierarchical status between a teacher and a student. In the Korean language, teachers are called *sunseng* (선생; ‘informal’) or *sunsengnim* (선생님; formal), in which *sun* in the Chinese character is written as 先, signifying ‘first,’ ‘prior,’ ‘ahead,’ or ‘advanced’ (“선”, n.d.); *seng* (生) means ‘born’ (“생”, n.d.). The word *sunseng* is also used in contexts as a way to show respect towards an expert, typically used by adding the surname (e.g., *Park sunseng*). In other words, the underlying meaning of the word *sunseng* socioculturally posits teachers as someone who was born prior to students and thus have more knowledge and deserve to be respected. Further, teachers’ authoritative power is associated with the word 권위 (*kwoni*)--a sociocultural status or ranking, in which power is bestowed upon, not necessarily by law, but often through societal acknowledgment of the beholder’s influence (“권위”, n.d.). What adds more to this deeply embedded power structure is the cultural proverb, “스승의 그림자도 밟지 말라” (‘Do not even step on your teacher’s shadows’), implying to fully respect teachers (“스승”, n.d.); here, the word 스승 (*seuseung*) is another word for teacher, but in a respectful form. This proverb, which first appeared during the Tang Dynasty in China, with Buddhist influence, originally stated that students should walk seven steps behind/away from the teacher and should not laugh or make noise (“스승의그림자”, n.d.).

Given this historically and culturally bestowed power, teachers in South Korea have generally disciplined students in the following situations: (1) Coming to school late; (2) getting a low grade in an exam; (3) coming to class without his/her homework done;

(4) not doing a respectful act (e.g., bowing to greet the teacher); (5) wearing uniform inappropriately (e.g., girls' skirts shorter than the school policy length); and (6) being noisy in class, especially when the teacher is talking (Chung, 1995.; Farrell, 2021; Park et al., 1998). Whenever these situations happen, the default discipline action was direct punishment, such as whipping or spanking, prior to 2010 (End Corporal Punishment, 2021). However, when a sixth-grader secretly recorded his elementary teacher (Mr. Oh 'Jang Pung'; a nickname given by students, referring to a martial arts technique, portraying the severity of his punishments) hitting his classmate in front of the classroom. When this video became viral online in 2010 (Journeyman, 2011), the society became outraged and the Korean government swiftly passed a law to ban corporal punishment in schools in November of 2010 (Marquez, 2015). However, the Ministry of Education still allows teachers to use indirect punishment, as deemed to be 'educationally necessary,' to discipline, such as making them run laps, do push ups, stand in the hallway for long hours, or pick up trash (Strother, 2011). Regardless of whether the discipline was direct or indirect, a major aspect of disciplining was giving shame, in hopes to prompt self-realization. Despite the national ban, according to a study conducted by the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education, amongst 21,000 students surveyed (from elementary to high school students), 20% of them indicated that they still experienced physical punishment (H. Lee, 2016). Marquez (2015) points out that Korean teachers revert to this sort of disciplining because teachers "recall" the use of punishment when they themselves were still students. As teachers who have seen the effect of what seems to be a 'fossilized' method, and thus may still be stuck with the idea of "the potential usefulness of corporal punishment," they are indeed lacking in "sufficient training on alternative disciplinary methods."

In the U.S., according to M. Kim (2003), while American teachers relate students' low academic achievements as requiring disciplinary action, ethnically Asian teachers practice disciplining in the classroom when students have specific behavioral issues, such as "playing with a classmate during the class; standing up and moving around during the class..." (p. 142). Korean teachers, specifically, were highly concerned with the deterioration of teachers' authority and control in the classroom (Y. Kim, 1999; W. Kim, 2000; Yoon et al., 1999).

In sum, disciplining practices in Korea are strongly tied to issues of power and respect, as any disruptions in the class means a threat to their authority and a sign of lack of respect. This ideology adds depth to the analysis of my findings, especially when examining why TWI teachers seem to be attached to silencing and ensuring students are well-behaved in the classroom at all times. As I explore TWI teachers in my study, I consider how such ideologies and 'fossilized' practices may have influenced their current practices in the classroom. Moreover, as teachers in my study are multilingual and multicultural, regardless of the instructional language time, I take a closer look as to how their linguistic ability, cultural ideologies, and semiotic practices are enacted in a hybridized way.

Critical Considerations to Hybridized Practices

According to Kim et al (2007), ethnic minority children often face confusion and challenges in developing social and behavioral competence when they face two different sociocultural norms in the classroom and at home, such as when recently immigrated parents practice cultural norms (e.g., humiliation) that deviate from the American societal norms (Kim & Hong, 2007). Rubin and Burgess (2002) claim that having this deviation creates a gap between relationships, which then impedes children's overall development.

Thus, when TWI teachers integrate cultural values and norms into their practices strategically or subconsciously, the question lies as to what extent these multilingual children are familiar with these norms when noticed, especially when these deviate from the American ways. Research (e.g., Kim & Hong, 2007) shows the impact of this gap within home settings, but very limited studies investigate what happens inside the classroom amongst culturally and linguistically diverse students (Yang & Mullen, 2003), especially in classrooms with Asian American children (e.g., Sohn & Wang, 2006). Sohn (2004) particularly emphasizes the need to study the Korean American group, who is one of the fastest growing Asian groups in American schools (Min, 1998), yet continues to be an understudied, unrecognized ethnic group (Y. Choi, 2014).

In Kim and Hong's (2007) study, first generation Korean American parents' claim to practice a hybrid style of disciplining in both American and Korean ways. The parents claim that their Korean style is rooted deeply from their collectivistic culture (Hofstede, 1980; Lehrer, 1988), valuing aspects such as respect and obedience (Kelly & Tseng, 1992; Lee, 1995; Oak & Martin, 2000). Korean immigrant parents discipline their children because they see their children as an extension of themselves, and thus, they feel responsible for their behaviors (Ahn, 1994). After having lived in the U.S., Korean immigrant parents learned that there is a significant difference between their ways and the 'American style' of disciplining (Kim & Hong, 1997, p. 67). Thus, they have incorporated some of the American style of disciplining, which emphasizes social and tangible rewards to promote certain desired behaviors, such as: using sticker charts, praising, and showing affection, as well as removing privileges (AAP, 1998; Webster-Stratton, 2002). In this hybridity, they began to minimize the Korean style, which is what they have commonly used for disciplining, such as: "yelling/scolding, warning/threatening, spanking, reflection and reasoning, children raising their arms in the

air for a certain amount of time (e.g., for five minutes) while sitting or standing, and giving extra homework” (E. Kim et al., 2010, p. 3).

More research is needed on how this hybridity in disciplining is impacting children, as Elderling (1998) claims that ethnic minority children go through a complex identity development, as they are exposed to ‘mixed’ messages. In the context of TWI schools, where Korean American immigrant parents delegate a parental level of authority to school teachers to discipline their children (Sohn & Wang, 2006), this research thus examines how multilingual teachers (1.5 Korean Americans), who are expected to be culturally competent in both cultures, practice hybridity inside the classroom, while enacting their complex identity, linguistic ability, and cultural ideologies. In particular, to what extent do they show hybrid semiotic practices reflected in disciplining practices inside the classroom?

Methods

Research Data

I conducted secondary analysis of a large data set and sorted through approximately 240 hours of video and audio recordings, which included 24 hours classroom data, eight hours of summer school audio data, 10 hours school playground/cafeteria/non-classroom data, 10 hours of afterschool club data, as well as four interviews of teacher, 20 interviews of a few selected parents, and 15 home interviews of children, and researchers’ field notes of 1st grade classrooms, drawn from a two-way immersion (TWI) Korean-English (K-E) school in Southern California. For this study, as the main data source, I analyzed a total of 24 hours of classroom observation video data (instructional time only); more details will be discussed later in the data analysis section.

Site

The research site is a public elementary school in Southern California, situated in newcomer communities. Among the 830 elementary students, 37% were multilinguals³, who spoke the following home languages: Armenian (61%), Korean (16%), Spanish (11%), and Filipino (3%). At the onset of data collection, the K-E TWI program, a strand within the public school (Howard, Sugarman, & Christian, 2003), was in its second year of operation. This study particularly focuses on a 1st grade classroom of 26 students that follows a typical 50/50 model, where students receive a daily language and content instruction half of the day in English and the other half in the target language/Korean.

Aside from California being the highest number of multilinguals among all the states in the U.S., a TWI program was chosen as the site of the study because multilinguals have the opportunity to take content classes and interact in two (or more) languages in the classroom, which enables a researcher to take a closer look at multiple linguistic interactions. Since TWI programs aim to develop learners' bilingual/multilingual abilities through fostering meaningful interactions (Christian et al., 2000), it is an ideal context to observe multilinguals' use of hybrid semiotic practices (HSP). Various studies in the context of TWI program have been conducted to explore successful bilingual interactions (Arce, 2000; Ballinger & Lyster, 2011; Calhoun et al., 2007; De Palma, 2010; Martin-Beltran, 2010; Olmedo, 2005; Palmer, 2008; Riojas-Cortez, 2010; Wiese, 2004) and on the challenges of bilingual interactions (Bears & de Jong, 2008; Coyoca & Lee, 2009; de Jong & Howard, 2009; Fitts, 2006, 2009; Lee et al., 2011; Torres-Guzman, 2011; Volk & Angelova, 2007). However, there are fewer studies examining what multilinguals' interactions look like, focusing on their complex and agentive practices that include language, culture, and semiotics. This study thus fits

³ The school designated them as "English Learners" whose home language is not English.

into a larger body of research examining multilinguals in public schools, who are expected to communicate in one language (most often in English) at a time.

Students and the Classroom

Within the 1st grade classroom of 26 students, there were 20 multilinguals who were ethnically Korean and eight who were non-Korean (two mixed heritage students of Japanese/white and Chinese/white; two white students; one African American student; and one Filipino student). Among the 20 ethnically Korean students, eight were born in Korea and 12 were born in the U.S. Everyday, students receive a teacher-fronted instruction for 50 to 70 minutes in each language. The teacher spends about 30 to 40 minutes in the beginning, engaging students in daily linguistic routines, such as chanting the days of the week and counting numbers, as well as giving a content instruction of main concepts prior to having students go into their designated small groups. After small group lessons, the teacher then reviews the lesson for about 20 to 30 minutes prior to switching the language of instruction. As for small group lessons, students are divided into three groups and spend about 60 to 90 minutes in their small group lesson; groupings are either mixed randomly or by language proficiency level assessed by the teacher(s). In their respective small group table, students engage in various activities with the teacher, such as reading and vocabulary activities; students rotate the table every 20 to 30 minutes.

For this study, I purposefully do not focus on multilinguals' linguistic proficiency of each language, as part of the purpose of presenting this research is to showcase multilinguals' competence using multiple languages in hybrid forms naturally, creatively, and with agency. That is, it is limiting to categorize multilinguals, especially learners such as this group who are developing all the languages simultaneously, and claim that one language is more dominant than the other (i.e. referring to multilinguals as

Korean-dominant or an English-dominant speaker). Further, in the current education system, multilinguals' proficiency continues to be assessed in one language, and not necessarily their multilingual competence itself to use various languages in complex and creative ways. Through research our understanding of who multilinguals are and their language practice have grown, acknowledging that they practice hybridity when communicating and that they possess one linguistic repertoire; yet our current assessment of their competence remains stagnant—highly focused on English language and evaluating their language ability separately, which continues to feed into the ideology that they are two (or more) monolinguals in one body/mind (Grosjean, 1989).

The layout of resources in the classroom is also unique and hybrid, as the walls and surroundings are covered with materials and signs written in both English and Korean. For instance, classroom rules, such as raising hands, and materials, such as scissors, are written/displayed in both English and Korean. Moreover, what makes this classroom even more unique is due to having both English and Korean language teachers in the same space/classroom (not typical in TWI programs; Lindholm-Leary, 2001), regardless of the language instruction time. When one teacher teaches during his/her instruction time, the other teacher assists the class (e.g., managing the students, helping with small group settings, etc.). This dual/hybrid role seems to be possible, because the teachers themselves are multilinguals.

Teachers

There are three teacher participants in this study: Mr. Choi, Ms. Jeon, and Ms. Sohn. Ms. Jeon and Ms. Sohn are the main classroom teachers, but Mr. Choi works frequently in the classroom and teaches the Korean class as a substitute teacher whenever Ms. Jeon was not available/on a trip (which includes some of the days of data collection).

All three teachers self-claim to be bilingual and are 1.5 generation Korean Americans. Ms. Jeon is the main Korean language teacher in the classroom and has about 10 years of teaching experience. In spite of immigrating to the U.S. at a young age (4-years-old), Ms. Jeon grew up valuing the Korean language and culture. Aside from attending a Korean heritage language school, she visited Korea almost every year and taught university-level Korean language courses in Korea.

Meanwhile, Ms. Sohn is assigned to be the English language instruction teacher in the classroom. She came to the U.S. when she was 14-years-old and had gone through the formal school education in Korea (until middle school). Similar to Ms. Jeon and Mr. Choi, Ms. Sohn is also a credentialed bilingual teacher, but she has less than 2 years of teaching experience.

As for Mr. Choi, as mentioned, he is a substitute teacher for Ms. Jeon for the Korean instructional time. While his educational background is unknown (due to being a secondary research analysis), based on the classroom video and interview data, Mr. Choi occasionally mixes English and Korean, but not on purpose. The rationale for inferring that he is not ‘intentionally’ mixing based on his explicit language policy in the classroom, telling students to not mix languages. His language ideology and policy on language separation are reflected throughout the data in this study, as he calls out students who speak English during the Korean instructional time. Mr. Choi’s language ideology is reflected in one of the teacher interviews, as he pinpoints the importance of language separation in a TWI classroom setting:

“근데 보니까 영어 하는 학생들이 많아 한국 시간에 보니까. 그렇게 한국말 못[*sic*; 안]하면은 이거 *class* 할 필요가 없죠... 영어만 자꾸 말하는 학생들이 있어요... 그 학생은 어리석은 학생이에요.”

‘I noticed that there are a lot of students speaking English during Korean time. If they don’t speak/use Korean, there’s no point for this (Korean) class. There are those students who keep using English... That student is a foolish one.’

Unlike Mr. Choi, both Ms. Jeon and Ms. Sohn do not explicitly call out students when

they mix languages or when they do not speak the target language during instruction time. However, based on the interview data, Ms. Sohn does value language separation in the classroom by implicitly encouraging them to use the target language by doing a teacher recast or by asking to repeat it in the target language.

Data Collection

The data for this study are video recordings of classroom activities and interactions of teachers and students. Two researchers collected the data over the course of eight months; they recorded full instructional days at regular intervals throughout the school year. Specifically, 10 hours of video data were collected at the beginning of the academic school year, and another 14 hours of video data were collected closer to the end of the school year. Approximately 10 hours each were collected per language instructional time (i.e., Korean and English class time), while the rest of the video data were teachers’ and students’ interaction in the cafeteria, hallways, playground, library, and the computer lab.

Two researchers, who assumed a passive role of observer participant (Spradley, 1980), were present in the classroom operating two video cameras. One of them was stationed in the front of the classroom, while the other was mobile to capture small group work. Both researchers observed the class at the same time, which allowed them to capture data from different angles and interactions. They also took fieldnotes of the

activities and interactions in the classroom and collected various artifacts, such as students' writings, teacher assessments, and scores of school/district implemented tests to attain more contextual information about the students and setting. The researchers were equipped to obtain quality video recordings, using wireless microphones, multiple cameras, wide angle lenses, and digital recording devices. Further, the research team used Ulead video capturing software and Roxio CD Creator to transform the data into a usable format for analysis. Overall, having these multiple types of data sources has enabled me as a researcher conducting secondary analysis to triangulate data to have a more in-depth view of the same settings (Patton, 2002), to help understand the participants holistically, including their linguistic and sociocultural background, and to ensure the trustworthiness of the data (Flick, 2007).

Data Analysis

Reflexivity when Conducting Secondary Data Analysis

Reflexivity, especially when collecting and analyzing qualitative data, is a critical concept that needs to be discussed in any and all research. According to Barbour (2007), *reflexivity* involves the act of “acknowledging the input of the researcher in actively co-constructing the situation that she or he purports to study,” and that “such insights can be put in making sense of or interpreting data” (pp. 156-157). As part of being “reflexive,” researchers are to self-examine their own perceptions, practices, and attitudes during the data collection process as a way to acknowledge and consider their own possible biases that could influence both the “angle of vision used and their location(s) and positioning(s) within the context of study” (Green & Dixon, 2008, p. 12).

When it comes to secondary data analysis, I believe reflexivity also plays an important role to the researcher. In my case, not only do I have to explore and decipher

data that I did not collect, but I also have to consider and understand the researchers' (who collected the data) perspectives, their sociolinguistic background that could have influenced their interactions as a participant observer (e.g., researchers' interactions in both Korean and English language with the multilingual students, researchers' social identities as teachers, or researchers' ethnic identities as a Korean), and their original purpose of the study at the time of data collection (i.e., to understand the extent of Korean and English language use during the designation language instruction time). In other words, as a secondary data researcher, I have to acknowledge that data collecting researchers (and their transparent reflexivity) plays a dynamic part of my qualitative analysis process.

Another important layer to consider when analyzing secondary data is the researcher's own reflexive process. Although I may not have influenced the data collection process, I believe my identity as a multilingual and multicultural speaker has somewhat influenced how I see and understand teachers' and students' language and cultural practices. Thus, acknowledging that it is impossible to fully detach oneself from the study and to take a fully objective position is crucial (Pole & Morrison, 2003).

As part of my own reflexive process, some of the challenges I faced using secondary data are the inability: (1) to ask further or follow up questions that caught my attention or that relate to my own research question(s); and (2) to view data from a different angle to see a closer look of the teachers, the students, or the surrounding artifacts. While the data collecting researchers utilized multiple perspectives and techniques—an ethnographic approach (Angrosino, 2007), because the original data was not collected to answer the present research question, there were limits to go more in-depth when understanding teachers' or students' language or action choices. From a methodological standpoint, although it is more time consuming and costly to collect and

analyze own data, one of the advantages seems to be having access to the participants and being able to ask follow up questions when needed.

Discourse Analysis Approach

When analyzing the video data, I used the Transana software to clip, code, transcribe, and manage analytically interesting moments, especially instances of multilinguals using various linguistics and semiotic resources. I also received assistance from Spanish-English and Korean-English bilingual research assistants to check the accuracy and confirm the reliability of the transcriptions and the translations. Further, I utilized a discourse analysis approach (Gee & Green, 1998; Green & Wallat, 1981; Gumperz, 1986) to analyze meaningful episodes in the classroom. Cazden's (2001) work on classroom discourse also served as a guide to analyzing language interactions when coding interaction patterns, especially when they use hybridity in their language and semiotic practices.

For this study, as my research question investigates the *multilingual teachers' varied use of hybridity in their classroom practices that are unique to their own linguistic, cultural, and socio-ethnic background*, the first step of my data analysis was to code for the following hybrid instances during their interaction and teaching in the classroom:

- (1) Linguistic hybridity (e.g., switching or alternating languages at the sentence/utterance level, blending languages at the word-level, mixing languages at the sentence/utterance level, etc.)
- (2) Semiotic hybridity (e.g., (subcategories) Cultural, Gestures, Sounds, Affect, Other Resources/Artifacts)
- (3) Linguistic + Semiotic Hybridity (a combination of both [1] and [2])

When coding for these instances, I added details, describing what this hybridity looks like, which led to subcategories. For example, when marking as a linguistic hybridity, I added details, such as (a) how this hybridity looks *syntactically*; (b) *functionally* (whether this practice reflects blending, alternating or switching, etc); (c) languages involved; and (d) the number of times hybridity happened and the direction of switch, if applicable (e.g., noting that the conversation started in English, and then it went to Korean, and ultimately coming back to English) during the selected “interactional episode.” An interactional episode, as defined by Fortune (2001) enabled me to bound an episode as a unit of interaction “to describe the contextual, social, and linguistic features” of interlocutors (p. 141). This interactional episode unit includes sufficient, rich contextual cues of interaction (e.g., a discussion of a topic), instead of a smaller analytic unit of turns or utterances by participants. Adapting this concept, when coding for all linguistic and semiotic “events” with hybridity, I refer to the analytic unit as an *interactional hybrid episode*.

When it comes to semiotic hybridity, once I identified the subcategories listed above, similar to linguistic hybridity, I added details helpful to identify patterns. For instance, for the “culture” subcategory, while it is difficult to pinpoint a single culture influencing the teacher’s action, there are certain explicit and common actions or reactions that could be inferred from historical and societal context/practices (e.g., using the “hapjuki” chant by the Korean teacher in this study). If the subcategories are not unique to a particular language and/or culture (and thus being ‘hybrid’), I made an effort to add possible semantic and pragmatic details of the interaction to help with the analysis. For the “gesture” subcategory, this includes hand gestures, facial gestures, gazes, eye movements, and body movements. For the “sound” subcategory, this includes tone, pitch, and/or voice description, sounds involving the use of body (e.g., whistle sound, snapping

sound of fingers, clapping sound, and paralinguistic sounds, such as “/tsk-tsk/”), and other external sounds, such as bells, music, etc. The subcategory “affect” includes any expressions or show of emotions/attitudes. Although this subcategory can be expressed through gestures and sounds, the purpose of separating this category is to focus on and describe what emotions and attitudes are presented by the interlocutor(s) during the interaction. Finally, “other resources/artifacts” is an open-ended subcategory, which I mostly used for including utilization of external materials during the conversation, and highlighting the importance of interlocutor’s engagement with the material(s) (e.g., books, flashcards, wall signs, handouts, etc.). It is important to note that one single instance may include multiple utilization of the subcategories of semiotic hybridity, along with the linguistic hybridity.

