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ABSTRACT

Since the first significant appearance of international students in U.S. higher education in the early 1990s, English language literacy has been a central focus to literacy teachers. Despite the plethora of studies concerning students’ second language proficiency, primarily aiming to enhance assimilation and acculturation into the U.S. academic disciplines, not many studies have looked beyond the pedagogical/instructional aspects within classroom settings. Under labels such as “international students,” “ESL learners,” or just “foreigners,” the students have often been considered one large homogeneous group in need of homogeneous language support. To understand the limits of such a blanket approach and to avoid deficit ideologies that focus primarily on what international students lack in language and literacy, my study explores the past, present, and projected literacy experiences of South Korean undergraduate students with early study abroad (ESA or jogi yuhak) experiences. I argue that the language and literacy practices of these undergraduate students (henceforth post-jogi yuhak students), with pre-college education in English speaking countries - including the United States, Canada, Australia, Singapore and Malaysia - continuously develop within the larger global and local contexts. My study therefore complicates not only categories of transnational students but also approaches to pedagogy. This understanding of the complexity of multilingual backgrounds is crucial to the field of Rhetoric and Composition at a pivotal time when U.S. higher education institutions are experiencing an unprecedented increase in the number of international undergraduate students.

This dissertation highlights the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak students, a particular group of international undergraduate students who have been fairly unknown to non-Koreans on campus and to composition and rhetoric scholars despite their significant presence in U.S. higher education institutions. At the University of Illinois, the public higher education institution
with the largest international student population, Korean students are the second largest international group and more than 80% of them have had jogi yuhak experience. My ethnographic project provides in-depth articulation of ways post-jogi yuhak students’ literacies and literate selves do and do not develop as they navigate college life. As my study demonstrates, post-jogi yuhak students sought out a transnational educational experience early in their lives to learn English and become “global” citizens, yet at Illinois I claim that they are heavily engaged in localization of their “Koreanness” not only through their use of the Korean language but also through the institutionalized rebuilding Korean social practices. These practices ultimately help them ground their identities as college students. Their literacy and rhetorical practices are shaped not only by and within global and local politics but also within the everyday dynamics of a particular institutional climate and policies.
To my fellow international students and all on their transnational journey
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CHAPTER I

JOGI YUHAK AND THE PROMISE OF LITERACY

Introduction

In the spring of 2012, the Korean Student Association (KSA) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) planned an ambitious series of events to celebrate Korean culture and Korean students on campus. One Saturday night, to commemorate and publicize “Korean Week,” the KSA hung a banner from a statue of the university’s Alma Mater. Shortly after the banner was hung, it disappeared. The following day, while another banner was ordered, the staff attached a small South Korean flag and an American flag in the hands of the statue. But even before the KSA could process what had happened, let alone notify authorities, these flags were gone. Below the statue, in the chalk graffiti that celebrated Korean Week, there were new words—“I hate”—written inside the Korean flag.

Figure 1. The Korean Week Banner: KSA staff members hanging the second banner (smaller than the first one) three days after the first banner was vandalized. Courtesy of KSA.

---

1 Alma Mater, which has presented the motto of “Learning and Labor” since its unveiling in 1929, is one of the most widely recognized symbols of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Located near the center of the campus, the statue has been used for displays representing various university and community events and is a very popular site for graduating
Although I had expected KSA members to be very upset by the incident and even concerned about their personal security as well as their broader acceptance in the university community, Kyung-won, who had spent so many days creating the banner, had quite a different response. “Not really,” she said when asked a week later if the literal hate speech worried or offended her; on the contrary, she found herself “fascinated.” Her immediate response, she admitted, was “Wow! It was stolen?” delivered not with disappointment but with animation. Surprised, I asked her why. She explained:

> I was *a part of* something big that happened at the university. I know that vandalism itself isn’t a good thing but it became a [significant/talked about] issue. It was in the DI [*The Daily Illini*, the independent student newspaper at U of I] and it was on TV. And just the fact that I was *a part of* it, it makes it so exciting!² (emphasis added)

Her reaction was not one of anger or resentment but one of excitement and delight, brought on by a sense of affiliation and association with the university where she had been enrolled for three years. Ironically, as she saw it, the event did not isolate her as a racial or language minority, but finally gave her recognition as a member of the university community.