In the second step, I further coded for the following spaces that the aforementioned hybridity occurred: (1) when (e.g., at the beginning of class time; context of the scenario); (2) where; (3) with whom; (4) for what purpose (e.g., why the interaction is happening, why the hybridity is possibly happening); (5) the theme of the interaction; (6) interactional moves (e.g., question, recast, request, etc.); and (7) the relationship of interlocutors (e.g., teacher-student). Then, I identified common patterns (more than 3+ occurrences) within each interactional hybrid episode to understand how multilingual teachers showed hybridity in their interactions in the classroom with the students. Each instance within the interactional episode, reflecting multiple utilization of hybridity, was then marked as an example of hybrid semiotic practice (HSP).

Upon selecting the interactional hybrid episodes for the study, I transcribed these in the original language (e.g., Korean), and translated these into English (Skukauskaite, 2012). When analyzing the data, specifically the identified common patterns (Neuman, 1997; Yin, 2003) across the collected instances of HSP, I sought to understand how these

linguistic and semiotic hybrid patterns reflect their unique identity as a multilingual speaker rather than analyzing how they differed (or similar) from native speakers. When transcribing, I included both the linguistic utterances and nonverbal communication of the interlocutors to capture the meaning-making processes (Goodwin, 1981; Kendon, 1990) and to have a deeper understanding in the context of teaching and learning (Yore & Treagust, 2006) . When analyzing the discourse, I adopted Bloome et al. (2005) transcription conventions, with some additions and modifications (see Appendix B). For certain transcribed words in Korean, I included the romanization of Korean speech, using the Revised Romanization of Korean, which is used by the Korean government (Ministry of Culture & Tourism, n.d.).

Findings

In this section, I present a variety of instances where TWI teachers show linguistically, culturally, and semiotically hybridized practices into their interactions with multilinguals.

I. Shared Cultural (Mis)Understandings

In Excerpt 1, Amanda, who was born and raised in the U.S., reacts to Mr. Choi's touch of her forehead when he makes an example of picking fruits during harvest. It is worth noting how they both react in response to Amanda associating this act as a potential disciplinary act towards her.

Excerpt 1
You Touched My Head!

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Mr. Choi	아니, 수확기! 수확기는 뭐예요? <i>Harvest, harvest!</i> 'No, <i>suhwakgi</i> ! What is <i>suhwakgi</i> ? Harvest, harvest!'	
2	Amanda (A)	Ohh=	
3	Mr. Choi	=그럼 이거 언제 나타나겠어? 가을에 나타나겠지? 그치? 'So when will this show up? It will appear in the fall? Right?'	
4	A	네 'Yes'	(Amanda faces the teacher's face)
5	Mr. Choi	가을에, 오리온 달 별이 뜨면= 'In autumn, when the Orion moon star rises'	((raises his right hand up high))
6	Mr. Choi	=아! 이제= 'Ah! Now'	((puts his hands down))
7	Mr. Choi	=벼를 벼를 잘 쓸고= 'Sweep the grain of rice well'	((waves his right hand side ways))
8	Mr. Choi	그리고 그다음엔 인제는 곡식을 걷는 수확기가 되었구나= 'And then, now it's the season for harvesting'	((faces Amanda, nodding his head)) (Amanda continues to face the teacher)
9	Mr. Choi	= 과일나무도 똑! [따야겠구나, 그렇게 되는 거예요. 'And we have to pick fruits from the fruit tree like <i>ttok</i> , that's what happens.'	((raises his right hand, touches Amanda's head, and then makes a picking up motion while making the <i>ttok</i> sound))
10	A	[Ow...	
11	Mr. Choi	아프지도 않은데, 뭘 <i>ow</i> 야 하하하 'It's not even painful, what's the <i>ow</i>	

		for @@@'	
12	A	<i>Nooo, you touched my hair</i>	
13	Mr. Choi	한국말 하세요 'Speak in Korean'	((clears his throat at the beginning))
14	A	그거가 <i>ouch</i> 에 요 [xxx] 'That's what's ouch'	
15	Mr. Choi	[ok 그 다음에 보자 (2s)= 'Ok now moving on'	
16	Mr. Choi	=우리 <i>Ellie</i> 는 보니까 <i>Yellow card</i> 받아야겠다 <i>Samson</i> 하고는= 'I think Ellie should get a yellow card along with Samson'	((clears his throat at the end))
17	Mr. Choi	=움직여서 자 다음에 (2s) 항상! (.) 폴라리스 별을 향하고 있는게 어떤 별이죠?= 'Who moved. Next (2s) always! Which star is facing the Polaris star?	
18		... (transcription omitted)	(after about 4 mins)
19	Mr. Choi	그래서 선생님 말 듣고! (2s) 새로운걸 배우는 학생들은, 어! 내가 해봐야지! 내가 [해봐야지!]= 'So, listen to your teacher! (2s) Students who learn new things, uh! They say I'll try it! [I'll try it!]=	
20	A	[<i>You* pinched</i> <i>me one time</i> =	(raised tone at the beginning)
21	Mr. Choi	=남이 하지않았던 거를 내가 해봐야지 그러면서 새로운걸 알수있어. 자 꺼내볼까 한번? 'You need to try things that others haven't done so that you can learn something new. Should I take it [book] out?'	
22	A	<i>You pinched me one time and you</i>	(louder than before)

<i>pricked me (1s) [*seven times]</i>		
23	Mr. Choi	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 60%;"> <p style="margin: 0;">[우리 에이미가 오늘은 <i>Yellow card</i> 선생님 주세요 하고 막 자꾸 자꾸 얘기하고 있네? 난 선생님은 주기 싫은데? 바로 앉으세요 에이미. 'It seems like Amanda keeps asking for the Yellow card from me today? Even though I don't want to give it to you? Sit up straight Amanda.'</p> </div> <div style="width: 35%; font-size: small;"> <p style="margin: 0;">((with a straight face, low tone at the end))</p> </div> </div>
24	A	((silent))

This excerpt provides an interesting insight into how discipline is perceived by the teacher (Mr. Choi) and the student (Amanda), and the gaps, awareness, and nuances in cultural understanding of discipline. In line 10, we first see Amanda reacting to Mr. Choi, who touches her forehead, stating “Ow!”--a typical verbal reaction when someone is hurt. Her reaction is worth examining, because Mr. Choi’s touch was neither a forceful touch nor was meant to be disciplinary, based on the context. Based on the overall classroom observation of Mr. Choi, and prior to line 10, he uses gestures throughout his lesson to explain different concepts. In this particular lesson, Mr. Choi motions an act of harvesting in the fall by bending his fingers into a round shape, and makes a verbal /*ttok*/ sound, while slightly tapping Amanda’s forehead, using his rounded hands. While we are uncertain how sensitive Amanda is to the sense of touch, we can raise a question, as to whether she confused this act with the Korean way of disciplining children, called /*kkul-bam*/ 꿀밤. The word *kkul-bam* refers to chestnuts that are particularly sweet; *kkul* refers to honey and *bam* is chestnut (“꿀밤^a”, n.d.). The word is also an act of clout with knuckles of a clenched fist over someone’s head (“꿀밤^b”, n.d.); this act is typically known to be done by someone older to a younger person, such as parent to a child or teacher to a student, often for reprimanding purposes. Even though Amanda was born and

raised here in the U.S., she could have been exposed to this disciplinary motion from her Korean immigrant parents at home or from her Korean/Korean American community.

Although her reaction could also be interpreted as a way to get the teacher's attention, we see that it may be beyond just trying to get noticed, because Amanda brings up in lines 20 and 22 of how many times she was pinched and pricked by the teacher. Though this claim is unconfirmed, that is, the researcher is unclear whether she associates Mr. Choi's previous motion (line 9) as pinching or pricking, and since when she had been counting, what is clear is that she was not okay with the teacher's act—to a point where she brings up the issue again after about five minutes from her first mention in line 10.

Aside from being bothered by the touch, she raises her concern because we can infer that she perceives this act as some sort of a disciplinary act that gave her pain. In line 12, Amanda explains that the teacher touched her “hair” (or her head), and how that was an “ouch” (line 14), a painful act in her opinion. And for her to bring this up later on, after five minutes, and mentioning all the accumulated instances of pinching and pricking, it seems like she wants the teacher to acknowledge that his act was unjust towards her, regardless of whether the acts were meant to be a punishment or not.

Moreover, Amanda's feeling of not being validated could be a result of how Mr. Choi initially responded to Amanda's reaction in line 10 (“ow!”) and his subsequent reactions to Amanda's explanations. When Amanda first reacted the “ow!”, Mr. Choi states “아프지도 않은데 뭘 ow 야” (line 11), accompanied by a soft laughter. There are two ways to translate and interpret this utterance. He either meant that ‘his act (of touching her forehead)’ was not even a painful one, or that he is claiming how ‘she’ is not in even pain, thus questioning why she even said “ow.” In addition, because researchers were present, recording the scene, Mr. Choi seemed to be conscious of how Amanda was interpreting his act, as thus hurried to change the subject or laugh about it. In line 11, he

immediately dismisses Amanda's reaction as an invalid one. When Amanda explains what Mr. Choi did to her in English (line 12), Mr. Choi resorts to prompting Amanda to talk in Korean, instead of attending Amanda's response (line 13). But when Amanda switches back to Korean, continuing her explanation, Mr. Choi ignores her and moves on with the lesson (line 15), overlapping what Amanda was saying (thus, the latter part could not be heard; line 14). Later, when Amanda brings up the issue in lines 20 and 22, with utterance in line 22 being louder, Mr. Choi finally attends to her comment, but in an indirect punishment. He states how Amanda is "making" him give a yellow card because she is "repeatedly" talking or mentioning the issue, even though he does not want to give her the yellow card (line 23). He firmly, with a low voice tone, then tells Amanda to sit "properly" (line 23), which shuts down Amanda to talk further.

A more in-depth analysis of this teacher-student interaction is done to particularly examine the possibility of cultural misunderstanding or a gap between a bilingual/bicultural child and teacher. Although Mr. Choi is a bilingual and bicultural teacher, the way he reacts and responds to situations, such as a student expressing pain, aligns with the Korean cultural and historical way of disciplining school children. Mr. Choi's reaction, including his way of indirectly threatening the child with a punishment (i.e. "yellow card") and shutting her off to be silent (i.e. by sitting "properly"), instead of allowing her to explain or validating her feelings or situations, perhaps stem from his own background as a learner in Korea. Moreover, such response to the student could be from his upbringing in a Korean home setting, where tolerating pain, being silent, and not talking back are all expected, especially when being disciplined for being mischievous at home or at school, and to show respect and acceptance of the consequences (Kim-Rupnow, 2001). Although there is no direct or severe disciplining given to Amanda, she regards the situation (of touching her) as important to be validated at the moment,

which is expressed to the fullest at a child's capacity (e.g., expressing pain at multiple times). Further, Amanda, being a bilingual/bicultural child, could have regarded the touch as *kkulbam*, especially since it accompanied with the sound /*ttok*/; relating or confusing Mr. Choi's motion as *kkulbam* could have only been possible because of Amanda's awareness of both cultures. Thus, when it comes to educating multicultural children, educators ought to consider that while these children may have a broader sense of multiple cultures, they are also still developing their understanding of the world and their identity. As they shape their identity and make meaning of the world, they may encounter gaps in their understanding, especially when they interact with teachers, whose diverse practices have also been influenced and 'hybridized' by their bicultural/multicultural background. Although teachers cannot attend to all the students' needs, Mr. Kim could have inquired what exactly Amanda was claiming and why she perceives it (touching or disciplining) in such a way; this could have been an opportunity for both the teacher and the students to learn about cultural references to disciplining and deepen their understanding of their multicultural identities.

At the end of Excerpt 1, we see Mr. Choi's way of showing his authority as a teacher, telling Amanda to sit down properly and that she is risking receiving a yellow card—an indirect disciplinary action that warns students of a negative impact for an undesirable behavior. In addition, In the following excerpts, other strategies bilingual/bicultural teachers use to indirectly discipline children in the observed classrooms are portrayed.

II. Hybridized Strategies

In the following excerpts, we see another portrayal of how disciplining happens in a two-way immersion classroom, where bilingual/bicultural teachers bring in a hybridized style, blending two cultures (Western/American and Korean). In these episodes, three common disciplinary strategies are shown: (1) isolation (i.e. sitting/standing in the corner); (2) exercise-like (i.e. “sit and stand” or “sit-up”) disciplining; and (3) silencing.

Isolation

Excerpt 2 happens during English time when Ms. Jeon informs the students of their homework—they have to transfer their draft writing (letter to their parents) into the paper that she will distribute soon. She warns them to be silent, or otherwise, they will all go home late.

Excerpt 2

Go to the corner

Line	Speaker	Transcription	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Ms. Jeon		((Turns around to grab students' papers for 8 seconds))
2	Samson Ahn	We're going home in one thousand hours!	((Turns to face a classmate next to him))
3	Students	xx	(loud chattering)
4	Ms. Jeon	And inside your, OH↑=	((Turns back around, facing the class))
5	Students	xx	((some students place one hand on their mouth, and the other hand raising it up—the “Be quiet” gesture))

6	Ms. Jeon	=remember we talked about as soon as I turn my BA:CK↑ I start hearing=	
7	Students	(silence)	((same students do the “Be quiet” gesture))
8	Ms. Jeon	=(3s)Samson Ahn↓, go back to your seat and sit over there. I don’t think you can handle this on the ground.	
9	Samson Lee		((stands up, wiping his eyes, and begins to walk forward))
10	Samson Ahn		((he sits in front of Samson Lee; he turns around to look at Samson Lee and slowly gets up))
11	Ms. Jeon	Samson AHN. Are you Samson Ahn?	((looks at Samson Lee))
12	Samson Lee		((shakes his head and returns to his seat))
13	Samson Ahn		((walks towards the main table/chair seat, smiling))
14	Samson Lee	But I really have to [go	
15	Ms. Jeon	[Have a seat	((Teacher does not look at Samson Ahn but faces the students sitting on the ground))
16	Samson Ahn		((Quietly sits on his chair, separated from the group, takes his backpack and wraps his arms around his backpack, and then puts his head down; he faces the teacher in a side view))

Once Samson Ahn is separated from the group, the teacher goes on and wraps up her class by interviewing the students. She randomly calls each student and asks what

he/she has learned today. She walks around with her microphone and asks each student. Once the student responds, he/she can go grab his/her backpack and get ready to go home.

Meanwhile, Samson Ahn sits separately from the group, up to four minutes, and does not get called by the teacher; the teacher only faces the students on the ground. During these four minutes, Samson Ahn tries to participate by raising his hand for a second, but he puts his hand down, behind his head. Later, he attempts twice to get called by raising his hand for a second or two, but he brings it down. During these four minutes, he does not talk, but he faces the group and each student that gets called by the teacher, and also gazes at the students that pack up to leave. The teacher eventually calls on him almost at the very end (second to the last student to be called).

On another occasion, during a Korean class time, Mr. Choi employs an isolation strategy that is commonly used in the Western culture, emphasizing the ‘thinking’ aspect.

Excerpt 3

Would you like to go to the corner and think?

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / ‘translation’)	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Mr. Choi	세린 환이 <i>disqualified</i> . Focus 한 다음에 얘기하면 <i>disqualified</i> 되는거죠? ‘Serin Hwanyi disqualified. After we say focus, and you speak, then you’ll be disqualified right?’	
2	Hwanyi	<i>I didn’t know that!</i>	
3	Mr. Choi	그러며는 저기 코너가서 생각해 볼래요? ‘Then do you want to go to the corner and think?’	
4	Hwanyi	<i>No</i>	

5 Mr. Choi 그럼 조용히 하세요
'Then be quiet'

Excerpt 2 and 3 show an interesting dimension to our analysis of hybridity in disciplining. In Excerpt 3, Mr. Choi tells Hwanyi to “go to the corner and think.” While this isolation method might look similar to Excerpt 2, the “think” part is added this time, which is a common disciplining strategy in the Western culture (Capriola, 2018). What makes this interesting is not only this is stated during the Korean time, but the teacher also states this in a formal Korean language, adding *요* /yo/ at the end of the sentence when reprimanding (lines 3 and 5), and states it in a suggestive way (‘would you like to’; ‘then please be quiet’) (lines 3 and 5). In South Korea, isolation strategies are still commonly used in the classrooms, and unlike Mr. Choi, Korean teachers typically state them in a command form of language. Also, culturally, while it is less common to add the latter part, ‘to think,’ as a time-out method when telling them to go in the corner, Korean teachers do require the student getting punished to do something as a consequence. This act called 반성 /*ban-seong*/is asked of the students to ‘reflect and repent’ for his/her behavior (“반성”, n.d.). Yet, this ‘reflect and repent’ is expected while standing outside in the hallway, oftentimes with both their hands raised. Frequently, students are sent to clean the school bathroom as a way to show *ban-seong*. All these isolating ways separate the students from class time, taking away learning opportunities, and truly undermines the reasons behind the disciplining. Isolation as a disciplinary strategy in schools in the U.S. has not improved students’ change in behavior (Rubio, 2014), but instead induces negative emotional impacts on students, such as “humiliation, anger, fear, shame, and sometimes, hate” (Southgate, 2010, p. 92).

Exercise-like Disciplining

Another common disciplining strategy used in South Korean classrooms is the ‘exercise’ or the ‘exercise-like’ activities as a disciplinary action or punishment, which is considered illegal in more than half of the U.S. (Richardson et al., 2012; Truesport, n.d.). In Korea, exercise-like disciplining includes: repeated motion of stand-up and sit-downs, push-ups, planks, duck walks, and running rounds in the school yard (S. Kim, 2001; My Utopia, 2018; Nohji, 2015). Excerpt 4 portrays an example of a typical exercise-like disciplining commonly used in South Korean classrooms, and even in the South Korean military (Namu, n.d., *앉았다 일어나기*). The setting for this excerpt is right before Mr. Choi begins his Korean lesson and tells the students to pay attention.

Excerpt 4
Stand up, Sit down

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / ‘translation’)	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Samson Lee	<i>I saw you xx</i>	(softly speaking to a student next to him)
2	Mr. Choi	삼손, 삼손, 삼손, 삼손, 삼손, 삼손 오늘 왜 이렇게 하나? ‘Samson, Samson, Samson, Samson, Samson, Samson why are you like this today?’	(in monotone) ((not initially facing Samson, while flipping pages of his book))
3	Samson Lee		(no audible noise)
4	Samson Ahn	삼손 아니고 쌤손/인 데요 ‘It’s not Samson [zʰamson], it’s Samson [sæmsən]	
5	Mr. Choi	<i>/한국말로 삼손이에요 ‘In Korean it’s Samson [zʰamson]’</i>	
6	Samson Ahn	한국말 아닌데요.::, 쌤손이에요 쌤손	

		‘It’s not Korean, it’s Samson [sæmsən]	
7	Mr. Choi	쌤손은 영어 이름이고 한국 이름은 삼손이야 ‘Samson [sæmsən] is English name and Korean name is Samson [ʒʰamson]’	
8	Samson Lee	삼손 아닙니다. ‘It’s not Samson [ʒʰamson]’	(softly, with a low tone)
9	Samson Ahn	Hi 삼손 ‘Hi Samson [ʒʰamson]’	((facing Samson Lee))
10	Mr. Choi	우리 칼라 체인지하고 시작할까 우리? (.) 일어서 (0.3) 앉아 (0.1) 일어서 (0.1) 앉아. 바로 하세요? ‘Should we do color change before we start? (.) Stand up (0.3) sit down (0.1) Stand up (0.1) Sit down (.) Do it right, ok?’	((facing Samson Lee, tone changes low))
11	Samson Lee		(Samson Lee stands from his seat and sits down, stands up and sits down, following Mr. Choi’s command)
12	Students		(silently watching Samson Lee)

In this excerpt, we see that Mr. Choi calls on Samson Lee multiple times, without looking at him, for talking right before his lesson. Although there was no audible noise, Mr. Choi asks Samson Lee why he is acting as such (line 2). Right before Samson Lee gets explicitly disciplined, Mr. Choi has an interesting interaction with Samson Ahn, where Samson Ahn points out Mr. Choi’s pronunciation of Samson Lee’s first name. In lines 4 and 6, Samson corrects Mr. Choi in calling ‘Samson’ with a short ‘a,’ syllabically stated in a ‘Korean’ way. In response, Mr. Choi explains that ‘Samson’ with a long ‘a’ is

his English name and that his Korean name is ‘Samson’ with a short ‘a.’ When Samson Lee himself negates that he is not ‘Samson’ with a short ‘a’ (line 8), Mr. Choi directs his conversation to Samson Lee from Samson Ahn and suddenly disciplines him in a Koreanized way. With a low tone and a command, informal language form, Mr. Choi tells him to ‘stand-up and sit-down’ repeatedly twice. In South Korea, the reference for this disciplining method is from the military (Namu, n.d., *군기훈련*). On a similar note, Korean students perform the military ‘at-ease’ (both hands in the lower, center of back with feet slightly apart) and ‘attention’ (feet are closed together with hands on the side) motions frequently in schools and classroom settings. These motions are not only used for disciplining but also as a routine (with a class leader chanting the motions) to show respect to the teacher, greeting him/her at the beginning and end of class. In our case, this ‘stand-up and sit-down’ or ‘sit-up’ disciplinary method is not only a Korean-style disciplining method, but it is also widely used as a punishment in South Asia to humiliate students (e.g., India, Burma, etc.) (Birk et al., 2021; TNN, 2013). Although Mr. Choi did not excessively make Samson do the sit-ups, similar to the isolation method, this exercise-like discipline method needs to be re-examined and re-considered, as students, especially children, may or may not fully understand the cultural aspect behind these actions. Further, this experience could be humiliating to children by being called out and performing a certain activity in front of the class.

Silencing

In this TWI classroom, another patterned observation was all the Korean teachers’ emphasis in silencing the classroom, regardless of English or Korean time. It is natural for any teachers desiring their students to behave, pay attention, and be silent, when they are talking. What is unique in this multilingual/multicultural setting is *how* the teachers

silence the children, incorporating a hybridized, Korean way. Moreover, it is interesting to see how teachers perceive silence in the classroom, showing a strong association of silence with respect, which is heavily influenced by Korean/Confucian ideals (J. Choi, 2015), as discussed in the earlier section of this paper.

Hapjuki: A Koreanized Call and Response Method. 합죽이 /*Hapjuki*/ is a call and response method unique to the Korean language and culture. The word, *Hapjuki*, literally means someone who has lost all their teeth and thus the mouth/lips automatically gets closed off; this is historically referred to an old grandma with no teeth (합죽이, n.d.). This word is chanted by the teacher prompting, “Let us all be an-(*Hapjuki*),” and the students respond with the word *hap*. Phonemically speaking, because *hap* ends with a /p/ (or the consonant /ㅍ/ in Korean), students automatically close their lips at the end of pronouncing the word.

In review of all the classroom data for this study, there were multiple instances of using *Hapjuki* as a call and response method to silence the students. Excerpts 5, 6, and 7 are selected to show a variety of instances of using this *Hapjuki* method—as an (1) instant attention-grabbing method; (2) a final resort; and (3) a transition call.

The setting of Excerpt 5 is a Korean language class time. Mr. Choi asks the students whether they know the word 희망 (‘hope’). He describes this word in Korean, stating that it is something ‘they hope to achieve’ (“어떤 일을 이루고 싶어하는 것”). He reads this definition from a Korean book that is about Wooram who wants to become a teacher. He adds that their hope could be small, such as having a nice family dinner at home, or something big, such as Harrison (one of the students) who could become a Military General. When a student asks if it means ‘wish’ and the teacher clarifies that it is ‘hope.’ When one student mentions her hope and the teacher could not understand fully,

he points out that ‘when talking about hope, it needs to be an achievable one’ (“희망은 이루어질 수 있는 것을 얘기해야 되는거야”). Then, the teacher moves on to calling individual students, asking about their hope. Many of the students begin chatting at the same time with their peers, while the teacher is talking and asking each student.

Excerpt 5
Hapjuki as an Instant Attention-Grabbing Method

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / ‘translation’)	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Mr. Choi	우리 해숨이느? (0.3) ‘How about Haesom? (0.3)’	
2	Students		(chattering)
3	Mr. Choi	<i>Shhh...</i> 해숨이느? (0.2)= ‘Shhh... How about you Haesom?’	(in monotone, not initially facing Samson, while flipping pages of his book)
4	Students		(chattering)
5	Haesom	= <i>[Soldier</i>	(quietly mentioned)
6	Mr. Choi	= <i>[Shh</i>	
7	X	조용히 해 ‘Be quiet’	(female student says this loudly)
	Students		(chattering)
8	Mr. Choi	합죽이가 됩시다 ‘Let’s be a <i>hapjuki</i> ’	(in monotone, but rhythmically)
9	Students	합! ‘Hap!’	(immediate silence after ‘hap’)
10	Mr. Choi	해숨이느 어떤 희망이 있어요? ‘So what do you hope to be Haesom?’	
11	Haesol	<i>Soldier</i>	

12	Mr. Choi	해숨이는 군인되고 싶어요? <i>Harry</i> 은? 'You want to be a soldier, Haesom? How about you Harry?'	(students are silent)
13	Students		(continued chattering)

In Excerpt 5, Mr. Choi utilizes the *Hapjuki* call and response method as an instantaneous way, in between discourse, to get students' attention and to gain silence. The effect of this method is interesting because students have been busy chattering despite Mr. Choi's prompt of hushing the students at multiple occasions. However, when Mr. Choi chants the *Hapjuki*, everyone gathers together and responds to him in unison.

In the following excerpt (Excerpt 6), Mr. Choi again uses the *Hapjuki* as a way to silence the students, but the timing and the purpose of using this method present another layer of analysis. The setting for Excerpt 6 is at the beginning of a Korean class time, with both teachers (Mr. Choi and Ms. Jeon) trying to settle down the students after a recess/break time. The music in the beginning of the excerpt signals the transition to class time. Excerpt 6 captures two minutes of the pre-class time. In the transcript of Excerpt 6, anything in between the timestamps are students chattering the whole time.

Excerpt 6
Hapjuki as a Final Resort

Line	Time Stamp (ss)	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	0:00-0:25			(students chattering; upbeat background music to signal class start time at 0:25)

2	0:26	Mr. Choi	자 다 전부 다 xxx 'Ok so everyone xxx'	
		Students		(chattering, roaming around)
3	0:42	Mr. Choi	자 이리 오세요 'Come here'	
4	0:52	Mr. Choi	[자 자 앉으세요 자리에 'Sit at your seats'	(no audible noise)
5		Ms. Jeon	[이선희 자리에 앉으세요 'Lee Sunhee sit at your seat'	
6	0:54	Mr. Choi	자리에 앉으세요 'Seat at your seats'	
7		Ms. Jeon	가서, [앉아, 주세요 'Go, seat at your seats'	
8	0:58	Mr. Choi	[자리 앉아주세요↑ 'Seat at your seats↑'	
9	1:01	Mr. Choi		((rings the bell once))
10	1:04	Students		(mostly all seated, but continues to chatter)
11	1:07	Mr. Choi		((rings the bell once more))
12	1:12	Mr. Choi	Harry, 일루오세요 'Harry, come over here'	
13	1:14	Mr. Choi	Erin	
14	1:17	Students		((some of them put both their hands up behind their head))
15	1:25	Mr. Choi	자 감사합니다, 앉으세요↑ 'Ok thank you, please seat↑'	
16	1:30	Mr. Choi	앉으세요. 우리 저, 우리 recess 가기 전에 우리 과학 공부 조금하고, 다음에	

			<p>갔다와서= 'Sit please. Before we go to recess, we're going to study science a little bit, and then after we come back=</p>	
17	1:36	Students		(chattering)
18	1:39	Mr. Choi	<p>=자 조용히 하세요, 하아::: ='Ok be quiet, ha:::'</p>	(sighs at the end of sentence)
19	1:42	Mr. Choi	<p>일루 오세요, 빨리 오세요, 빨리 오세요 'Come over here. Come quickly. Come quickly'</p>	
20	1:46	Mr. Choi	<p>자리에 와서 빨리 앉으세요, 나중에 하고 'Come to your seat and sit down, do that later'</p>	
21	1:50	Mr. Choi	<p>다 놔두고 일루 오세요 'Leave everything and come over here'</p>	
22	1:52	Mr. Choi	<p>빨리 오세요 'Come quickly'</p>	
23	1:55	Mr. Choi	<p><i>Reanna, Reanna, Reanna, Reanna, Reanna xxx</i> 빨리 와서 앉으세요 'Reanna, Reanna, Reanna, Reanna, Reanna xxx come quickly and sit'</p>	
24	2:10	Mr. Choi	<p>자 여기 보세요 'Ok look over here'</p>	
25	2:13	Ms. Jeon	<p>[앉으세요 'Sit please'</p>	
26	2:13	Mr. Choi	<p>[성육아, <i>Shhhh</i> 'Sunguk, shhh'</p>	
27	2:16	Mr. Choi	<p>합죽이가 됩시다 'Let's be a <i>hapjuki</i>'</p>	

28	2:17	Students	합! 'Hap!'	(students remain in silence for 5 seconds)
----	------	----------	--------------	---

Within two minutes, both teachers (mostly Mr. Choi) mention ‘come’ (일루오세요) and ‘come quickly’ (빨리 오세요 / 빨리 와서) for a total of eight times. They tell the students to ‘sit down’ and ‘sit down quickly’ for a total of 10 times. Moreover, both teachers call out five students separately, with Reanna being called by her name five times consecutively by Mr. Choi (line 23). Before Mr. Choi uses the ‘Hapjuki’ method in line 27, it is important to note that for two minutes, he had tried to prompt them to pay attention in multiple ways. In fact, in line 18, Mr. Choi tells them specifically to be ‘quiet’ and makes an audible sigh, which could be interpreted as a sign of his frustration. Right before he calls the *Hapjuki* method, he tells them to ‘look at him’ (line 24) and tries to hush them (line 26) as well. Similar to Excerpt 5, the *Hapjuki* method is used by Mr. Choi to get their attention and to gain silence and control; however, in Excerpt 6, we see that it was used as a last resort, as none of the multiple prompts worked for Mr. Choi.

Excerpt 7 is also a Korean class time, but it is taught by another bilingual teacher (Ms. Sohn). Ms. Sohn teaches both English and Korean classes for these students. The setting for this excerpt is right at the end of their Korean time, and they are about to switch to their English time, also taught by the same teacher (Ms. Sohn).

Excerpt 7
Hapjuki as a Transition Call

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / ((Comments))
1	Ms. Sohn	아주 잘 하고 있어요= 'You're doing great'	((looks at the clock))

2	Ms. Sohn	=(<i>clap, clap, clap-clap-clap</i>)=	((stands up and makes rhythmic clap))
3	Students	=(<i>clap, clap, clap-clap-clap</i>)	(some chattering)
4	Ms. Sohn	합죽이가 됩시다 'Let be a <i>hapjuki</i> '	((hand motion like an orchestra director))
5	Students	합! 'Hap!'	(student loudly chants 'hap') ((Ms. Sohn makes a fist motion on the 'hap'))
6	Ms. Sohn	손! [하나= 'Hand! [One'	((raises both hands in the air, palms facing the students—like a high five gesture))
7	Students	[손! 둘! ['Hand! Two!'	
8	Ms. Sohn	=둘! (0.2) 'Two! (0.2)'	((during the pause, she turns her palms facing towards her at the count of 'two'))
9	Students		(students chattering) ((students follow the hand turn gestures of the teacher))
10	Ms. Sohn	<i>Good morning boys and girls</i>	(with a gentle voice) ((bows slightly))
11	Students	<i>Good morning Mrs. xxx</i>	(loudly)

In Excerpt 7, the students show the same level of chattering noise as to Excerpts 5 and 6. However, when examining the point of when the *Hapjuki* method is used, based on the timing and the gestures of Ms. Sohn, we can infer that she uses this method as a transition and as part of a symbolic step to change into another language (English) time. Upon checking the time (line 1), Ms. Sohn makes a rhythmic clap; as a response, students clap back to the same rhythm (lines 2-3). Then, she immediately makes the transition by raising both her hands like an orchestral conductor and chants the *Hapjuki*; when students

say the *hap*, Ms. Sohn creates an o-pursed hand gesture (Boyes Braem & Bräm, 2000, p. 150)--a motion used to end music by conductors. Finally, Ms. Sohn moves on to her third phase, which is her transition gesture to the other language time (lines 6-8). From lines 2 to 10, Ms. Sohn makes a rhythmic, and rather smooth transition in each step. Moreover, because students were fully engaged in every step, they did not have the time to chatter with peers; hence, the *Hapjuki* was not fully meant to use to silence the students, but was used as part of the transition ritual, cuing the students to prepare for the next language class time.

Silence and Direct Association with Respect. Another interesting pattern shown from the TWI classrooms is the association of silence with respect. In many Asian cultures, silence and being obedient to be silent have been an explicit sign and expression of respect (St. Clair, 2015), either acknowledging the expertise and wisdom of others, mostly seniors and superiors (Gu, 2004; Yuan, 2015). Moreover, culturally and historically, children are expected to listen to their teachers and are “trained to control this opposition and obey what the teacher says” (p. 60). This Confucian-based expectation is also portrayed in our TWI language classrooms, where teachers thank the students for being silent and showing respect, or thanking students in advance and being obedient in showing silence. Moreover, teachers also make it explicit that students are making the “right” or “good” decision for showing silence. Excerpt 8 captures a prime example of explicitly associating silence with respect and right judgment:

Excerpt 8
Thank you for Showing Me Respect

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Ms. Jeon		((raises her right hand up and places her left hand over her lips; aka "be quiet" gesture))
2	Students		((three students follow Ms. Sohn's gesture)) (students' chattering noise)
3	Students		((except for a few students, almost all students are following Ms. Sohn's gesture)) (silence)
3	Ms. Jeon	(0.15) 아직 기다리고 있는데, 선생님의 이SIGN 을 하나도 못 알아듣는 친구 아직도 많아. 이게 무슨 뜻이었더라?= '(0.15) I'm still waiting, but there are still many friends who don't understand this SIGN. What did this mean again?'	((waving her right hand at the word "SIGN"))
4	Ms. Jeon	=말 그만하고= ='It means to stop talking'='	((taps her left hand over her lips three times))
5	Ms. Jeon	=선생님 봐주세요, 그 뜻이었어요= ='and to look at the teacher, that's what it meant'='	((waves her right hand in the air))
6	Ms. Jeon	=다른 말 필요없어요, 이거 보고싶어요, (0.2) 준이 하고 있나요? 윤슬 하고 있어요? (0.2) 재우이 기다릴게요 (0.3) Zoe ↑기다릴게요 (0.2) 현이도 기다릴게요. =No other words are needed, I just want to see this, (0.2) Junyi are you doing it? Yoonseul are you doing it?	((("be quiet" gesture)) (the class is silent while Ms. Jeon keeps her gesture throughout)

		(0.2) Jaewoo I'll wait for you (0.3) Zoe ↑I'll wait for you (0.2) Hyunyi I'll wait for you too.	
7	Hyunyi	<i>Samson</i> 안해요 'Samson is not doing it'	
8	Ms. Jeon	(0.7) 바꿀게요= '(0.7) I'll change='	((shows her palm to the students))
9	Ms. Jeon	=옆으로 손, 하나 둘 셋 [찰각! '=Put your hands sideways, one two three <i>chalkak!</i> '	((upon counting one, two, and three, at the <i>chalkak</i> ('a camera shutter click sound expressed in Korean'), she turns her palm/hand inward towards her))
10	Students	[찰각! '[chalkak!'	((Students follow her motion and the word <i>chalkak</i> in unison))
11	Ms. Jeon	= <i>Good morning everyone</i>	
12	Students	<i>Good morning Ms. xxx</i>	(in unison; then students start chattering in English)
13	Ms. Jeon	(0.3) <i>Turn your body and face ↑me</i> (0.8) <i>Jungwoo, Hyunwoo (0.2) Ona have a seat.</i>	((Ms. Jeon, while doing the "be quiet" gesture, moves perpendicular to where she was at; she stands by the whiteboard wall))
14	Students	((<i>silence</i>))	
15	Ms. Jeon	<i>Boys and gi:rls! (0.3)=</i>	((with a raised tone, shaking her head, doing the "be quiet" gesture))
16	Ms. Jeon	= <i>I was just here, and I moved over here</i> =	((while touching two fingers together, Ms. Jeon walks toward the original spot and then walks back in front of the whiteboard))

17	Ms. Jeon	<i>=in between that thr– short time, of about three seconds, <I couldn't believe> how loud it got! (0.5) You need to practice waiting for directions (20s). Wow word, go?</i>	((shaking her head; touches her ear when mentioning the word “direction”))
18	Students	<i>°Category sort sort°</i> <i>[...]</i>	(approximately two minutes of Ms. Jeon's lecture–omitted)
19	Ms. Jeon	<i>We've been learning [about (xxx) to school for=</i>	
20	(Unknown student)	<i>[TEACHER, can we, count?</i>	
21	Ms. Jeon	<i>=twenty eight weeks, we probably have twenty eight Wow words that we know</i>	(puts away the Wow word cards on the whiteboard slip)
22	(Unknown student)	<i>.hhh Twenty [what?</i>	
23	(Unknown student)	<i>[I thought it was–</i>	
24	Ms. Jeon	<i>[What is the date today boys and girls?</i>	((“Be quiet” gesture))
25	Students	<i>((chattering))</i>	
26	(Unknown student)	<i>FOUR THOUSAND weeks?</i>	
27	(Unknown student)	<i>천 WEEKS, 천 weeks</i>	
28	Students		((some are doing the “be quiet” gesture))
29	Ms. Jeon	<i>Thank you Yoonseul, thank you Ann, thank you Jessica, Phoenix thank you so: much for making that decision. Amanda I love the way you're showing me respect. Erin</i>	

		<i>when you're ready (0.2) show ↓me. Thank you. What is the day today boys and girls?</i>	
30	Students	<i>((low chattering noise))</i>	(Ms. Jeon stops because it is not complete silence)
31	Ms. Jeon	<i>I like the way you raise your hand before you speaking it out loud</i>	((making the “be quiet” gesture; taps her lips when mentioning the word “speaking”))
32		<i>[...]</i>	(approximately two minutes of Ms. Jeon’s lesson–omitted)
33	Ms. Jeon	<i>I'm waiting for those people who are showing me respect. And I really love the way Harry, Amanda, and Karen ↑keep showing me respect. ↑Thank you for showing us gre:at examples. If you forgot, just turn around and look at the way they are doing.</i>	(Moves back to the side of the classroom, original spot at the beginning of class; pinpointing students who are doing the “be quiet” gesture) (students are in silence)

Teachers typically employ their own style of classroom management skills, in which the purpose is to enable the teachers to focus on teaching and the students can effectively learn. However, in this excerpt, we can see how Ms. Jeon does not allow any student participation without raising a hand and being called, unless she prompts them to respond in unison. She specifically asks the students to make the “Be quiet” gesture, not just for this episode, but in all the recorded observations of her class. Her attachment to seemingly ‘absolute’ silence interferes with her moving forward with her lesson, and creates an atmosphere, where students may not feel comfortable to share ideas, not just to the teachers but also to their peers. What is interesting is how a few students, without Ms. Jeon prompting, are doing this “Be quiet” gesture constantly throughout the class, whenever they feel like other peers / the class is being loud. The students seem to

constantly check for silence, not only for this class, but for other classes (with different teachers), where the teachers are not actually prompting them to do this gesture.

In addition, this excessive focus on ‘silencing,’ is not only an extension of disciplining practices expected culturally in most Asian classrooms (with consequences attached when not in silence; Chung, 1995.; Farrell, 2021; Park et al., 1998), this practice of being silent is heavily tied to being respectful to the teacher historically and culturally (J. Choi, 2015; Lee & Lineman, 2013). Ms. Jeon explicitly comments on the show of respect, reflected in lines 29, 31, and 33 of Excerpt 8. In fact, being silent is not enough to show respect, but students need to accompany silence with a specific gesture, which is the raising of one hand and placing the other hand over the lips. The teacher points out those students who are not doing these motions, although silent, as those who are not showing respect (line 33) and that she is waiting for them to do so; otherwise, she does not move on to her lesson.

For all other occasions, whenever students respond without raising their hands, or blurt out something in unison, Ms. Jeon makes the “be quiet” gesture and reminds the students to “make a better decision,” such as the following utterances, all mentioned on different days:

“I’ll wait until everyone is ready. (Glancing at a student) Chris, make a better decision. You’re not making good decisions right now.”

“(“Be quiet” gesture) Thank you for understanding my signal and following me. Thank you for showing RESPECT! Thank you for making that great decision!”

“(“Be quiet” gesture) Thank you for understanding my signal. Thank you for making that good decision. Zoe, thank you SO:: much for showing me RESPECT. Thank you so much SO much for making a good decision Harry. Thank you so much Yoonseul. (Pointing a group of students), I think a lot of friends are needing help in making good decisions. Thank you for showing them how to make good decisions. ↓Hyunyi, ↓Samson Ahn. Make a good decision in the way you’re sitting.”

Ms. Sohn also reminds the students to be “respectful” when they attempt to talk in unison; she also defines what being “respectful” is to the students:

“Oh: I don’t see people who are being RESPECTFUL. Mrs. Choi (another teacher) is certain that we have respectful people here. Being respectful is, one way of being respectful is, LISTENING, to the person who is speaking, whether a teacher or your peer.”

III. Semiotic Hybridity

In Parts I and II of the Findings section, I explored teachers’ disciplining methods in TWI settings that may be socioculturally and historically influenced, which could potentially create cultural gaps between the teacher and multilingual students. In this section, I summarize other semiotic hybrid practices (e.g., gestures and sounds) that are incorporated in the class time that are unique to TWI setting.

Table 1
A Sample Semiotic Hybridity in a TWI Classroom

<i>Gestures and/or Sounds</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Who / Context</i>
1. Raising hand and hand turn	To signal a change in language class time (English to Korean and vice versa)	Teachers (Ms. Jeon & Ms. Sohn) and students do this motion together; teachers initiate the gesture and the students follow; this motion is frequently accompanied with a count of 1-2-3. Once the hand turn is done, the teacher and students switch into another another (Korean or English)
2. “Chalkak” sound with hand turn	To signal a change in language class time (English to Korean and vice versa)	Ms. Jeon uses this motion; <i>chalkak</i> is an onomatopoeic Korean word, which is a sound similar to a camera shutter; Ms. Jeon counts one, two, and three, and states “chalkak”; students respond back with “chalkak.”
3. Rocket cheer (hybrid in Korean and English)	To congratulate a peer for doing well	Regardless of the language time, Ms. Sohn prompts students to do a “rocket cheer” in Korean; the word “rocket cheer” is stated in English; the students then count by saying “시작 / <i>si-jak</i> ” (‘start’); students count in Korean: 3-2-1 (“삼이일” / <i>sam-yi-yil</i>), and they make a motion of putting hands together and raising it up high like a rocket blast.
4. “Be quiet” (One hand on lips and other hand raising up)	To show the teacher he/she is paying attention and/or is ready	Students and teachers, (mostly Ms. Jeon); Frequently, students, who want to show they are cooperative, choose to do this gesture; in Mr. Choi and Ms. Sohn classes, teachers do not use this gesture, but students initiate this motion whenever they feel the class is

		noisy; students during Ms. Jeon class who do this gesture get complimented by Ms. Jeon.
5. Bell (a call bell; 1 ring)	To instantly prompt students to be silent, pay attention, or to get back together as a class after a timed task or when asked a teacher-led question.	When teachers ring the bell, students' immediate response is to put both their hands on top of their head; while Mr. Choi and Ms. Jeon mostly use the bell to get students to be silent, Ms. Sohn occasionally use it as a way to signal them that time is up, after asking a question or giving a task.
6. Xylophone (3 tonal sound; “딩동댕” /dingdongdeng/)	To prompt students to put their hands over their head (as a way to prepare for the next class); used in transition times.	When this xylophone is played by the teacher manually, students stand up and place their hands on top of their head; they get ready to go to their next class; they hold this motion and not move, until the Jeopardy theme song is played or until the teacher prompts them they can leave the classroom. Occasionally, Ms. Jeon uses it to silence the students during transition times within the class time or at the beginning or end of class times.
7. Jeopardy theme song music	To prompt students to move / go back to their seats for their next class (regardless of whether it is Korean or English time).	Students pack up their things and move to the next class session (in the same classroom)
8. School Alarm (Beep and Buzz)	To alert the students to transition to another class, recess, lunch break, or end of day	A long beeping/buzzing sound made by the school; Ms. Jeon accompanies this sound with the “be quiet” motion
9. Training clicker	To prompt students to be silent	This training clicker is the most silent tool used to silence the children in comparison to other

tools the teachers use. This clicker is typically used to train animals, such as dogs, when they are complimented for their actions.