My study is an exploration of the literacy and rhetorical practices of South Korean undergraduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC/U of I), a public university in the American Midwest. I begin with the banner incident as it, along with many others, captures and signals realities faced by many international Korean undergraduate students during their college years in the United States—realities that have been shaping these students’ literacy and rhetorical practices. For example, despite claims that the university is a global campus that embraces diversity, the Korean students I studied and worked with found that

² Interviews with Korean students were conducted mainly in Korean and I present the English translations throughout the dissertation.
racism, segregation, and language discrimination were a reality of their campus lives. And despite their large presence at this campus, these students had experienced themselves as basically invisible—so much so, in fact, that even this negative incident could become, for some, a welcome change from the status quo.

Although my study is about international South Korean undergraduate students’ literacy and rhetorical practices at a U.S. university, it is not necessarily about how the students write (and read) for academic purposes. Rather, the study focuses on how the students’ literacy practices are shaped by, and shape, the immediate and distant, visible and invisible, web of contextual forces surrounding them. Furthermore, my dissertation on Korean undergraduate students highlights the students with early study abroad (in Korean, jogi yuhak) experience in English-speaking countries before matriculating into the university. This particular group of international Korean undergraduate students (henceforth post-jogi yuhak students), despite their large presence on U.S. campuses, have been fairly unknown to non-Koreans on campus and to composition and rhetoric scholars. At the University of Illinois, the public higher education institution with the largest international student and Korean student population, the majority of the Korean undergraduate students have had pre-college study abroad experience.

In my dissertation, I provide in-depth articulation of ways post-jogi yuhak students’ literacies and literate selves do and do not develop as they navigate college life. The students (or their families) sought out a transnational educational experience early in their lives to learn English and become “global” citizens/elites, yet at Illinois, as Chapter 3 demonstrates, they are

---

3 According to the Division of Management Information at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, there were 802 Korean undergraduate students (with F1 Visas) in Fall 2014. Although the population is slowly decreasing from its peak of 999 students in Fall 2010, Korean international students continue to be the second largest international student population at the university, following Chinese international students.
heavily engaged in, what I call literacy and rhetorical practices of localization. The students were (re)engaging with their “Koreanness” not only through their use of the Korean language but also through the institutionalized rebuilding of Korean social practices. In many ways, the multilingual literacy practices at this mid-western U.S. university resembles Jan Blommaert’s (2013) depiction of his own neighborhood in Belgium, through which he demonstrates both online and offline superdiversity, environments where intense globalization has led people to “take any linguistic and communicative resource available to them—a broad range, typically, in superdiverse contexts—and blend them into hugely complex linguistic and semiotic forms” (8). I argue that the localization practices—literacy and rhetorical practices shaped not only by and within global and local politics but also within the everyday dynamics of a particular institutional climate and policies—ultimately help the post-jogi yuhak students ground their identities as college students. The emergence of increasingly global pathways of education and of an academic version of superdiversity, with increasingly complex inter-relationships between signs, people and space, calls for new approaches and remedies to support academic success in higher education.

This study explores what literacy and rhetorical practices of localization looked like for the post-jogi yuhak Korean students enrolled at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign during the period of this research (roughly 2011–2014). In the following chapters, to make sense of these practices and the relationships, I draw out more of the salient historical, national, institutional, and ideological contextual layers that flow through local and global boundaries and co-exist specifically for a particular group of students at a particular locality at a particular time in history. For my transnational participants, I argue that these contextual boundaries are fluid, messy, and scattered: depending on where the transnational individual stands (physically,
ideologically, emotionally) these contexts are both discretely and simultaneously local, global, and somewhere in-between. The following sections, in exploring the literacy and rhetorical practices of Korean students at Illinois, draw on and aim to contribute to the different disciplinary literatures on Korean early study abroad practices, language ideology, transnational literacy, and international students’ socialization into academic and cultural language and literacy practices. The next three sections summarize these literatures and discuss how my research contributes to each.