A TWI classroom is a unique setting because multilingual children are exposed to constant hybridity in language and semiotic use, that are socioculturally embedded. One of the most interesting uses of semiotics is when the class changes its language time. Because students do not go into another classroom for English or Korean classes, the teachers prompt the children to ‘switch’ the language they are using, as they are about to enter a different language time. While all three teachers have their own style of switching, one common gesture they all use is to raise their hand and do the hand turn (see Table 1, #1). Ms. Jeon, specifically uses the Korean word, “*chalkak*” along with the hand turn. *Chalkak* (찰칵) is an onomatopoeic word in Korean, which describes the sound of a camera shutter when taking a photo. With the count of one, two, and three, students and teachers in unison say *chalkak* with one clap simultaneously. Based on the classroom observations, upon doing this semiotic practice (either switching to English or Korean class), students also change their interactional language with their peers, even if five minutes ago, they were talking in the other language (matching the instructional time language). This practice is in line with the TWI program’s goal of separating languages—using English language only during the English instructional time and using non-English/“target” language only during the assigned non-English/“target” instructional time (Cummins, 2008; Howard & Christian, 2002; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). However, this language separation practice in TWI is still heavily debated whether or not this truly benefits multilingual children, who has the ability to transfer and use all their linguistic resources simultaneously while learning (Genesee et al., 2006; Gort, 2006, 2008; Reyes, 2006). Given that multilinguals use their full linguistic and cultural repertoire (Bauer &

Gort, 2012; Gort 2006), Hornberger and Link (2012) recommend the use of translanguaging inside TWI classrooms, especially since multilingual children are not two (or more) monolinguals in one (Grossjean, 1989).

In this TWI classroom, although the language separation is in place, there are several instances of teachers' linguistic and cultural transfer that are intentional and strategic (Escamilla et al., 2014), such as these hybridized semiotic practices listed in Table 1. Another example of this practice is reflected in #3 of Table 1, in which Ms. Sohn asks the class to congratulate a peer by doing a "rocket cheer" stated in English. However, regardless of the language instruction time, the term "rocket cheer" is always stated in English, while the rest of the act of doing the rocket cheer is performed in Korean language, by doing a 3-2-1 countdown in Korean ("삼이일" /*sam-yi-yil*/).

Aside from these two specific examples that are related to language and gesture, sounds/music are also added in multilingual teachers' practices in the TWI classroom. There are diverse sounds (e.g., school bells) commonly used to manage a classroom, but as shown in Table 1, it is important to be aware how even sounds can reflect cultural influences, thus showing hybridity. For example, how the xylophone is used in the TWI classroom (#6 in Table 1) can be inferred as a practice influenced by Korean culture and context. In Korea, xylophones are frequently used in classrooms (and other quiz-like settings), specifically by playing the musical notes of "do-mi-sol" to indicate that an answer is correct. Oftentimes, a Korean speaker would say the onomatopoeic word, "딩동댕" /*dingdongdeng*/, which is reflective of the 3-level tonal sounds played by TWI teachers in this study. Verbalizing these tones happens when there is no xylophone, or if the speaker just wants another creative way to say, "you're correct" in their everyday language practices. In this TWI context, this xylophone, using these three, sequential tonal sounds, is used in both English and Korean language class times to prompt students

to place both their hands on their heads to be ready for the next class. As for Western cultural influences of using semiotic resources, the data showed patterns of using a classic desk bell, the American Jeopardy theme song, and a training clicker, regardless of the language instruction time. A classic desk bell, originated from the reign of George I, desk bells were “commonly used throughout America and the continent to summon servants to the dining room to wait on staff” (AC Silver, n.d.). In this TWI classroom, the teachers use it to prompt students to be silent or to signal them that their time is up for doing a task. The use of the American Jeopardy theme song is interesting as it signals multilingual children to prepare for their next class time, which can either be Korean or English. Finally, the use of training clickers, are not used in the Korean setting, but are typically used in the U.S. to train dogs and compliment their good behavior. The TWI teachers incorporate the use of this low-level click sound to discipline children to be silent in the classroom.

Discussion & Implications

This study examined how multilingual teachers used hybridity in the classroom. Specifically, in the context of strict and visible language separation approach/policy to ensure bilingual/multilingual development in a TWI program (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), this study investigated multilingual and multicultural teachers’ embodied hybridity in practice, mixing and blending linguistic and cultural values, and crossing over sociocultural boundaries. With research claiming the importance of learning both language and culture, and considering the goal of fostering cultural competence especially in a TWI context, this paper opens up the discussion in the following three considerations: (1) Whether or not teachers should teach, practice, and expose the culture that correspond to the language, and vice versa simultaneously; (2) whether or not

teachers should teach the corresponding language “A” and culture “A” separately from language “B” and culture “B”; and (3) what considerations need to be taken when dealing with multicultural and multilingual teachers (and children), who embody linguistic and semiotic hybridity, and thus may not have a clear-cut cultural and linguistic boundary in practice.

My findings reveal that multilingual teachers—whether consciously or subconsciously—frequently embedded their hybridized, complex sociocultural and socioethnic values into their teaching practices. While bilingualism and multilingualism research generally advocates for teaching language and culture jointly, we ought to be mindful that children’s backgrounds are diverse, especially in a TWI setting. For instance, there may be a child whose ethnic background may not be in line with the non-English, target language, and thus may not fully understand or even agree with the cultural practices the teacher embeds or enforces in the classroom. Also, there may also be a child, whose ethnic background is in line with the non-English target language, yet she/he may refuse to accept the heritage cultural norms practiced by the teacher in the classroom. Heath and Mclaughlin (1993) argue that when children are forced to adapt to their heritage, they sometimes break off from their heritage link. As this result can bring a severe impact on heritage language education and maintenance, many educators should continue to ponder upon ways to teach language and culture, while considering their own and learners’ complex hybrid identities.

The incident of Mr. Choi touching Amanda’s head and the discourse exchanged between the two is a prime example to rethink the issue of language and culture. Specifically, Amanda, who is multilingual and multicultural, reacted strongly to Mr. Choi’s head touch, considering it as an act of ‘Korean-style’ disciplining (꼴밤 /*kkulbam*). When her affect was not validated by Mr. Choi (“that was not even painful”),

this seemingly had bothered her even more, and thus expressed other instances of Mr. Choi pinching and pricking her. Whether or not these instances were true, Mr. Choi further dismisses her by warning her that she will receive a “yellow card.” This dismissal was not simply because he did not believe that she was in pain, but there seemed to be a cultural, power stance. As discussed in my review of literature, challenging the teacher’s authority in Korea is considered disrespectful and face threatening (Lo, 2009; Lo & Howard, 2009). Moreover, in Korea, students displaying affect, such as Amanda, inside the classroom is frowned upon (Lo, 2009).

At both the policy and pedagogical level in a TWI program and when dealing with multilingual/multicultural learners, it is crucial to think about how teachers implement cultural values during language instructional time. In this study, the question lies whether it is ‘okay’ to embed Korean cultural values during the Korean language instructional time, or that regardless of the language instructional time, the U.S. school frame should be the ultimate standard to follow. For future research, it will be meaningful to explore whether multilinguals’ cultural behaviors correspond 1 to 1 to the language situation they are in, or whether their dominant cultural practice comes into play in either language situations.

Another aspect I explored in this paper is the semiotic hybridity when disciplining inside the classroom. Regardless of the language instruction time, there were instances of teachers enforcing Western style disciplinary methods (Capriola, 2018), such as having the learner go to the corner and think, or Korean/Asian style, such as the ‘stand up and sit down’ exercise-like disciplining commonly used in Korean classrooms and Korean military. In both language times, however, all the teachers frequently indexed their Korean cultural identity, with an emphasis on valuing silence, and relating silence to an

act of showing respect (J. Choi, 2015; Chung, 1995.; Farrell, 2021; Lee & Lineman, 2013; Park et al., 1998; St. Clair, 2015).

In relation to silence, this study presented various ways ethnically Korean, multilingual teachers utilized a unique, Korean-style call and response method called *Hapjuki* in both English and Korean instructional times. Although these young learners may not deeply think about or even aware of ‘who’ they have to be while being silent (the literal and historical reference to the word *Hapjuki* is a old grandma with no teeth; “합죽이”, n.d.), this chant to grab attention instantly, to transition, or to silence children as a final resort is an interesting, culturally rich, hybrid semiotic practice the multilingual teachers utilize in the classroom. While teachers’ attachment to classroom silence is complex, the cultural value of showing respect was highly emphasized. For instance, when the children talked without raising their hands, the teachers asked them to make a “better decision”; the teachers also thanked them for showing respect by remaining silent and/or obeying the teachers’ prompt to be silent (Gu, 2004; St. Clair, 2015; Yuan, 2015). This cultural value of silence and respect (J. Choi, 2015) seemed to have effectively penetrated into the children’s mindset, including those who do not share the Korean ethnic background, as many of them took agency in doing the “be quiet” gesture on their own, without the teachers prompting, regardless of whether it was Korean or English instructional time. Thus, this raises another important question: Should language teachers make efforts to detach from their own multicultural values and practices and follow the dominant, U.S. based practices, if possible?

Finally, there were intentional hybrid usage by multilingual teachers, as described in Table 1, such as counting in English while using Korean onomatopoeic words when switching language instructional time, using the Jeopardy music during language transition time, and playing three tonal xylophone sound, commonly used in Korean

classrooms, to indicate the answer is correct. Semiotic hybridity displayed in Table 1 is an example of multilingual/multicultural teachers incorporating hybridity in creative and engaging ways, as they tap into the childrens' multiple linguistic and semiotic resources.

While language separation continues to be the recommended approach in many language programs to have successful language development (Lindholm-Leary, 2001, 2011), this study provides an insight that in practice, this is not easy. We see in this study that due to the complex nature of multilingual and multicultural teachers (and children), teachers perform a hybridized practice in the classroom, such as enforcing certain cultural values, while the multicultural children either push away or adapt to this cultural norm. This paper also demonstrates that multilingual and multicultural teachers tend to emphasize and practice their ethnically-based cultural values, regardless of the language instruction time.

Chapter 5: Hybrid Semiotic Practices of Multilingual Children

Introduction

The Deficit Views around Multilinguals and their Speech

When it comes to multilinguals who claim to speak a language, but is a heritage language (HL), the expectations toward the speaker and the speech competency are somewhere in between that of native speakers and that of L2 learners (Kondo-Brown, 2006; Lee, Moon & Long, 2009; Lee & Zaslansky, 2015; Montrul, 2015). This ‘in-between’ perception further places multilingual speakers as those who have the “-like” proficiency—native-like, learner-like (Kim, 2008). This creates a dilemma for multilingual speakers and is an alarming concern for multilingual learners, because while monolingual speakers are seen as ‘at least’ fully fluent in one language, multilingual speakers are perceived to be ‘half-full’ in terms of fluency in all the languages spoken.

Amongst the multilingual speakers, deficit views toward the speakers who claim or consider to speak HL have the worst stigmatization, despite the benefit of having sociocultural and even ancestral connection to the language, as well as possessing an intuition about what “sounds” right (Benmamoun et al., 2013; Lee & Zaslansky, 2015; Sorace, 2004, 2011; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009). Multilingual speakers, in particularly HL speakers, are often misunderstood or mis-positioned as “semilinguals” (Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986; Shin, 2013), “non-standard” (Jo, 2001; Lee & Shin, 2008), “incorrect” (Lo & Kim, 2012; Lee & Zaslansky, 2015), “inauthentic” (Lo & Kim, 2012), and “comical” (Sun, Lee & Yuan, forthcoming).

What adds to the complexity is when multilingual speakers are examined through a “native speaker gaze” (Harris & Lee, 2022), which encompasses native speakers’

expectation towards multilingual speakers to possess a certain linguistic level or fluency, especially HL fluency, in connection with the speakers' race and ethnicity. Instead of fostering and validating a multilingual identity, with rich and diverse sociolinguistic repertoire, perpetuating negative views towards multilingual speakers create linguistic insecurities. Bucci and Baxter (1984) define *linguistic insecurity* as "situationally induced, a matter of performance in certain contexts rather than a fixed attribute of an individual. A person may be fluent and expressive in informal settings in his own speech community, but his language behavior and attitudes change in contexts in which SAE [Standard American English] is the expected norm" (p. 192). Multilingual speakers' linguistic insecurity is typically triggered when they are surrounded by situations that make them think or assume that their linguistic ability is being judged negatively. Similar to having a "poor body image" of self, Bucci and Baxter explain that speakers with linguistic insecurity may have a "poor speech image," which lead them to "feel bad" or embarrassed by how they talk (p. 191). In Sun et al.'s (forthcoming) study, their multilingual speaking participants show frustrations as they find themselves having to explain to monolingual, native speakers of Korean constantly, not because they are prompted to do so, but as their defense mechanism and their keen awareness of the "listener's negative judgments" when they are around native speakers (Bucci & Baxter, 1984, p. 192). Interestingly, when these multilingual speakers are surrounded by other multilingual speakers, they often do not feel insecure when talking. In fact, the participants feel good about their linguistic fluency and their language practices (Sun, et al., forthcoming). Thus, the source of many multilingual speakers' linguistic insecurity is not from self or within, but is mainly driven by 'outside' societal deficit perceptions.

Another important discussion is the actual language practices of multilingual speakers. Because the dominant perspective in educational settings towards bilingual and

multilingual speakers is two (or more) monolinguals in one body/mind (Cummins, 2008; Grosjean, 1989; Hall & Cook, 2012), whenever multilinguals code-switch, translanguaje, mix, blend languages (or what I deem all as “hybridity”), the society and the education system often misperceives their language practice as having a “incomplete” acquisition (Montrul, 2008). Further, multilingual speakers, specifically those who speak an HL, are often understood as having an “unbalanced” internal grammar system (Attig, 2019; Kiaer & Bordilovskaya, 2017; Martínez et al., 2015; Shin, 2017), which refers to unequal language fluency (Polinsky & Scontras, 2020). However, these theories are continued to be challenged by researchers (Pascual y Cabo & Rothman, 2012; Otheguy, 2016), arguing that framing as such is inaccurate, as these leave out the sociocultural context, and causes a misunderstanding of multilinguals' highly cognitive ability. Bilinguals and multilinguals, which includes HL speakers, are not only inherently different from monolinguals due to the co-existence of two or more linguistic systems, but their complex identity and experiences all contribute to how they produce a unique speaker-hearer language variety, which should not only be mistreated and misperceived as errors.

Is it Konglish?

When it comes to multilingual speakers, when speakers use hybridity in Korean and English, researchers often refer to their speech as “Konglish.” Lawrence (2012) describes Konglish (along with Chinglish and Janglish) as a “potential contact vernacular developing as a creative mix between English and the local language, which normally include morphology, semantics and syntax but may also include pronunciation, pragmatics and discourse” (p. 73); it is developed through cultural exposure since the arrival of the U.S. army, and is “a spoken, not codified language...conceptualized as a sub-variety of Korean, in the form of words and phrases” (p. 73). However, I find this

term unfitting and even lacking to fully describe the language variety and the linguistic and semiotic practices of multilingual speakers of Korean and English. Konglish, which is also known as the Korean-style English in Korea, is still continuously associated in a deficit way, associating the speaker with a “low” social status (Nam, 2010; McPhail, 2018), and often perceived as not being educated ‘enough’ to speak English fluently. McPhail (2018) adds that Konglish has a long history of stigmatization due to its connections to the U.S. military and Korean women, being uneducated, and adherence to impure forms of language use.

This negative perception towards the use of Konglish is further stigmatized by regarding it nationally, including in presidential speeches, as an insufficient language practice (Lee, 2010). Currently labeled as a “wrong” way of speech, when someone mispronounces words, such as stating the word “pork” with a /p/ instead of “fork” with an /f/, speakers are perceived to be speaking “Konglish” (Lee, 2019). Hence, the focus is primarily on the lack of fluency in English, judged by native speakers of Korean, and not truly the hybridity within the repertoire of a multilingual speaker. Moreover, because the word Konglish is associated amongst interlocutors of native Koreans using English, typically used in the South Korean context (Nam, 2010), it is deemed as a “locally created variety of English” (Lee, 2019, p. 33) used by Korean speakers/hearers. Also, Konglish has been referred to as a variety that frequently uses English loan words transferred into Korean pronunciation or meaning, for instance, *aisukhulim* for ‘ice-cream’ (Cheng, 2020).

For this study, due to the negative positioning and stigmatization surrounding the concept of Konglish, and in my attempt to acknowledge multilinguals’ language use as creative, systematic, and dynamic, I refer to their speech as “Kyopomal” (i.e., “the Korean word for language used amongst Koreans living abroad”; Sun et al., p. 1, forthcoming). I also use the lens of “hybrid semiotic practice,” which I define as speakers

taking agency to innovatively and collaboratively practice diverse sets of linguistic, cultural, and semiotic resources. Using this lens, I explore the following research question in this paper:

- (1) How do multilingual children use linguistic and semiotic hybridity when communicating with their peers and teachers?

This study overall contributes to the expansion of patterns of speech practiced by Korean American “Kyopos” (a Korean word referring to overseas ethnic immigrants; M. Song, 2005); the original effort in exploring the patterns of Kyopomal is adopted from Sun et al.’s work (see Appendix A for a sample list of characteristics of this hybridized language variety).

Methods

Research Data

The data used in this study is part of a larger data set of 240 hours of video and audio recordings of first-grade Korean-English (K-E) two-way immersion (TWI) classroom of 26 students at an elementary school in Southern California. The school follows a typical 50/50 model, where students receive a daily language and content instruction half of the day in English and the other half in the target language/Korean. The larger data set included classroom data, summer school audio data, school playground/cafeateria/hallway/outside the classroom school data (I refer as “non-classroom” data), afterschool club data, interviews of teacher, parents, and children, various relevant classroom artifacts (e.g., copies of lesson handouts and assessments) as well as researchers’ field notes. To explore my research questions, I combed through approximately 24 hours of classroom video data, 10 hours of non-classroom data, and 30 hours of children’s home interview video data. However, I observed and captured the

most amount of HSP during children’s peer-to-peer interaction outside of the classroom; this is perhaps due to the TWI model and policy, where students were aware of language separation policy (e.g., students mentioning to peers and teachers that it is not “English time” or “Korean time”) and/or the teachers implicitly or explicitly enforced this language separation policy. Further, outside the instruction time is where I noticed the most ‘natural’ talk and interactions amongst multilingual children, as they did not act on the role of being a ‘learner’ outside of the classroom.

Students

Within the 1st grade classroom of 26 students, there were 20 multilinguals who were ethnically Korean and eight who were non-Korean (two mixed heritage students of Japanese/white and Chinese/white; two white students; one African American student; and one Filipino student). Among the 20 ethnically Korean students, eight were born in Korea and 12 were born in the U.S. In this study, I focused on four ethnically Korean students who showed instances of HSP. Table 1 provides a brief description of the focal students’ background and which excerpt(s) in the Findings section I highlight the interactions of these focal students.

Table 1
Focal Multilingual Students’ Background

Student Name	Excerpt(s)	Description
1. Shannon	1, 3, 4, 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Born in the U.S. ○ Family/parents migrated in the late 1990s. ○ Speaks mostly Korean language at home through daily interactions with family members, especially her grandmother and older siblings; speaks both English and Korean at school with peers. ○ (Based on parents’ interview) Family values Korean language development; her grandmother helps with her Korean language homework. ○ (Based on teachers’ interview) Teachers view her Korean

		<p>is stronger than her English language ability; they believe that her “everyday language” interaction in Korean is great, but she still needs to improve her “academic language” in Korean.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Based on fieldnotes) She “switches” her languages between English and Korean when interacting with her sister.
--	--	---

2. Jessica	1, 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Born in the U.S. ○ Speaks mostly Korean language at home; speaks both English and Korean at school with peers. ○ (Based on parents’ interview) Her language ability in Korean improved because the mother explains concepts to her and reads a lot of books to her in Korean. ○ (Based on fieldnotes) There is a home language policy of speaking Korean at home; she has to read one chapter of Korean bible (religious) text everyday before going to bed. ○ (Based on teachers’ interview) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers view her Korean as “extremely strong” in all areas--speaking, reading, vocabulary, and writing ○ Teachers believe that her English ability improved because she began to use Korean and English separately in the classroom: “Before, she mixed up two languages. But now, she speaks English during the English instructional time, and Korean during the Korean instructional time.”
------------	------	---

3. Amanda	2, 3, 4, 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Based on researcher’s observation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Speaks both English and Korean at school with peers naturally. ○ She frequently uses a hybrid semiotic practice when communicating with teachers and peers, including switching/alternating languages between English and Korean, blending and mixing both languages creatively; she seems to choose the languages and use these in hybrid forms based on topic, interlocutors, etc. ○ Unlike other focal students in this study, her background information is limited, as data on her (e.g., parents’/teachers’ interviews and fieldnotes) were not collected because at the time of collection, she was not one of the focal students of the researchers’ study.
-----------	------------	--

4. Ann	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Born in the U.S. ○ Speaks Korean and Japanese (and sometimes English) at home; speaks both English and Korean at school with peers. Her mother is ethnically Japanese and her father is ethnically Korean.
--------	---	---

-
- (Based on parents' interview) They are involved in her language development, especially Japanese (for the mother)
 - (Based on fieldnotes)
 - Her mother usually talks to her in Korean, but she sometimes switches into Japanese or English.
 - She rarely speaks Japanese, but it seems that she understands her mother's talk in Japanese.
 - Her room is filled with Japanese, English, and Korean books.
-

For this study, I purposefully do not focus on multilinguals' linguistic proficiency of each language, as part of the purpose of presenting this research is to showcase multilinguals' competence using multiple languages in hybrid forms naturally, creatively, and with agency. That is, it is limiting to categorize multilinguals, especially learners such as this group who are developing all the languages simultaneously, and claim that one language is more dominant than the other (i.e. referring to multilinguals as Korean-dominant or an English-dominant speaker). Further, in the current education system, multilinguals continue to be assessed with one language proficiency at a time and not necessarily their multilingual competence itself to use various languages in complex and creative ways. Through research our understanding of who multilinguals are and their language practice have grown, acknowledging that they practice hybridity when communicating and that they possess one linguistic repertoire; yet our current assessment of their competence remains stagnant—highly focused on English language and evaluating their language ability separately, which continues to feed into the ideology that they are two (or more) monolinguals in one body/mind (Grosjean, 1989).

Data Collection

Two researchers collected the data over the course of eight months; they recorded full instructional days at regular intervals throughout the school year (e.g., at the

beginning and end of the academic year). Two researchers, who assumed a passive role of observer participant (Spradley, 1980) in the classroom operating two video cameras (front and back). During the non-classroom time, the researchers carried their own video camera and followed a few students around to capture their talk. As one can notice from this study, these two researchers interacted with the students frequently, as the children asked questions and engaged with the researchers, calling them as a “teacher.” The researchers switched back and forth from being an active and passive observer during the collection of non-classroom data. They also took fieldnotes of the activities and interactions and collected various artifacts, including students' writings and assessments to attain more contextual information about the students and setting.

Data Analysis

Interactional Hybrid Episodes

When analyzing the video data, I used the Transana software to clip, code, transcribe, and manage analytically interesting moments. I also received assistance from Spanish-English and Korean-English bilingual research assistants to check the accuracy and confirm the reliability of the transcriptions and the translations. Further, I utilized a discourse analysis approach (Gee & Green, 1998; Green & Wallat, 1981; Gumperz, 1986) to analyze meaningful episodes in the classroom. Cazden's (2001) work on classroom discourse also served as a guide to analyzing language interactions when coding interaction patterns, especially when they use hybridity in their language and semiotic practices.

For this study, as my research question investigates the *how multilingual children use linguistic and semiotic hybridity when communicating with their peers and*

teachers, the first step of my data analysis was to code for the following hybrid instances during their interaction:

- (1) Linguistic hybridity (e.g., switching or alternating languages at the sentence/utterance level, blending languages at the word-level, mixing languages at the sentence/utterance level, etc.)
- (2) Semiotic hybridity (e.g., (subcategories) Cultural, Gestures, Sounds, Affect, Other Resources/Artifacts)
- (3) Linguistic + Semiotic Hybridity (a combination of both [1] and [2])

When coding for these instances, I added details, describing what this hybridity looks like, which led to subcategories. For example, when marking as a linguistic hybridity, I added details, such as (a) how this hybridity looks syntactically; (b) functionally (whether this practice reflects blending, alternating or switching, etc); (c) languages involved; and (d) the number of times hybridity happened and the direction of switch, if applicable (e.g., noting that the conversation started in English, and then it went to Korean, and ultimately coming back to English) during the selected “interactional episode.” An interactional episode, as defined by Fortune (2001) enabled me to bound an episode as a unit of interaction “to describe the contextual, social, and linguistic features” of interlocutors (p. 141). This interactional episode unit includes sufficient, rich contextual cues of interaction (e.g., a discussion of a topic), instead of a smaller analytic unit of turns or utterances by participants. Adapting this concept, when coding for all linguistic and semiotic “events” with hybridity, I refer to the analytic unit as an *interactional hybrid episode*.

When it comes to semiotic hybridity, once I identified the subcategories listed above, similar to linguistic hybridity, I added details helpful to identify patterns. For instance, for the “culture” subcategory, while it is difficult to pinpoint a single culture

influencing their language choice or action, I notated certain possible cultural references to how and why they use language in such ways. If the subcategories are not unique to a particular language and/or culture (and thus being ‘hybrid’), I made an effort to add possible semantic and pragmatic details of the interaction to help with the analysis. For the “gesture” subcategory, this includes hand gestures, facial gestures, gazes, eye movements, and body movements. For the “sound” subcategory, this includes tone, pitch, and/or voice description, sounds involving the use of body (e.g., whistle sound, snapping sound of fingers, clapping sound, and paralinguistic sounds, such as “/tsk-tsk/”), and other external sounds, such as bells, music, etc. The subcategory “affect” includes any expressions or show of emotions/attitudes. Although this subcategory can be expressed through gestures and sounds, the purpose of separating this category is to focus on and describe what emotions and attitudes are presented by the interlocutor(s) during the interaction. Finally, “other resources/artifacts” is an open-ended subcategory, which I mostly used for including utilization of external materials during the conversation, and highlighting the importance of interlocutor’s engagement with the material(s) (e.g., books, flashcards, wall signs, handouts, etc.). It is important to note that one single instance may include multiple utilization of the subcategories of semiotic hybridity, along with the linguistic hybridity.

In the second step, I further coded for the following spaces that the aforementioned hybridity occurred: (1) when (e.g., at the beginning of class time; context of the scenario); (2) where; (3) with whom; (4) for what purpose (e.g., why the interaction is happening, why the hybridity is possibly happening); (5) the theme of the interaction; (6) interactional moves (e.g., question, recast, request, etc.); and (7) the relationship of interlocutors (e.g., teacher-student). Then, I identified common patterns (more than 3+ occurrences) within each interactional hybrid episode to understand how multilingual

children showed hybridity in their interactions with peers and teachers. Each instance within the interactional episode, reflecting multiple utilization of hybridity, was then marked as an example of hybrid semiotic practice (HSP).

Upon selecting the interactional hybrid episodes for the study, I transcribed these in the original language (e.g., Korean), and translated these into English (Skukauskaite, 2012). When analyzing the data, specifically the identified common patterns (Neuman, 1997; Yin, 2003) across the collected instances of HSP, I sought to understand how these linguistic and semiotic hybrid patterns reflect their unique identity as a multilingual speaker rather than analyzing how they differed (or similar) from native speakers. When transcribing, I included both the linguistic utterances and nonverbal communication of the interlocutors to capture the meaning-making processes (Goodwin, 1981; Kendon, 1990) and to have a deeper understanding in the context of teaching and learning (Yore & Treagust, 2006). When analyzing the discourse, I adopted Bloome et al. (2005) transcription conventions, with some additions and modifications (see Appendix B). For certain transcribed words in Korean, I included the romanization of Korean speech, using the Revised Romanization of Korean, which is used by the Korean government (Ministry of Culture & Tourism, n.d.).

Findings

This section is divided into two parts. I first present a diverse set of patterns of *hybrid semiotic practices* (HSP) of multilingual learners. I highlight some of the patterns that have been already explored in Sun et al.'s (forthcoming) work on characteristics of Korean American Kyopomal. The second section shows a summary of multilingual children's interviews on their perceptions and attitudes toward bilingualism/multilingualism and their identity.

I. Patterns of Linguistic and Semiotic Hybridity in Students' Talk

Pattern 1: Adding an Emphasis, Visualizing, and/or Giving Further Description

The setting of Excerpt 1 is during their lunch break. Jessica and Shannon, are multilingual students who both use Korean and English at home and at school. Here, Shannon, who has a younger/baby sister, describes how she is to her friend, Jessica. Due to recording limitations, there are portions where Jessica's voice is inaudible. However, Shannon is the focal point of this analysis, who is actively and dynamically using HSP in her interaction with Jessica.

Excerpt 1

Hybrid Semiotic Practices of a Multilingual Child

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Shannon	<i>My baby</i> 인현 ('Inhyun') <i>she's small, she could eat</i> 라면 ('ramen')	
2	Jessica	xxx	
3	Shannon	<i>yeah and she could eat xxx and everything</i>	
4	Jessica	xxx	
5	Shannon	<i>it's not even spicy for her</i>	
6	Shannon	<i>Is it good, brownie?</i>	((pointing to her brownie in her lunch tray))
7	Jessica	xxx	
8	Shannon	<i>OF COURSE she could!</i> 들어서 먹어 매일 ('She lifts it and eat it everyday')	((with both hands in front of her mouth))
9	Shannon	재, 과자 어딘는 줄 알고, 물 어딘는 줄 알고, 우유 어딘는 줄 알고, 옷 어딘는 줄 알고, 화장실 어딘는 줄 알고, 다 알아 @@	((counting with fingers when making the list))

		‘She knows where the snack is, where the water is, where the milk is, where the clothes are, where the bathroom is, she knows everything @@’	
10	Shannon	하고 침대도 매일 혼자 올라가고= ‘She also climbs up the bed by herself everyday=’	
11	Shannon	=↑이렇게 큰데 =‘↑even though it’s this big	((raising her hand high))
12	Jessica	어떻게 들어가? ‘How could she go?’	
13	Shannon	<i>I don't know~I don't know how she learned that!</i>	
14	Shannon	<i>When I was a baby, I didn't-- I was like 영 /eong/-- crawlin?</i>	((makes a crawling motion with both hands))
15	Shannon	<i>Oh, just, so ↑옛날에</i> (‘in the past’), 인현’s (‘Inhyun’s) <i>face was like ALL FAT? Like THIS? =</i>	((with eyes widened, while curving her left palm and placing over her left cheek like a puffed cheek))
16		<i>=but then she was like BIG? =</i>	((shaking her head))
17		<i>=and now she eats ↑↑쪼끔씩 쪼끔씩</i> (‘little by little’)? =	
18		<i>=NOW her face is like °this° @@@</i>	((pressing her left cheek flat with her left palm, with eyes dropping low))

In Excerpt 1, the main pattern shown in this short discourse is using linguistic and semiotic hybridity whenever the speaker is seemingly making an emphasis, giving additional details or description, and to help the interlocutor visualize the description. Shannon, not only switches to another language to show a sudden contrasting effect in her utterance, but she also accompanies gestures with either of the languages to allow the interlocutor to better engage and picture what she is describing.

In line 1, Shannon first mentions what her sister can eat, which is “ramen” noodles. She pronounces this word in Korean 라면 /rAmandaeon/ [la:mjʌn] instead of the

Westernized pronunciation of this foreign borrowed word [ra:mən]. She adds how these foods are “not even spicy for her,” pointing how this is shocking or amusing considering her sister is still a baby. When Jessica asks her a question of whether her sister can do something (inaudible, but this question is assumed due to Shannon’s response in line 8), Shannon reacts that her sister can do this. She then switches to Korean and adds further details, describing how her sister eats, accompanied with her gesture with both hands in front of her mouth (line 8). In lines 9 to 11, she continues on to provide more details/examples of what her sister can do, and shares this in Korean; when she is listing all the examples, she again accompanies with gestures, a counting motion using her fingers. In line 11, she emphasizes how tall the bed is with her raised tone and a gesture of raising her hand up high, as she tries to help visualize the height, and accentuate how tall it is, with the word 이렇게 (‘this’) prior to stating the word ‘tall.’

As shown in line 13, Shannon, an multilingual speaker, smoothly transitions back to English, which is the language she first began with in this lunch conversation. Shannon continues on by sharing how her sister is amazing for her age for doing all these things, unlike herself who could only “crawl” when she was a “baby” (line 14). In that same line, she tries to switch to Korean before using the word “crawl.” It is not clear why she cut off the word 영긎 /eonggeum/ and only stated the first part—whether the word 긎 /geum/ was inaudible in the recording; or she decided to use the word “crawl” in English instead as it seems more ‘fitting,’ especially since 영긎 is a descriptive movement associated with a turtle, signaling ‘slow’ (Naver, n.d., 영긎), and thus she may not have wanted to relate herself with this word; or she simply did not remember the 긎 part of the word.

Regardless of the reasons, we can see two patterns—one is using the gesture to show this motion of crawling to emphasize, visualize, and add details, as well as a similar pattern highlighted in Table 1 (Characteristics of Kyopomal; Sun et al., forthcoming), which is

switching into another language prompted by the word “like” (Patterns 1a, 1b, and 1c); another example of this use of “like” is shown in the latter part of this section in Table 2 (“expansion” of the characteristics displayed in Table 1).

Lines 15 to 18 of Excerpt 1 further exemplifies the HSP of a multilingual speaker. Here, Shannon not only mixes English and Korean in her utterance, but she also uses her entire body (face, hands, and voice) to tell a much more descriptive story of how her sister was before and how she is now. In line 15, to stress the ‘before’ aspect, she uses the word 옛날에 /yennare/ ‘in the past.’ This word in Korean is frequently used in storytelling of folktales, 옛날 옛적에 /yennal yetjeoge/ ‘A long time ago’ (Naver, n.d. 옛날옛적), which similar to the English fairytale beginnings of “A long time ago” or “Once a upon a time.” She makes another switch to Korean in line 17 to show contrast in her utterance, which is spoken majority in English, and to convey how her sister now only eats a ‘little’ (조끔씩). There are two important practices here: First, she not only uses this word 조끔씩 /jjokkeumssik/ [tʰjokumsig] repeatedly (twice) to emphasize this word, but to pragmatically signal that the act of eating less was done ‘gradually’ or in ‘progression,’ similar to ‘little by little’ (Naver, n.d., 조끔씩). Second, the word 조끔 is originally written and pronounced as 조금, but in the Korean language, some adjectives and adverbs can be further emphasized by making the originally non-aspirated, non-double consonants of ㅈ [tʃ] and ㅋ [k] into ㅉ [tʃʰ] and ㅋ [kʰ], respectively. When switched to a double consonant, more force is added when pronouncing the consonants and is said with a higher pitch, but the sound is not aspirated (Naver, n.d. 조끔씩). In contrast to the native Koreans’ constant mockery associated with Korean American immigrants,’ specifically Kyopos’ speech, reflected in the media (Sun et al., forthcoming; Hankyulle, 2009), where they are assumed to be unable to pronounce consonants according to its sound, but instead are turned into aspirated consonants—such as from the

consonant ㄱ [g] to ㅋ [k] in 한국말 [*hangugmal*] ('Korean language') to 한국말 [*hank^hugmal*] (Hankyulle, 2009). Referring back to Shannon's utterance, she did not pronounce the word 조금씩 [*dʒ'ogumsig*] into 초큼씩 [*ts^hok^humsig*]; instead she said 쪄끔씩 [*ts'okumsig*] which follows the prescriptive grammatical rules of the Korean language, using double consonants, and pronounced as how 'native' speakers assume to be the 'correct' form. Along with this complex linguistic hybridity, she uses gestures throughout her utterance, adding depth and creativity to the story, making it interesting and engaging for the hearer.

Pattern 2: Showing Creative Language Play (and to Accommodate)

In Excerpt 2, there are three speakers involved. Ann, Jessica, and Amanda are all multilingual speakers who speak both English and Korean at home. The (data collection) researcher, who is called a “teacher,” holds the camera, video-recording the students; the researcher is also multilingual, but speaks mostly Korean at home. The setting for this excerpt is during the lunch break. The children invite the researcher/teacher in their imaginary playscene of being in the “snow.”

Excerpt 2
Creative Hybrid Language Play

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Amanda	<i>We need to go!</i>	
2	Ann	빨리 가요, 빨리 가야해요. 'Let's go quickly, we need to go quickly.'	
3	Researcher	왜 빨리 가야되요? 'Why do we need to go quickly?'	
4	Ann	지금 눈 오잖아요! 봐봐요! 지금 눈	((while pointing to the sky))

		오잖아요 지금 'It's snowing! Look! It's snowing right now'	
5	Amanda	봐봐, <i>white stuff</i> 그거 다 눈이예요 'Look, white stuff they're all snow'	((while pointing the ground / grass))
6	Jessica	<i>White stuff? (0.2) eyeball</i> 이예요 'White stuff? (0.2) It's eyeball'	(silently)
7	Ann	여기요, 꽃 동네 새 동네 'Here, this is flower town new town'	(singing a song/a rhythmic tone)
8	Jessica	<i>I need to do this</i>	(out of the camera angle)
9	Ann	선생님! 우리가 이거 들고 있을래요, 네? 'Teacher! We'll carry it [camera], please?'	
10	Researcher	선생님이 할께요.: 'Teacher [referring to self] will do it'	
11	Amanda	아니 ('No'), <i>Ann do like this one like before.</i>	
12	...		(conversation omitted)
13	Jessica	<i>Smells so good.</i> 선생님 옷 냄새 너무 좋아요 ('Teacher your clothes smell good')	

Aside from the children showing their creative imagination of snowing in Southern California, their language practice sheds light to layers of creativity. In line 2 and 3, Amanda and Ann prompt the researcher to 'go quickly'; when the researcher asks for the reason for rushing to go, Ann and Amanda point out that 'it is snowing' and there is currently 'snow on the ground.' When Amanda pinpoints the "white stuff" and refers to it as 'snow' (line 5), Jessica hops in the conversation. For a second or two, Jessica wonders what Amanda refers to as "white stuff," but she joins this imaginary play by "giving further description" of the utterance (which is pattern described earlier in Pattern 1 of this section). Her description of snow or the "white stuff," which she states as "eye

ball,” is what makes this instance a creative representation of HSP (line 6). At a glance, one may wonder why “eyeball” and may even presume that this was said in ‘mistake.’ However, the main reason why “eye” is mentioned in the first place is because ‘eye’ in Korean is 눈 /nun/, which is also the same word for ‘snow.’ The “ball” part of the “eyeball” comes from the English reference of “snowball”; thus, the Korean word for ‘snow’/‘eye’ is combined with the English word of “ball.” Although there was no visible “ball-shaped” “white-stuff” in the video-recording on the ground, at a very short span of time, Jessica was able to think and mix words in two languages, drawing from her linguistic repertoire and funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). Jessica’s hybrid practice was not because she lacked the linguistic knowledge or the conceptual understanding of the word “snow” in either Korean or English, but because she was able to draw from both language resources, and she wanted to creatively contribute to the conversation, while accommodating the researcher, who mostly speaks Korean to the children.

Later, Jessica shows another hybrid practice that is characterized in Kyopomal (Table 1, Patterns 1a, 1b, 1d), which is repetition of the *entire* utterance in both languages. When the school bell rings, Jessica walks past the researcher, and she mentions how her clothes “smells so good” in both English and Korean (line 13). This practice, as discussed in Sun et al (forthcoming), is not only to emphasize the utterance being said, but is also to accommodate the hearers and their assumed to be ‘dominant’ language, in this case, Korean for the researcher.

Pattern 3: Pronouncing (Borrowed) Words According to the Interlocutor’s Language

The setting of Excerpt 3 is during lunch time. The (data collecting) researcher, who is multilingual but mainly speaks Korean at home and mostly communicates in Korean to the children, video-records Shannon as the focal point. As mentioned earlier,

both Shannon and Amanda are multilinguals who speak both Korean and English at home. While the camera angle focuses on Shannon only (and not purposely filming Amanda), Amanda includes herself in the conversation and goes back and forth between talking to Shannon in English and to the researcher in Korean. The excerpt begins with Amanda asking the researcher what she wrote in her field notes journal.

Excerpt 3
Pronunciation Hybridity & Accommodation 1

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / ‘translation’)	((Gestures)) / (Comments)
1	Amanda	뭐 적어요? ‘What are you writing?’	((looks at the researcher))
2	Researcher	뭐 먹나 적어요. ‘I’m writing what she is eating’	(she is currently filming Shannon eating lunch; she responds to Amanda while continuing to focus her video angle on Shannon)
3	Amanda	<i>Shannon! She's writing what you're eating right now</i>	((looks at Shannon))
4	Shannon		((smiles shyly; continues to eat))
5	Amanda	여긴 뭘 적혀 있어요? ‘What’s written here?’	((pointing to the notebook))
6	Researcher	응? ‘What?’	
7	Amanda	여기요. 옥수수 다음에요. ‘Here. After corn’	((pointing to the notebook))
8	Researcher	<i>Chicken</i> [tʰɪkʰɪn] 이요. ‘It’s chicken [tʰɪkʰɪn]’	
9	Amanda	<i>Chicken</i> [tʰɪkʰɪn] 이요? 앵? <i>Ketchup</i> [kʰɛtʰɪab] 은 왜 안 적어요? ‘It’s chicken [tʰɪkʰɪn]? /Eng?/ Why didn’t you write ketchup [kʰɛtʰɪab]?’	(/Eng/ is a onomatopoeic word in Korean signaling something is surprising, almost equivalent to ‘what?’)

10	Researcher	아, 그거는 중요하지 않을것 같아서 안 적었어요. 'Ah, it's because I didn't think of it as important so I didn't write it.'	
11	Amanda	<i>She wrote, look look, she wrote</i> 옥수수 ('corn'), <i>Chicken</i> [ʈʂʰikʰin], 우유 ('milk')	((looking at/prompting Shannon))
12	Shannon	나볼래요 'I want to see'	((takes the field notes journal from the researcher and reads it))
13		...	(conversation omitted)
14	Amanda	선생님, 안경 찍어요 ('Teacher, film my glasses') <i>Hello! My name is glasses! My name is Amanda's glasses bye. Hula hula!</i> 선생님 잠깐만요. 나 안보여요 <i>pen</i> ('Teacher wait. I can't see the pen').	((puts her glasses in front of the camera))

During this entire interaction, the researcher films Shannon. Yet as shown in Excerpt 3, Shannon does not talk a lot and only focuses in eating her lunch. In contrast, Amanda tries to engage with both interlocutors. Interestingly, she seems to function like an interpreter, going back and forth, repeating what the interlocutors say, despite the fact that all of them can understand each other, such as in lines 3 and 11. Furthermore, when Amanda talks to the researcher, she only speaks in Korean (lines 1, 5, 7, 9, and 14), and when she interacts with Shannon, she mixes Korean and English (3, 11). One can infer, based on observation, that as Amanda switches languages back and forth, Amanda is mostly trying to accommodate the 'dominant' language of the researcher, which is Korean; Shannon, who can also speak both Korean and English, talks to the researcher in Korean (line 12). Yet the highlight of this excerpt is in lines 9 and 11. When Amanda pronounces these two borrowed English words, *치킨* /chikin/ [ʈʂʰikʰin] and *케찹* /kechap/ [kʰetsʰab], she enunciates it in what research refers to as "Konglish"--a Koreanized way

of English (Lo & Kim; 2012; Nam, 2010). Amanda’s mirroring of pronouncing 치킨 as such, perhaps, could have been influenced by how the researcher said the word 치킨—in the perceived ‘Koreanized’ way, or how ‘native’ Korean speakers in Korea state certain borrowed English words. However, Amanda continues on mentions the word 케첩 in the prescriptive ‘Koreanized’ way (line 9), while asking why the researcher did not write this word in her journal. One of the biggest misperceptions about hybridized way of talk is the assumption that multilingual speakers is not proficient ‘enough’ in either languages. However, in this case, not only is the speaker, Amanda, is fluidly switching back and forth, using the language that she deems the hearer is more comfortable with or the language she thinks the hearer is most used to (for both the researcher and Shannon), but she is even considering the linguistic context of how certain (borrowed) words are used. In other words, Amanda is making sure she ‘sounds like’ the prescriptive way a native speaker talks when stating her utterance in line 9. In line 11, however, when speaking with Shannon, she is using hybridity in her talk, to show she is multilingual and because she shares the same identity as Shannon.

In another occasion, Shannon attempts to accommodate the hearer / researcher and pronounces an English word in a way she assumes native Koreans would pronounce this word. Excerpt 4 is a short episode where Amanda and Shannon approach the researcher because Samuel hit Shannon and the other girls. Both Shannon and Amanda bring Samuel in front of the researcher.

Excerpt 4
Pronunciation Hybridity & Accommodation 2

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / ‘translation’)	((Gestures)) (Comments)
1	Shannon	여기 ‘Here’	(She brings Samuel in front

			of the researcher filming the camera; she stands behind Samuel)
2	Amanda	<i>Samson</i> 이 애 때려요 'Samson is hitting her'	
3			(<i>Nae</i> is used to get attention or to confirm, similar to 'hey,' 'look.' Amanda is trying to get the teacher's attention) (Her tone is very high pitched)
	Amanda	네? 사진 찍지마요! 그거 땀에 아니라 때렸어요. ' <i>Nae?</i> Don't film! It's not that but he hit [her]'	
4		알아요, 때렸으면 어떻게 해야되요? [미안하다고 사과하면 되죠. 'I know, if someone hits another person, what should we/you do? You need to apologize.'	
5	Amanda	[say]-	
6	Shannon	[<i>Sorry [z^holi]</i> 도 하나도 안했어요. 이렇게 하나도 안 만지고 그냥 이렇-- 그냥 이렇게만 해요. 하나도 안 만졌어요. 'He didn't even say sorry [<i>z^holi</i>]. He didn't even touch and only did this. He didn't touch at all.'	((she waves her hand in the air, showing the motion of slight touch))
7	Amanda	그리고 이렇게 스윽... 'And like /seueuk/...'	(seueuk is an onomatopoeic sound in Korean of sweeping of hand)
8	Researcher	<i>Sorry [soli]</i> 할땐 이렇게 만져야돼요? 'When saying sorry [soli] do you have to touch like this?'	
9	Amanda	네 'Yes'	
10	Shannon		((nods))

In line 1, when Shannon brings Samuel in front of the researcher, Amanda explains what Samuel did (line 2). When the researcher does not respond to their

‘complaint,’ Amanda becomes upset and almost yells at the researcher telling her to not record but to act upon the situation (line 3). When the researcher acknowledges her and talks to all of them—instead of just to Samuel. In line 4, she asks a rhetorical question and provides a solution to the situation: “If someone hits another person, what should we/you do? You need to apologize.” This ‘need’ to apologize is more of an implied one due to how it is stated grammatically, specifically the *-하면* /*hamyeon*/ at the end of the utterance is used as an ‘if’ (e.g., 사과 *하면* /*sagwahamyeon*/ ‘if [you] apologize’); and *되죠* /*doejo*/ can be interpreted as ‘then it will be.’ When the researcher asks the rhetorical question, Amanda, in line 5, responds with “say—” but gets interrupted by Shannon; the cut off word most likely is “sorry.” Shannon then explains to the researcher that Samuel did not say the word “sorry” and also did not do the gesture of apologizing, which is probably something their teacher or class decided as a rule (line 6); she shows the gesture to the researcher how Samuel should have done and what Samuel actually did as an apologetic gesture. The highlight, however, of this utterance in line 6 is how she pronounced the word “sorry.” Instead of the prescriptive English pronunciation of “sorry” [sa:ri], she pronounces it as [ʒʰoli], which is similar to the word 소리 /*sori*/ in Korean, which means ‘sound.’ This utterance reflects an interesting way of using hybridity, because the speaker seemingly tries *not* to mix languages to accommodate the native speaking hearer by changing the pronunciation of an English word into her perception of how a Korean speaker would say the English word (though it is not a borrowed word used in Korean context).

Pattern 4: Following the Syntax Rules of the Language Dominant during Utterance

Excerpt 5 is another episode during the lunch period. The interlocutors are Amanda, Shannon, and the researcher. Unlike Excerpt 3, when the researcher is only

recording Shannon, in this episode, the researcher films both Amanda and Shannon while they are having a conversation while eating their lunch. In the following excerpt, once again, Amanda talks in Korean to the researcher whom these children perceive her to have a more preference, comfort, or dominance in speaking in Korean, as she has only communicated (productive speech) with them in Korean. Shannon, in previously presented excerpts and in other episodes, also talks in Korean to the researcher.

Excerpt 5

Fluid Hybridity following Syntax & Accommodation

Line	Speaker	Transcription (<i>original</i> / 'translation')	((Gestures)) (Comments)
1	Amanda	<i>Hi! Shannon~</i>	
2	Shannon	<i>Hi::: stop it!</i>	
3	Amanda	선생님, <i>TV</i> [<i>tʰibi</i>] 하는거예요? 아니면 그냥 찍는거예요? 'Teacher, are you doing TV [<i>tʰibi</i>]? Or just filming?'	
4	Researcher	그냥 찍는거예요. 'I'm just filming.'	
5	Amanda	아:: 'Ah::'	((puts her face/mouth in the camera))
6	Shannon	<i>Amanda, sto:p it</i>	
7	Amanda	<i>TV</i> [<i>tʰibi</i>] 로하면 안돼요? <i>TV</i> [<i>tʰibi</i>] 하면 재밌겠다 @ 'Can you do it as TV [<i>tʰibi</i>]? It'll be fun to have it as TV [<i>tʰibi</i>] @'	
8	Shannon		((smiles really hugely))
9	Amanda	<i>TV</i> [<i>tʰibi</i>] 로하면(.)= 'When doing in TV [<i>tʰibi</i>](.)=	((facing Shannon))
10	Amanda	=Shannon, 'member we're talking about news [<i>nu:z</i>]?=	
11	Amanda	=나 news [<i>njusu</i>] 에 나왔어요.	((facing the researcher))

		‘=I was on the news [njusuu].’
12	...	(omitted conversations)
13	Shannon	<i>Okay you're funny. You know Samantha? She's so nice.</i>
14	Amanda	<i>Who?</i>
15	Shannon	<i>Samantha</i>
16	Amanda	<i>Who's Samantha?</i>
17	Shannon	<i>She's my friend!</i>
18	Amanda	<i>I have a friend named Samantha</i>
19	Shannon	<i>Samantha comes to this school.</i>
20	Amanda	<i>Huh?</i>
21	Shannon	<i>Samantha, comes to this school.</i>
22	Amanda	<i>Huh?</i>
23	Shannon	<i>SaMANtha comes to this school</i>
24	Amanda	<i>Samantha comes to this school?</i>
25	Shannon	<i>Yeah...I saw her in the office</i>
26	Amanda	<i>When you were 아팠다 ('sick')? your 머리 ('head')?</i>
27	Shannon	((nods))

In this episode, Amanda begins by interacting with Shannon in English (lines 1 and 2), as Shannon tells Amanda to stop interfering with the researcher’s filming. When Amanda talks to the researcher in line 3, she switches back to Korean language. This fluidity of Amanda’s linguistic hybridity continues on as Amanda, from talking to the researcher in Korean, quickly interacts with Shannon in English about how they were recently “talking about [her being in the] news” (line 10). Amanda then returns back to

her conversation with the researcher, in Korean, letting her know that she was in the news (line 11).

In addition, similar to Excerpt 3, Amanda is cognitively and socioculturally aware of how borrowed words are pronounced by native Korean speakers. When she pronounces the English borrowed word “TV,” instead of saying the prescribed English pronunciation of [ti:vi:], Amanda utters it as [thibi] (lines 3, 7, and 9). Amanda’s hybrid practice to accommodate is particularly shown in both lines 10 and 11. When Amanda talks to Shannon and refers to the word “news” (line 10), she utters it in the prescriptive English pronunciation [nu:z]. Yet in line 11, when immediately Amanda goes back to talking to the researcher, she pronounces “news” as /nyuseu/ [njusu], which is the ‘Koreanized’ way of stating the borrowed English word.

One of the highlights of Excerpt 5 is Amanda’s hybridity *in between* her utterance in line 26: “When you were 아팠? Your 머리?” (‘When you were sick? Your head?’). In the Korean language syntax, this statement would be typically stated in the following order of words:

너 - 머리 - 아팠을 때
neo - meori - apasseul ttae
Your - head - sick - time/when
‘The time/when your head was sick’

너 - 아팠을 때
neo - apasseul ttae
You - sick - time/when
‘The time/when you were sick’

When examining how Amanda said this sentence, “When you were 아팠? Your 머리?”, she follows the syntax of English. While she changes a few words in Korean, she did not put these Korean words randomly, but instead accordingly—placing the Korean adjective (아팠) where the English adjective fits, and putting the Korean noun (머리) into where

the English noun should be in the syntax of English. This is neither a coincidence nor a mere switch of certain words. As described earlier, this follows the pattern of using hybridity to emphasize words or concepts. This pattern is also displayed in Table 1 from Sun et al (forthcoming), where Korean American Kyopos follow the syntax of the language that is dominantly used in that particular utterance—and this happens not only in English (such as this case in Excerpt 5), but also in Korean (see Table 1, patterns 2 and 3). Overall, this highly cognitive, systematic use of hybridity is unique to multilingual speakers and most likely is a *shared* patterned practice amongst the group of immigrant multilingual speakers.

Additions to the Characteristics of Multilingual Speakers (specifically of Korean American Kyopos)

In this section, I present Table 2, which consists of additional examples that use the same patterns of Korean American Kyopos’ hybrid speech, mentioned in Sun et al’s (forthcoming) original work (see Table 1). Some of the examples are taken from the excerpts discussed previously in this chapter. As an extension, there are two additional patterns to characterize the hybrid linguistic and semiotic practices of multilinguals, specifically Korean American Kyopo speakers. This list is not exhaustive, and is open for further additions and analyses. provide an overview additional examples, some are taken from the excerpts analyzed

Table 2
Additional Characteristics of Kyopomal of Multilingual Speakers of Korean

Patterns & Examples	Description
1. Adding translation in Korean/English afterwards / Use of “like”	

<p>a. <i>Smells so good.</i> 선생님 옷 냄새 너무 좋아요. ('Teacher your clothes smells so good')</p>	<p>A word, phrase, or the entire sentence in one language is translated to the other language, after they have already mentioned this in the other language.</p>
<p>b. <i>There's like</i> 단추 ('button'; points to it), and <i>she always takes it out, all by herself</i></p>	<p>Oftentimes, as shown in Examples b and c of Pattern 1, prior to switching / translating, they preface the word "like." In these examples, the speakers are not necessarily explaining the words, but simply repeating it, translated in gesture or the other language.</p>
<p>c. <i>When I was a baby, I didn't. I was like</i> 영/eong/-[금] crawlin?</p>	<p>The purpose may be to accommodate the interlocutor, to emphasize the word(s), to ensure the meaning gets across.</p>

2. Replacing verbs in Korean/English (but still follows the syntax of the dominant language spoken)

<p><u>English Verbs:</u></p> <p>a. 선생님 나 Ellie 랑 노는데 자꾸 나 bother 해요. 나 재 Ellie 랑 놀구 있는데, Shannon 하고 Anna 가 자꾸 나 Bother 해요. 'Teacher I'm playing with Ellie but she bothers me. I'm playing with Ellie, and Shannon and Anna bother me.'</p>	<p>When the dominant language spoken is language A, when they replace a verb word in language B, they still follow the syntax of language A; this pattern applies vice versa for the other language. In Examples a Pattern 2, the speaker follows the default Korean syntax of subject-object-verb (SOV), as the dominant language spoken is Korean. Instead of randomly inserting words from either languages, speakers place either the Korean or English verb in the sentence to be "grammatically correct" in the dominant language spoken.</p>
---	---

3. Replacing adjectives/adverbs in Korean/English; switching frequently after the word "너무" (but still follows the syntax of the dominant language spoken)

<p><u>Korean Adjectives/Adverbs:</u></p> <p>a. <i>When you were</i> 아파 ('sick')? b. <i>Now she eats</i> 조금씩 조금씩 ('little by little')</p>	<p>Similarly to Pattern 2, when speakers replace an adjective or an adverb in Korean or English, they follow the</p>
--	--

English Adjectives:

- c. 너무 너무 *blurry* 해요 ('It's very very blurry')

syntax of the dominant language spoken.

Additionally, speakers tend to switch to the other language right after using “너무” ('very/too/super') (In Table 1 of Sun et al, “so” in English also prompts for the switch to Korean). The purpose of using hybridity may be to emphasize the adjectives/adverbs, as these words are accentuated during discourse, and to better reflect the storytelling (such as Example b of Pattern 3: instead of stating ‘gradually’ or ‘little by little,’ 쪼끔쪼끔 쪼끔쪼끔 with double consonant use and repetition, along with the higher pitch tone, enables the hearer to have a better picture of the situation.

NEW #1: Replacing nouns in Korean/English; frequently after the word “너무” (but still follows the syntax of the dominant language spoken)

English Nouns:

- a. 너 코구멍에 *Flower* 들어갔어. 코구멍에 *bee* 가 계속 들어가서 너 아야아야하고 코딱지가 너무 많아져
'Flower goes into your nose. Bees keep going into your nose and you'll be /aya-aya/* and will have a lot of booger'

In the original Table 1 characteristics of Kyopomal (Sun et al, forthcoming), it does not include examples showing multilingual speakers' replacement of nouns. Here, similar to Patterns 2 and 3, the replacement happens following the syntax of the language uttered dominantly. Also, when pronouncing words in Korean (Examples b to f of Pattern New #1), speakers pronounce them in the prescriptive 'native' speaker way. When pronouncing words in English, it varies—while some are uttered in the prescriptive American English way, some borrowed English words are

Korean Nouns:

- b. *Your* 머리 ('head')
-
- c. *She's taking picture of your* 음식 ('food').
-
- d. *If you look in the camera, your* 음식 ('food') *is more smaller*
-
- e. *She wrote, look look, she wrote* 옥수수 ('corn'), 치킨 ('chicken'), 우유 ('milk')
-

- f. *She could eat* 라면 ('ramen noodles')
-

	pronounced in the ‘Koreanized’ way (see Pattern New #2 below). */aya-aya/ is a Korean onomatopoeic sound when someone is hurting.
--	--

5. Using Korean/English words unique, representative or exclusive to the language and culture

<u>Korean words:</u>	Speakers typically use hybridity to be creative, to be efficient, and to make a connection or reference unique to their Korean and American hybrid identity and culture. For instance, in Example a of Pattern 5, the speaker mentions “옛날에” (‘a long time ago’) as she begins to tell a story about how her baby sister was and is now. The word “옛날에” is typically used in Korean storytelling beginnings, such as in the Western fairytale beginnings of “Once upon a time.”
a. <i>Oh, just, so 옛날에</i> (‘in the past’), <i>인현’s</i> (Inhyun’s) <i>face was like all fat, like this?</i>	

NEW #2: Pronouncing words (frequently borrowed words in English) in a ‘Koreanized’ way to accommodate

a. <i>Chicken</i> [tʰɪkʰɪn]이요? <i>Eng?</i> <i>Ketchup</i> [kʰɛtʰɪb]은 왜 안 적어요? ‘It’s chicken [tʰɪkʰɪn]? /Eng?/ Why didn’t you write ketchup [kʰɛtʰɪb]?’	To accommodate the interlocutor’s speech and to represent a multilingual competence and identity, the speakers pronounce English words, some borrowed, in ways that native Korean speakers have adopted to pronounce these words in Korea (except for Example b of New #2).
b. <i>Sorry</i> [zʰoli]도 하나도 안 했어요. ‘He didn’t even say sorry [zʰoli]’	
c. <i>TV</i> [tʰibi]하는거예요? ‘Are you doing TV [tʰibi]?’	
d. <i>나 news</i> [njusu]에 나왔어요. ‘I was on the news [njusu].’	

As shown throughout the previous excerpts and Table 2, multilingual children, particularly Amanda, Shannon, and Jessica all switch back and forth in Korean and English depending on who the hearer is. When they speak directly with the native Korean speaking hearer (the researcher), they communicate in Korean, with seemingly effortless

yet purposeful accommodation reflected through their *choice* of using (and not using) hybridity, including attempts to pronounce the English words (some borrowed) in a ‘Koreanized’ way. Characteristics of language hybridity identified initially from the original work of Sun et al (forthcoming), specifically patterns 1, 2, 3, and 5 in Table 1 are reaffirmed through this study, along with additional patterns from this study (listed as New#1 & 2).

Discussion & Implications

This study presented a variety of hybrid semiotic practices that multilingual children use during interaction. Specifically, multilingual children showed not only a hybridized linguistic practice (i.e., mixing, blending, switching, alternating of two or more languages at the word and utterance level), but their practice is deemed as ‘hybrid’ due to including semiotics. This addition of semiotics (e.g., gestures, culture, affect) when describing multilinguals’ speech practices expands the current research on how multilinguals communicate—from code-switching and translanguaging (García & Sylvan, 2011) to hybrid language practice (Gutiérrez et al., 1999) to what I frame in this paper as a *hybrid semiotic practice*.

Additionally, this paper analyzed and provided further sample patterns of Korean Americans’ speech. Through this process, I found that their hybridized practices, including which languages to blend and switch are not random, but are rather systematic and strategic. Some of the highlighted reasons for using HSP are: (1) to make an emphasis; (2) to elaborate; and (3) to accommodate the interlocutor. This study reveals similar speech patterns to Sun et al.’ (forthcoming) findings, and demonstrates that multilinguals even at a young age use HSP. For example, they use a hybrid language to contrast words in two different languages to highlight a certain point (e.g., 너무 blurry

해요; It's very blurry). They also repeat the word, phrase, or the entire sentence in the other language afterwards, not only to accommodate the interlocutor (as the interlocutor may also be multilingual), but to emphasize a point. They also use language and semiotics (e.g. gestures) in hybrid ways to ensure that the meaning is delivered accurately, especially if there is a more 'fitting' word in the other language. Multilingual speakers use HSP to help the interlocutor better visualize their story. For example, when Shannon was telling her story in English about her younger sister and how she crawls slowly to Jessica (see Excerpt 1), she incorporated a lot of the Korean linguistic and cultural aspects, such as using the word “엇금” /*eonggeum*/ ('crawl'), a descriptive movement but is used as an onomatopoeia word for turtles when crawling at a slow pace. Along with uttering this word, she acted out the movement to show what this word means, even though Jessica, being fluent in Korean, probably already understood the word. Shannon's HSP use thus represents a highly cognitive strategy to make her story engaging to the interlocutor.

Multilingual speakers in this study also showed that they are capable of using/following the 'prescriptive' ways of pronunciation of words in sociolinguistic context. For instance, Shannon pronounced the word 조금 [*ɕogum*] as 쪼끔 [*ɕ'okum*], which is used commonly by native Korean speakers to pragmatically turn the meaning of the word from 'little' to 'very little.' Multilinguals also showed that they are capable of pronouncing words in ways a 'native' Korean speaker assumes to be the 'correct' form. For instance, Amanda pronounced the English borrowed words chicken and ketchup in Korean way, ㄷ이킨 'chicken' as [*ɕ'ihikin*] and 케첩 'ketchup' as [*k'ets'hab*].

The study also presented ways in which multilingual speakers play with language (Čekaitė & Aronsson, 2005). For example, Jessica could have used the English word "snowball" during her imaginative play with other multilingual peers, but she instead

called it “eye-ball” in English. This utterance did not mean she did not know the difference between a snowball and an eyeball; this marks her knowledge that she is fully aware that the word for ‘snow’ and ‘eye’ are the same (눈 /nun/), thus was referencing to 눈공 /nun-gong/ ‘snowball.’ These types of creative attempts should not be perceived as a language error, but instead, these should be regarded as a complex and innovative practice that is unique to multilinguals. Such hybridity and creativity are used to make their meaning-making process richer and to show their competence in accessing and utilizing their resources in multiple languages and semiotics.

Another interesting pattern in this study that showed similarity with Sun et al (forthcoming) is when multilingual speakers frequently repeated their utterance, following it with a translation of words or phrases into the interlocutor’s presumed language of preference/comfort. At a glance, their utterance may seem to be redundant. However, their practice needs to be viewed as a communicative attempt to show accommodation and/or to ensure that the interlocutor(s) understood the full message.

Finally, the data showed that multilinguals are highly cognitive in word placement strategies. That is, when multilinguals inserted a Korean word, and when the ‘majority’ or ‘most’ of the speech/conversation was in English, they followed the syntax rules of English. This was also the case when inserting English words during the Korean conversation (thus following the syntax rules of Korean). Moreover, they even go further by conjugating the replaced word to make sure that the word is grammatically equivalent to the language spoken. For example, in the sentence “This is so 재밌어 /*jaemisseo*/ [‘fun’]”, the word *jaemisseo* has been conjugated from the base form 재밌다 /*jaemitda*/, because the base form is commonly considered as a dictionary form. Such systematic use of word placement to fit better in utterance is not random, but is a shared pattern practiced by multilinguals, particularly amongst the Korean Americans (Sun et al., forthcoming).

More studies need to be done whether such word placement patterns and hybridity appear amongst other immigrant community speeches.

This study has a significant implication for theories in SLA (second language acquisition). Aside from the methodological recommendation to include semiotics (e.g., gestures, affect, culture) when analyzing multilinguals' language practices (framing it as hybrid semiotic practice [HSP]), this study raises the question whether we should view multilinguals as "X-language dominant" or "Y-language dominant" depending on their language assessment outcome, the perceived language of comfort, the language of use in school, or their home/heritage language. The basis for questioning such frame/perception is because, as reflected in this study, multilinguals (even at a young age) use hybridity constantly as part of their everyday speech. While I acknowledge that my focal participants were seemingly fluent in both Korean and English, however, even if the multilinguals are still developing their language proficiency, their hybrid semiotic practice, especially amongst the community of multilingual immigrant speakers, is already commonly practiced and established. In other words, when they are practicing this hybridity, there is no clear cut boundary to determine and claim that multilinguals are dominant in X or Y language, by counting the amount of language use in X or Y in a single utterance; we cannot say that they are blending 60% of words in X language and 40% in Y language and thus, he/she is a dominant X language user. Multilingual speakers are a unique group, in which they use hybridity in strategic and creative ways, as well as with agency, choosing resources to hybridize for their complex communicative purposes.

On that note, this study also calls to re-examine the recommended language separation policy in TWI programs, considering that multilinguals' everyday language practice, including the practice of their community members, to interact and make meaning, is a hybrid one. Restrictive classroom language policy may not be the most

effective approach for multilinguals as they tend to access and use all of their linguistic and semiotic resources when communicating. When not having a strict language separation policy, advocates of the TWI model is concerned that learners may end up only using and developing one language proficiency and not the other language(s). However, this research provides an insight to how effectively multilinguals manage multiple languages even at a young age. Therefore, we should acknowledge that multilingual speakers do not necessarily develop language sequentially and do not practice language in a compartmentalized manner, by switching one language off while using another language. Further, at the pedagogical level, educators should tap into multilinguals' hybrid resources and practices, fostering and validating their strategic and innovative multilingual competence.

References

- Ahn, H. N. (1994). Cultural diversity and the definition of child abuse. In R. Barth, J. D. Berrick, & N. Gilbert (Eds.), *Child welfare research review* (pp. 29–55). Columbia University Press.
- American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP). (1998). American Academy of Pediatrics: Guidance for effective discipline, committee on psychosocial aspects of child and family health. *Pediatrics*, *101*, 723–728.
- Amrein, A., & Peña, R. A. (2000). Asymmetry in dual language practice. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n8.2000>
- Attig, R. (2019). Coco and the case of the disappearing Spanglish: Negotiating code-switching in the English and Spanish versions of Disney and Pixar's animated film. In *Hybrid Englishes and the Challenges of/for Translation* (pp. 151-162). Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.
- Baker, C. (2010). Increasing bilingualism in bilingual education. In D. Morris (Ed.), *Welsh in the 21st century* (pp. 61–79). University of Wales Press.
- Bauer, E. B., & Gort, M. (2012). *Early biliteracy development*. New York, NY.
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics*, *39*, 129–181. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2013-0009>
- Bialystok, E., & Craik, F. I. (2010). Cognitive and linguistic processing in the bilingual mind. *Current directions in psychological science*, *19*(1), 19-23.
- Birk, S. K., Davison, C., Bartels, S., Aldersey, H., Oo, N. N., Mhote, P. P., & Purkey, E. (2021). Perceptions of child physical discipline among Burmese migrants living in Mae Sot, Thailand. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *4*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100234>
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407–434). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Boyes, Braem, & Bräm. (2000). *Set of hand shapes set by conductors in non-dominant hand gestures*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Set-of-hand-shapes-set-by-conductors-in-non-dominant-hand-gestures-Boyes-Braem-Braem_fig1_340606884
- Bucci, W., & Baxter. M. (1984). Problems of linguistic insecurity in multicultural speech

- contexts. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 433(1), 185-200.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2016). Embodied sociolinguistics. *Sociolinguistics: theoretical debates*, 1(1), 173-200.
- California Department of Education. (2012). *Parental waivers for English Learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/er/parentalwaiverltr.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2015b). *State schools Chief Torlakson calls first year of CAASPP results California's starting point toward goal of career and college readiness*. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr15/yr15rel69.asp>
- California Department of Education (2018a). *English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)*. www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ep/
- California Department of Education (2018b). *Four-year adjusted cohort outcome - 2017-18*. <https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/CohOutcome.aspx?cds=00&aggllevel=state&year=2017-18>
- California Department of Education (2021). *English Learners in California schools: Information, resources, and educational outcomes for English Learner students*. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sg/englishlearner.asp>
- California Department of Education (2022). *English Learners*. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/>
- California Legislative Information (2017). *California Education Code, Article II, Section 306 (a)*. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=1.&title=1.&part=1.&chapter=3.&article=2
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Capriola, D. P. (2018, December 30). *Is standing in the corner a good punishment?* Strategies for Parents. <https://strategiesforparents.com/is-standing-in-the-corner-a-good-punishment/>
- Čekaitė, A., & Aronsson, K. (2005). Language play, a collaborative resource in children's L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 2(26), 169-191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amh042>
- Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Turner, A. M. (2017). Countering silence and reconstructing identities in a Spanish/English two-way immersion program: Latina mothers' pedagogies in El Nuevo Sur. In X. Rong & J. Hilburn (Eds.), *Immigration and education in North Carolina: The challenges and responses in a new gateway state* (pp. 195-220). Brill Sense.

- Cha, M. (2020, April 4). *Rod of love: An excuse for child abuse*. The Yonsei Annals. <http://annals.yonsei.ac.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=2110#:~:text=The%20so%2Dcalled%20%E2%80%9Crod%20of,to%20take%20such%20disciplinary%20actions>
- Cheng, A. (2020). Accent and ideology among bilingual Korean Americans. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley].
- Choe, Y. H. (1974). Commoners in early Yi Dynasty civil examinations: An aspect of Korean social structure, 1392-1600. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 33(4), 611–631. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2053128>
- Choe, Y. H. (1987). *The Civil Examinations and the Social Structure in the Yi Dynasty Korea, 1392-1600*. Korean Research Society.
- Choi, J. Y. (2015). Reasons for silence: A case study of two Korean students at a U.S. graduate school. *TESOL Journal*, 6(3), 579–596. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.209>
- Choi, Y. (2014). Moving forward: Asian Americans in the discourse of race and social problems. *Race and Social Problems*, 6(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-014-9113-6>
- Christian, D. (2016). Dual language education: Current research perspectives. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10, 1–5.
- Christian, D., Howard, E. R., & Loeb, M. I. (2000). Bilingualism for all: Two-way immersion education in the United States. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(4), 258–266. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477345>
- Chung, Y. (1995). *Physical Punishment (Bul)*. www.stwing.upenn.edu/~yangsup/bul.html
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education. Heinle & Heinle.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (2008). Multi-competence: Black hole or wormhole for second language acquisition research. In Z. Han (Ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 16–26). Multilingual Matters.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.
- Cuban, L. (2013). *Inside the black box of classroom practice: Change without reform in American education*. Harvard Education Press.

- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction. In Street, B. & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., vol. 2, pp. 71-83). Springer Science + Business Media.
- de Jong, E. J. (2013). Effective bilingual education: From theory to academic achievement in a two-way bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 26(1), 65-84.
- de Jong, E. J. (2016). Two-way immersion for the next generation: Models, policies, and principles. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 10, 6–16.
- Durán, L., & Palmer, D. (2014). Pluralist discourses of bilingualism and translanguaging talk in classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 14(3), 367-388.
- Duran, R. P. (2020a). "Orienting assessment toward serving students reaction to contributions of Edmund Gordon: We need to change educational practice and assessment together". *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 39(3); 79-80.
- Duran, R. P. (2020b). "The Changing U.S. Latinx immigrant population: demographic trends with implications for employment, schooling, and population Integration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43(1), 218-232.
- Dworin, J. (2003). Examining children's biliteracy in the classroom. In A. I. Willis, G. E. García, R. Barrera, & V. Harris (Eds.), *Multicultural issues in literacy research practice* (pp. 29–48). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eldering, L. (1998). Mixed messages. Moroccan children in the Netherlands living in two worlds. In E. T. Trueba, & Y. Zou (Eds.), *Ethnic identity and power, cultural contexts of political action in school and society* (pp. 259–282). SUNY Press.
- End Corporal Punishment. (2021, March). *Corporal punishment of children in the Republic of Korea*.
<https://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/wp-content/uploads/country-reports/RepublicOfKorea.pdf>
- Erikson, F. (1997). Culture in society and in education practices. In A. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. (3rd ed, pp. 32-60). Allyn & Bacon Press.
- Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O., & Escamilla, M. (2014). Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action (pp. 25-26). Caslon Publishing.
- Farrell, C. (2021): *School corporal punishment in South Korea*. World Corporate Punishment Research. <https://www.corpun.com/counkrs.htm>
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education.

Educational Policy, 30, 13–38.

- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Flores, N., & Schissel, J. L. (2014). Dynamic bilingualism as the norm: Envisioning a heteroglossic approach to standards-based reform. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 454–479. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43267976>
- Fránquiz, M. (2012). Traveling the biliteracy highway: Framing biliteracy from students' writings. In E. B. Bauer & M. Gort (Eds.), *Early biliteracy development: Exploring young learner' use of their linguistic resources* (pp. 132–156). Routledge.
- Freeman, R. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 202–229.
- Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap*. Pew Hispanic Center. <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/89.pdf>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. New York: Blackwell/Wiley.
- García, O. (2011). Educating New York's bilingual children: Constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14, 133–153. doi:10.1080/13670050.2010.539670
- García, O. (2013). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism, and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface and hybridity* (pp. 100–118). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. In *Equity Matters: Research Review No. 1*. A Research Initiative of the Campaign for Educational Equity.
- García, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. In *Equity Matters: Research Review No. 1*. A Research Initiative of the Campaign for Educational Equity.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–218). Springer.
- García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education* (pp. 45–75). Peter Lang.

- García, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 385–400.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses*. Falmer Press.
- Genesee, F. H. (2009). Early childhood bilingualism: Perils and possibilities. *Journal of Applied Research on Learning*, *2*, 1–21.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W. M., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Glick, J., & White, M. (2003). Academic trajectories within immigrant youths: Analysis across cohorts. *Demography*, *40*, 759–783.
- Gomez, L., Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2005). Dual language education: A promising 50–50 model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *29*, 145–163.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gort, M. (2006). Strategic code switching, interliteracy, and other phenomena of emergent bilingual writing: Lessons from first-grade dual language classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *6*(3), 323–354.
- Gort, M. (2008). “You give me idea!” Collaborative strides toward bilingualism and biliteracy in a two-way partial immersion program. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *10*(4), 192–200.
- Gort, M. (2012). Code-switching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *44*, 45–75.
- Gort, M. (2015). Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with “doing being bilingual.” *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 1–6. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2014.988030
- Gort, M., & Pontier, R. W. (2013). Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms. *Language and Education*, *27*, 223–245. doi:10.1080/09500782.2012.697468
- Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers’ languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children’s performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *9*(1), 7–25.
- Gu, X. L. (2004). A contrastive analysis of Chinese and American views about silence

- and debate. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13, 51-64.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2001). What's new in the English Language Arts: Challenging policies and practices, ¿y qué?. *Language Arts*, 78 (6), 564–569.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., Alvarez, H. H., & Chiu. (1999). Building a Culture of Collaboration through Hybrid Language Practices. *Theory Into Practice*, 38(2), 87–93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477228>
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, & Activity: An International Journal*, 6(4), 286–303.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Turner, M. G. (1997). Putting language back into language arts: When the radical middle meets the third space. *Language Arts*, 74, 368-378.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Morales, P. Z., & Martinez, D. C. (2009). Re-mediating literacy: culture, difference, and learning for students from nondominant communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 33, 213-245.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(89\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5)
- Ha, H. J., Lee, E. J. & Hong, M. J. (Producers). (2021, March 18). 문명특급 [MMTG – Episode 176] [Television broadcast]. SBS YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rN7-e9o-RwM>
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language teaching*, 45(3), 271-308.
- Han, S. H., & Jung, U. S. (2011, June 22). Is indirect corporal punishment right? *The Korea Herald*. <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20110622000912>
- Heath, S. B., & M.W. McLaughlin (1993). *Identity and inner-city youth*. Teachers College Press.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Eds.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 1-24). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596047_1
- Higginbotham, S. (2014). “The cane of love:” Social and cultural reform of corporal punishment in South Korea. *International ResearchScape Journal*, 1(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.25035/irj.01.01.09>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-oriented values*. Sage.
- Hong J. S., Lee, N. Y., Park, H. J., & Faller, K. C. (2011). Child maltreatment in South

- Korea: An ecological system analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(7), 1058-1066.
- Hopewell, S. & Escamilla, K. (2014). Biliteracy development in immersion contexts. *Journal of Immersion and Content-based Language Education*, 2(2), 181-195.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 271–296.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Student voice and the media of bi(multi)lingual/multicultural class- rooms. In T. McCarty (Ed.), *Language, literacy and power in schooling* (pp. 151-167). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today’s classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory Into Practice*, 51, 239–247.
doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.726051
- Howard, E. R., & Christian, D. (2002). *Two-way immersion 101: Designing and implementing a two-way immersion education program at the elementary level*. Educational Practice Report 9. Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
- Howard, E. R, Sugarman, J., Christian, D. (2003). Trends in two-way immersion education: A review of the research. The Johns Hopkins University.
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/report63.pdf>
- Ima, K., & Nidorf, J. (1998). Troubled Southeast Asian refugee youth: Profile of a delinquent population. In R. Endo, D. Park & J. Tsuchida (Eds.), *Current issues in Asian and Pacific American education* (pp. 37–63). Pacific Rim Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2007). Codeswitching and stance: Issues in interpretation. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 6, 53–77.
- Jeong-hyun [종현]. (2020, November 25). 가짜사나이 ep.1 [Fake men ep. 1] [Video]. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QYpJb_0u9xY
- Jo, H. (2001). ‘Heritage’ Language Learning and Ethnic Identity: Korean Americans’ Struggle with Language Authorities. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14(1):26–41.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
- Jorgensen, J. N., Karrebaek, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Moller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13, 23–37.
- Journeyman Pictures. (2011, January 4). *Vicious corporal punishment exposed in South Korea*. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bv_d6laoxzM
- Jung, C. M. (Producer). (2020, September 3). 식스센스 1 [Sixth sense – Season 1, Episode 1] [Television broadcast].

http://program.tving.com/tvn/tvnsixthsense/12/Vod/View/CLIP/EA_319397

- Kang, H. (2001). Under the black umbrella voices from colonial Korea, 1910-1945. *Korea Observer*, 32(3), 471-476.
- Kang, S. (2002). Democracy and human rights education in South Korea. *Comparative Education*, 38(3), 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006022000014179>
- Kelly, M. & Tseng, H. (1992). Cultural differences in child rearing: A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23, 444–455.
- Kiaer, J., & Bordilovskaya, A. (2017). Hybrid English words in Korean and Japanese: A strange brew or an asset for global English? *Asian Englishes*, 19(2), 169-187.
- Kim, E., Guo, Y., Koh, C., & Cain, K. C. (2010). Korean immigrant discipline and children's social competence and behavior problems. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 25(6), 490–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedn.2009.05.002>
- Kim, E., Han, G., & McCubbin, M. A. (2007). Korean American maternal acceptance—rejection, acculturation, and children's social competence. *Family and Community Health*, 30(2), 33-45.
- Kim, E., & Hong, S. (2007). First generation Korean American parents' perceptions on discipline. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 23(1), 60–68.
- Kim, H. (2008). Heritage and non-heritage language learners of Korean: Sentence processing differences and its pedagogical implications. In K. Kondo-Brown & J. D. Brown (Eds.), *Teaching heritage students in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean: Curriculum, needs, materials, and assessment* (pp. 99–134). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Taylor & Francis.
- Kim, H. J. (Producer), & Kim, S. W. (Director). (2020, September 25). 와썹맨 [Wassup man – Season 2, Episode 12] [Television broadcast]. JTBC/Studio Lulu Lala. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GAAqjuLZoOA>
- Kim, M. (2003). Teaching and learning in Korean classrooms: The crisis and the new approach. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 4(2), 140-150.
- Kim, S. (2001, April 19). [잃어버린 시절을 찾아서] (59)기울부. Kyeonghyang Newspaper. <https://www.khan.co.kr/article/200104191654361>
- Kim, W. (2000). An analysis of classroom collapse from the perspective of educational psychology. *Educational Anthropology*, 3, 79-138
- Kim, Y. H. (1999). First we need to recover the respect for the teacher. *Kyook Madang*, 21, 214-218.
- Kim-Rupnow, W. S. (2001). *An introduction to Korean culture for Rehabilitation Service Providers*. Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange. <http://cirrie-sphhp.webapps.buffalo.edu/culture/monographs/korea.php>

- Kondo-Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (Vol. 32). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in SLA and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *Modern Language Journal, 91*, 905-920.
- Kuhl, P. (2011). Early language learning and literacy: Neuroscience implications for education. *Mind, Brain and Education, 5*, 128–142.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). Research methodology on language development from a complex systems perspective. *Modern Language Journal, 92*, 200–213.
- Lawrence, C. B. (2012). The Korean English linguistic landscape. *World English, 31*(1), 70–92.
- Lee, E., & Zaslansky, M. (2015). Nominal Reference in Korean Heritage Language Discourse. *Heritage Language Journal, 12*(2), 132–158.
<https://doi.org/10.46538/hlj.12.2.2>
- Lee, H. (2019). Konglish? Or multilingual practice? An investigation of subtitles in Korean TV shows. *The Korean Language in America, 23*(1), 27–52.
<https://doi.org/10.5325/korelangamer.23.1.0027>
- Lee, H. J. (2016, April 4). *20% of Seoul students still face corporal punishment: Report*. The Korea Herald.
<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20160404000771#:~:text=The%20Seoul%20Metropolitan%20Office%20of%20Education%20banned%20corporal%20punishment%20in,such%20as%20North%20Jeolla%20Province>
- Lee, J. (2010). Ideologies of English in the South Korean ‘English immersion’ debate. In M. T. Prior, Y. Watanabe, & S. K. Lee (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 2008 second language research forum: Exploring SLA perspectives, positions, and practices* (pp. 246–260). Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lee, J. S., & Bucholtz, M. (2015) Language socialization across learning spaces. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 319-336). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lee, J. S., & Jeong, E. (2013). Korean-English dual language immersion: Perspectives of students, parents and teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 26*. 89-107.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2013.765890>.
- Lee, J. S., & Shin, S. J. (2008). Korean heritage language education in the United States: The current state, opportunities, and possibilities. *Heritage Language Journal, 6*(2), 1-20.
- Lee, J. S. & Suarez, D. (2009). A synthesis of the roles of heritage languages in the lives of immigrant children. In T. Wiley, J. S. Lee, & R. Rumberger (Eds.) *The*

education of linguistic minority students in the United States (pp.136-171).
Multilingual Matters.

- Lee, J. S., & Wright, W. E. (2014). The rediscovery of heritage and community language education in the United States. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 137–165. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X13507546>
- Lee, L. (1995). *Korean American*. Marshall Cavendish.
- Lee, S. (2000). *Yangban: The cultural life of the Joseon literati*. In *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art. http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/yang/hd_yang.htm (October 2004)
- Lee, S. C., & Lineman, M. (2013). A study of changes in direction, focusing on discipline methods and classroom management in Korean schools. *JFMSE*, 25(6), 1245-1262.
- Lee, S., Moon, J., & Long, M. (2009). Linguistic correlates of proficiency in Korean as a second language. *Language Research*, 45(2), 319-348.
- Lehrer, B. (1988). *The Korean American*. Chelsea House Publishers.
- Li, W. (1998). The “why” and “how” questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity* (pp. 156–176). Routledge.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English Language Learners. In California Department of Education (Eds.), *Improving education for English Learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 323-382). Sacramento: CDE Press.
- Lindholm-Leary, K., & Hernández, A. (2011). Achievement and language proficiency of Latino students in dual language programmes: native English speakers, fluent English/previous ELLs, and current ELLs. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(6), 531-545.
- Lo, A. (2009). Lessons about respect and affect in a Korean heritage language school. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 217-234.
- Lo, A., & Howard, K. M. (2009). Mobilizing respect and politeness in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 211-216.
- Lo, A., & Kim, J. (2012). Linguistic competency and citizenship: Contrasting portraits of multilingualism in the South Korean popular media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16, 255–276.
- MacSwan, J. (2000). The architecture of the bilingual language faculty: Evidence from

- intrasentential code switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3, 37–54.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Marquez, K. (2015, October 21). *Understanding corporal punishment in Korea*. Magazine Korea. <https://10mag.com/corporal-punishment-in-korea/>
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 254-277.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). “What do you want to say?” How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8, 208–230.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Romaine, S. (1986). Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 26–38.
- Martínez, R. A. (2010). *Spanglish* as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(2), 124–149.
- Martínez, R. A. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(3), 276–288.
- Martínez, R. A., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking ideologies of linguistic purism: How dual language teachers make sense of everyday translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 9(1), 26-42.
- McPhail, S. A. (2018). South Korea's linguistic tangle: English vs. Korean vs. Konglish: A study of the relative status of Konglish and its parent languages in South Korea. *English Today*, 34(1), 45-51.
- Menezes, V. (2011). Affordances for language learning beyond the classroom. In P. Benson & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Beyond the language classroom* (pp. 59-71). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230306790_6
- Menken, K., & Garcia, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating Language Policies in Schools: Educators as Policymakers (1st ed.)*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855874>
- Mercado, C. (2003). Bilingual development among Latino youth in New York City communities: An unexploited potential. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). Introduction: Codeswitching and bilingualism research. In L.

- Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 1–14). Cambridge University Press.
- Min, P. G. (1998). Korean American families. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *Minority families in the United States: A multicultural perspective* (pp. 252–295). Prentice-Hall.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476399>
- Montrul, S. (2015). *The acquisition of heritage languages / Silvina Montrul*. Cambridge University Press.
- Muro, J. A. (2016). “Oil and water”? Latino-white relations and symbolic integration in a changing California. *Sociology of Race & Ethnicity*, 2(4), 516-530.
- My Utopia. (2018, August 5). 나의 학창시절 (90년대~2000년대) 학교 체벌에 관하여 - 프롤로그. My utopia: Naver blog. <https://blog.naver.com/utopia4640/221333225453>
- Nam, H. (2010). Konglish, Korean L2 learners’ unique interlanguage: Its definition, categories and lexical entries. *응용언어학*, 26(4), 275-308.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2015). *Fast facts*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010a). *Common Core State Standards*. <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010b). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/introduction/key-design-consideration/>
- National Institute of Korean Language. (2017, July 1). 국어에서의 주어와 서술어의 수 일치 [*Matching the number of subjects and descriptive words in Korean*]. https://www.korean.go.kr/front/onlineQna/onlineQnaView.do?mn_id=216&qna_seq=121532
- Nohji. (2015, October 8). 오리 걸음으로 운동장 두 바퀴가 체벌이라구요? 노지의 소박한 이야기. Nohji. <https://nohji.com/2934>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oak, S., & Martin, V. (2000). *American/Korean contrast: Patterns and expectations in the US and Korean*. Hollym.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin, *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 336-358). Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

- Oller, D. K., & Eilers, R. E. (2002). *Language and literacy in bilingual children*. Multilingual Matters.
- Orellana, M. F. (2009). *Translating childhoods: Immigrant youth, language, and culture*. Rutgers University Press.
- Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43, 48–65.
- Otheguy, R. (2016). The linguistic competence of second-generation bilinguals. A critique of 'incomplete acquisition'. In C. Tortora, M. den Dikken, I. Montoya, & T. O'Neill (Eds.), *Romance linguistics 2013. Selected papers from the 43rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)* (pp. 301-319). John Benjamins.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6, 281-307. 10.1515/applirev-2015-0014.
- Paciotto, C., & Delany-Barmann, G. (2011). Planning micro-level language education reform in new diaspora sites: Two-way immersion education in the rural Midwest. *Language Policy*, 10, 221–243.
- Palmer, D. K. (2008). Building and destroying students' 'academic' identities: The power of discourse in a two-way immersion classroom. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 21(6), 647-667.
- Palmer, D. K., Martínez, R. A., Mateus, S. G., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 757-772.
- Paris, D. (2009). "They're in my culture, they speak the same way": African American language in multiethnic high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79, 428–447.
- Park, J. S. (2012, Nov. 11). A total ban of corporal punishment. *The Keimyung Gazette*. <http://gazette.gokmu.com/news/article.html?no=1631>
- Park, J., Kim, S., Kim, Y., Kim, H., Jung, J., Jin, D., & Hwang, H. (1998). 학교체벌에 대한 연구, 부정적 입장에서, 인터뷰, 분석, 체벌의 외국사례 등. 네이버 블로그 - 평화의 노래. <https://m.blog.naver.com/PostView.naver?isHttpsRedirect=true&blogId=inyouwithyou&logNo=10046902786>
- Pascual y Cabo, D., & Rothman, J. (2012). The (il)logical problem of heritage speaker bilingualism and incomplete acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 33, 450–455.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Pérez, B. (2004). Language, literacy, and biliteracy. In B. Pérez (Ed.), *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy* (2nd ed., pp. 25-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Polinsky, M., & Scontras, G. (2020). Understanding heritage languages. *Bilingualism (Cambridge, England)*, 23(1), 4–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000245>
- Poplack, S. (1980). “Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español”: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7–8), 581–618.
- Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. In R. P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino discourse and communicative behavior* (pp. 169-184). Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. Longman.
- Rampton, B. (2009). Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society*, 38, 149–176.
- Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in schoolchildren’s conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(1), 77-98.
- Reyes, I. (2006). Exploring connections between emergent biliteracy and bilingualism. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 6(3), 267–292.
doi:10.1177/1468798406069801
- Reyes, M. L. (2012). Spontaneous biliteracy: Examining Latino students’ untapped potential. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 248–255.
- Reynolds, J., & Orellana, M. F. (2009). New immigrant youth interpreting in white public space. *American Anthropologist*, 111(2), 211–223.
- Rhodes, N. (2014). Elementary school foreign language teaching: Lessons learned over three decades (1980-2010). *Foreign Language Annals*, 47, 115–133.
- Richardson, K., Rosenthal, M. M., & Burak, L. (2012). Exercise as punishment. *American Journal of Health Education*, 43(6), 356–365.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2012.10598866>
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, K. H., & Burgess, K. B. (2002). Parents of aggressive and withdrawn children. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (pp. 383-418). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rubio, A. (2014). *Student misconduct and isolation from the school environment: A study of student, teacher, and administrator perceptions of school discipline at an urban middle school* [Doctoral dissertation, California State University, Los Angeles]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8, 15-34.
- Rumberger, R. W. (2011). *Dropping out: Why students drop out of high school and what can be done about it*. Harvard University Press.
- Sánchez, P. (2007). Urban immigrant students: How transnationalism shapes their world learning. *The Urban Review*, 39, 489–517. doi:10.1007/s11256-007-0064-8
- Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 63–88.
- Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. University of Hawaii Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824862305>
- Seth, M. J. (2005). Korean education: A philosophical and historical perspective. *Korean education*, 25, 3-15.
- Shin, S. J. (2013). *Bilingualism in schools and society: Language, identity, and policy*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Shin, S. J. (2017). *Bilingualism in schools and society: Language, identity, and policy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315535579>
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Sohn, L. (2004). The health and health status of older Korean Americans at the 100-year anniversary of Korean immigration. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 19, 203–219.
- Sohn, S., & Wang, X. C. (2006). Immigrant parents' involvement in American schools: Perspectives from Korean mothers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 34(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-006-0070-6>
- Song, M. (2005). *Strange future : pessimism and the 1992 Los Angeles riots / Min Hyoung Song*. Duke University Press.
- Sorace, A. (2004). Native language attrition and developmental instability at the syntax-discourse interface: Data, interpretations and methods, *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(2), 143-145.
- Sorace, A. (2011). Pinning down the concept of “interface” in bilingualism. *Linguistic approaches to bilingualism*, 1(1), 1-33.
- Sorace, A., & Serratrice, L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2), 195-210.
- Southgate, E. (2010). Punishing powerplays: Emotion, discipline and memories of

school life. In Z. Millei, T. G. Griffiths, & R. J. Parkes (Eds.), *Re-theorizing discipline in education: Problems, politics & possibilities* (pp. 90-102). Peter Lang.

St. Clair, R. N. (2003). The social and cultural construction of silence. *Intercultural Communication of Studies*, 12(3), 87-91.

Strother, J. (2011, April 8). *South Korean school children can no longer be hit for bad behavior*. DW.COM.
<https://www.dw.com/en/south-korean-schoolchildren-can-no-longer-be-hit-for-bad-behavior/a-6497992#:~:text=For%20many%20decades%2C%20corporal%20punishment,punishment%20has%20now%20been%20banned>

Sugarman, J. (2019). The unintended consequences for English Learners of using the four-year graduation rate for school accountability. *Migration Policy Institute*.
<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/ELGradRates-FINALWEB.pdf>

Sun, H., Lee, J. S., Yuan, Y. (forthcoming). Finding legitimacy of Korean Americans' immigrant speech.

Swain M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). Continuum.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Knouzi, I., Suzuki, W., & Brooks, L. (2009). Languaging: University students learn the grammatical concept of voice in French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 5–29. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264126>

Tedick, D. J., Wesely, P. M. (2015). A review of research on content-based foreign/second language education in US K-12 contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28, 25–40.

The Constitution of California and the United States (2021). *State of California - Official State Language, Article III, Section 6, p. 175*.
https://www.senate.ca.gov/sites/senate.ca.gov/files/2021-22_constitution_a da.pdf

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.
<http://repositories.cdlib.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=crede>

Toribio, A. J. (2004). Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: Evidence from code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7, 165-173.

Torres-Guzmán, M. E., Kleyn, T., Morales-Rodríguez, S., Han, A. (2005). Self-designated

dual-language programs: Is there a gap between labeling and implementation? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29, 453–474.

- TrueSport. (2021, March 22). *Take a lap: Alternatives to exercise as punishment in youth sports*. <https://truesport.org/leadership/youth-sports-punishment-alternatives/>
- TvN. (2020, September 3). #하이라이트# 200만 달성! 첫 방부터 케미 터지는 유재석 X 제시(a.k.a 재석바라기) 모음 ZIP #식스센스 *The sixth sense EP.1 [Highlights clip 2 million viewers! Good chemistry between Jaesuk Yoo and Jessi from the start: The sixth sense Season 1, Episode 1]* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mTvzN-xOA7Q>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). *American community survey*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/13_1YR/B16004
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015a). *The Condition of Education 2015* (NCES 2015-144). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2013). *Report to Congress on dual language learners in head start and early head start*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/report_to_congress.pdf
- Urciuoli, B. (1985). Bilingualism as code and bilingualism as practice. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 27(4), 363–386.
- Valde's, G. (2002). *Expanding definitions of giftedness: The case of young interpreters from immigrant communities*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Valde's, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 410–426.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Walls TV. (2020a, January 28). 제이의 미국 일상 브이로그! 갈비찜 만들기 [*Jei Yu's vlog in America*] [Video]. World Star Entertainment/YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uAw_qSdmuSo&list=WL&index=8
- Walls TV. (2020b, June 30). 제이의 미국 필수템 하울 [*Jei Yu's must-haves in America*] [Video]. World Star Entertainment/YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_VJ8EaCp9Y8&list=WL&index=4
- Walqui, A. (2000). *Access and Engagement: Program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students in secondary school*. Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co.

- Watanabe, M. (1969). *Kinsei chōsen kyōiku kenkyū (History of Modern Korean Education)*. Yuzonkaku.
- Webster-Stratton, C. (2002). *The incredible years: A troubleshooting guide for parents of children aged 3–8*. Umbrella Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998) Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 1-47). New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (2004). Codeswitching. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 73–94). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Worthy, J., Durán, L., Hikida, M., Pruitt, A., & Peterson, K. (2013). Spaces for dynamic bilingualism in read-aloud discussions: Developing and strengthening bilingual and academic skills. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36, 311–328.
- Yang, H., & McMullen, M. B. (2003). Understanding the relationships among American primary-grade teachers and Korean mothers: The role of communication and cultural sensitivity in the linguistically diverse classroom. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 5(1), 1-15.
- Yang, S. (2009). Cane of love: parental attitudes towards corporal punishment in Korea. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 39(8), 1540–1555.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcn034>
- Yoon, C. K., Lee, I. K., & Park, C. N. (1999). *The current state of school collapse and resolution strategies*. Korean Youth Development Institute.
- Yuan, Y. Q. (2015, August). Analysis of silence in intercultural communication. In *International Conference on Economy, Management and Education Technology ICEMET Conference* (Vol. 35). Atlantis Press. [https://dx. doi. org/10.2991/icemet-15](https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/icemet-15)
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Blackwell.
- Zentella, A. C. (2007). Dime con quién hablas y te diré quién eres: Linguistic (in)security and Latino unity. In J. Flores & R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to Latino studies* (pp. 25–39). Blackwell.
- 군기훈련 (n.d.). In *Namu Wiki*.
<https://namu.wiki/w/%EA%B5%B0%EA%B8%B0%ED%9B%88%EB%A0%A8>
- 권위. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://terms.naver.com/entry.naver?docId=387525&cid=41978&categoryId=41985>

꿀밤a. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/cd08ec0ecd874e89b0787d15e3ec448e>

꿀밤b. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/8d7efde595154eaa9bdeeff5654d770a>

반성. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/4d949009b43d49809c1befcd24971656>

쟁. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://hanja.dict.naver.com/#/search?query=%E7%94%9F&range=all>

선. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://hanja.dict.naver.com/#/search?query=%E5%85%88&range=all>

스승. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/2c1f2904d3f948259bde6ea260fc94ff>

스승의 그림자도 밟지 말라. (n.d.). In *Joungul*.

http://joungul.co.kr/meditation/meditation1/meditation3/%ED%95%9C%EA%B5%AD_5270.asp

앉았다 일어나기 (n.d.). In *Namu Wiki*. <https://namu.wiki/w/앉았다%20일어나기>

합죽이. (n.d.). In *Naver Dictionary*.

<https://ko.dict.naver.com/#/entry/koko/b43ecb3ba87843cb8ad1b7c361f74f04>

Appendix A

Characteristics of Kyopomal (adopted from Sun et al., forthcoming)

Patterns & Examples	Description
1. Adding translation in Korean/English afterwards	
a. Poetic like 시적이고 ('poetic') (Ha et al., 2021)	A word, phrase, or the entire sentence in one language is translated to the other language, after they have already mentioned this in the other language. Oftentimes, as shown in Examples a and b of Pattern 1, prior to switching / translating, they preface the word "like." In these examples, the speakers are not necessarily explaining the words, but simply repeating it, translated in the other language. The purpose may be to accommodate the interlocutor, to emphasize the word(s), to ensure the meaning gets across, and to represent their identity as a Kyopo.
b. Do you regret that, like 후회해요 ('do you regret it')? (H. J. Kim, 2020)	
c. 너무 like 달콤해요. Toothpaste 가. 치약이 ('Very like sweet. The toothpaste') (Walls TV, 2020b)	
d. 어디서 만나요? ('Where do we meet?') Where do we meet men and women? (H. J. Kim, 2020)	
2. Replacing verbs in Korean/English (but still follows the syntax of the dominant language spoken)	
<u>Korean Verbs:</u>	
a. You're supposed to 갈아 ('grind') this (H. J. Kim, 2020)	When the dominant language spoken is language A, when they replace a verb word in language B, they still follow the syntax of language A; this pattern applies vice versa for the other language. In Examples a and b of Pattern 2, the speakers follow the subject-verb-object (SVO) sequence of English, as the dominant language spoken is English. In Examples c to f of Pattern 2, the speakers follow the default Korean syntax of subject-object-verb (SOV), as the dominant language spoken is Korean. In Kyopomal, instead of
b. Don't 무시해 ('look down') (Jung, 2020; TvN, 2020)	
<u>English Verbs:</u>	
c. 다리 shave 할때요 ('To shave legs') (Walls TV, 2020b)	
d. 돈도 save 하고 세상도 save 하게 ('To save money and to save the world') (Walls TV, 2020b)	
e. 이거 다 connect 하시면 되요 ('You can connect all these') (Kim & Kim, 2020)	
f. 들때 scoop 하는것 처럼 ('When you lift, do it as if you scoop') (Kim & Kim, 2020)	

	randomly inserting words from either languages, speakers place either the Korean or English verb in the sentence to be “grammatically correct” in the dominant language spoken.
3. Replacing <u>adjectives</u> in Korean/English, frequently after the word “너무” / “so” (but still follows the syntax of the dominant language spoken)	
<u>Korean Adjectives:</u>	Similarly to Pattern 2, when speakers replace an adjective in Korean or English, they follow the syntax of the dominant language spoken. Additionally, speakers tend to switch to the other language right after using adverbs such as “so” or “너무”
a. You’re so 매력적 (‘attractive’) (H. J. Kim, 2020)	(‘very/too/super’). The purpose of using hybridity may be to emphasize the adjectives, as these words are accentuated during discourse.
b. So 짜 (‘salty’) now (H. J. Kim, 2020)	
c. 나는 솔직히 짠거 좋아해 (‘Honestly I like salty food’). 근데 (‘But’) do you eat 짠 (‘salty’) food? (H. J. Kim, 2020)	
<u>English Adjectives:</u>	
d. 너무 close 해 (‘You’re too close’) (Walls TV, 2020a)	
e. 한국꺼는 너무 fresh한 느낌이 안나는것 같아요 (‘The Korean one does not have the super fresh feeling’) (Walls TV, 2020a)	
4. Making Korean nouns plural by adding “-s” suffix	
a. 언니s (‘sisters’) (Jenctzen, n.d.)	For either countable and noncountable nouns, the speakers add the suffix ‘-s’ at the end of Korean nouns to make these plural. In Korean, the suffix -들 / <i>tul</i> / is typically added after countable nouns to make these plural (National Institute of Korean Language, 2017). Aside from being playful using hybridity, in the case of Example b of Pattern 4, the speaker added -s (but not -들 as meat is noncountable), to make meaning more accurate, emphasizing there is ‘a lot of’ meat.
b. 고기s (‘meat’)! You know what I’m sayin’ (Jung, 2020; TvN, 2020)	
5. Using Korean/English words to meet sociolinguistic and sociocultural norms, and are unique, representative or exclusive to the language and culture	
<u>Korean words:</u>	Speakers use hybridity to be creative, to be efficient, and to
a. My 운 (‘luck’) is very good (Nam, 2015)	

b. Call me 연습 ('practice') parasite. Oscar winning parasite (Ha et al., 2021)	make a connection or reference unique to their Korean and American hybrid identity and culture. For instance, in Example b of Pattern 5, the speaker makes a reference to both Korean and American culture and language when using the words “연습 /yensup/ [‘practice’] parasite.” Koreans typically call people who works diligently as “연습벌레” (‘practice bug’). The speaker also uses the word “parasite” to make a connection to the Korean American movie, “The Parasite.” Speakers may also use hybridity to make accommodations to other speakers’ sociolinguistic and sociocultural norms. In Example f of Pattern 5, the speaker calls the other speaker “you” in English, instead of calling the other speaker by his name, as culturally, it would be impolite since they both have not established their relationship. The speaker chose to use “you” while speaking in Korean, as in the English language, there is no honorific counterpart for ‘you.’ The speaker may have felt safe to use “you” since the other speaker has some understanding and exposure to Kyopomal.
c. no 빵 ('joke') so good (Jung, 2020; TvN, 2020)	
<u>English words:</u> d. 요즘에는 ('Recently') chic. I love chic (Ha et al., 2021)	
e. 그니깐 그냥 double tag team 해야해 ('So we should just double tag team') (Nam, 2015)	
f. You가 입수할것 같은데 ('I think you'll have to make the dip') (Kim & Kim, 2020)	
g. 왜냐면 ('Because') I'm Korean-American. 어디 가서 ('Others say') You're not Korean. You're not American (Ha et al., 2021)	
h. Unbothered. 그런 energy로 살아야 해요. 남한테 피해 주지만 말고 ('You must live with that energy. And not bother others'). Be kind. Be loving. 그 다음에 unbothered ('And then be unbothered') (Ha et al., 2021)	
6. Using the word “love” in English when expressing a strong like	
a. I looove 단무지 ('pickles') (Jung, 2020; TvN, 2020)	The word “love” is used in English to express a strong ‘like’ towards someone or an object. This word is often pronounced with an elongated ‘o’ to make an emphasis. This is seen as a hybridity as the word “love” is typically not used together with objects in the Korean language.
b. I loooove 봉준호 감독 ('Producer Bong Joon Ho') (Ha et al., 2021)	
c. I looove 단체생활 ('group living') (Ha et al., 2021)	

7. Transferring figurative expressions directly

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. It's real. 눈떠요! ('Open your eyes') (Jung, 2020; TvN, 2020) | Speakers frequently test and push linguistic boundaries through transferring phrases from one language to the other to see if |
| b. 너 인성 문제 있어? ('Do you have an attitude problem?') (Jeong-hyun, 2020; H. J. Kim, 2020) | these phrases work in their discourse and to show their linguistic hybrid identity. |
-

Appendix B

The following conventions are adopted from Bloome et al. (2005) with additions and modifications made by the authors for transcribing the episodes.

< >	Media captions
()	Transcriber's/translator's description or comments that cannot be typically captured through transcription symbols
@	Laughter, with each token marking one pulse
!	Pitch accent
?	Rising intonation, with utterance(s) ending in high pitch
' '	Utterance in English translation
=	Latching/continuous stretches of talk; no gap between intonation units
[]	Overlap utterance(s); left-hand square bracket marks the onset, and the right-hand square bracket marks when the overlap stops
.	Falling intonation, signaling end
↑↓	Higher or lower pitch shift in the utterance(s)
:	Prolonged sound; multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound
(0.0)	Elapsed pause in seconds; greater than 0.2 seconds
(.)	Brief pause less than 0.2 seconds
	Long pause
	Short pause
<u>word</u>	Stressed word(s) via amplitude or pitch