**Study Abroad**

My interest in this topic was first sparked in spring 2006. As part of graduate course work encouraging community service, I had the opportunity to teach SAT and TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) writing to a group of Korean high school students at the Korean Cultural Center located on campus. As expected, all six students taking the course were preparing to apply for college in the U.S. To my surprise, however, all six students had been studying abroad in the Champaign-Urbana area for the previous two or more years. Shortly after, I was asked by a local resident to tutor English to a group of eight study abroad Korean high school students. I was fascinated and a little alarmed to learn that the local resident was running a business providing guardianship for the group of high school students from Korea. Under his guardianship, the students were all living in a house (used as a dormitory) a few blocks away from his own family’s home. My curiosity grew in the following years as my encounters directly and indirectly related to students with pre-college study abroad experience grew frequent in South Korea and at the university.
As the most popular study abroad destination, the United States recorded its eighth consecutive year of international student enrollment growth, reaching a record high of 886,052 students, making up 4% of total education enrollment in the U.S. in 2013/2014 (Open Doors 2014). The overall number of international students in the US has grown by 72% over the past 15 years, from 514,723 in 1999/2000 to 886,052 in 2013/14. The growth of international student population in the United States reflects the broader global trend of the increasing number of students who pursue higher education outside of their homelands each year. The most significant contributor of this rising trend in U.S. international enrollment is China. With its large population and strong economic growth in the last decade, China has been the leading “sender” nation of students to study in the United States since 2009/10. According to Open Doors 2014, Chinese students represent 31% of all international enrollments in the United States.

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, before the sharp rise in the Chinese student population in 2010, South Korea had been the largest sender of foreign students. On the national level, after consistently increasing through the 1980s and 1990s, the number of Korean students in the U.S. decreased in the late 1990’s due to the Asian financial crisis. Following a rebound of the economy, Korean student numbers increased significantly after 1998/99 and reached a peak of about 75,000 in 2008/09 before beginning to decline again. In 2001/02, Korea moved from the fourth leading place of origin to third, after China and India. Despite the recent decline since 2011/2012 (6.4% in 2013/14), Korea continues to keep third place (OECD 2014).

---

4 In 2012, 4.5 million students studied internationally worldwide, an increase of over 50% since 2005 (OECD 2014).
5 The declining trend is contributed to low birth rates and increasing number of courses/programs in English in non-U.S. higher education institutions. For example, the percentage of South
The Transnational Educational Project

In Korea, this form of study abroad before college (typically in English-Speaking countries) is known as jogi yuhak (조기유학). Jogi yuhak, which literally stands for Early Study Abroad (ESA), is a transnational educational migration trend that has been prevalent and popular in Korea since as early as mid 1990s. According to the Ministry of Educational Science and Technology (Korean Ministry of Education), the number of pre-college students who left Korea for study increased from just over 2,000 in 1995 to a peak of nearly 28,000 in 2006 (see Figure 2). The total number of jogi yuhak students is estimated to be much higher counting the

---

Korean students that choose to study in Canada grew from less than one percent in 2002 to 6.4 percent in 2012 (Open Doors).

Early Study Abroad (ESA) is also used widely by scholars. Here, in my project, I use the Korean term, jogi yuhak, as my project pertains to the ESA phenomenon in/of Korea.

The Early Study Abroad phenomenon was present even before the 1990s in Korea and was also present in other East Asian countries like Taiwan/China, where the transmigrant students have often been referred to as “satellite kids” and “astronaut families.” For studies on Chinese ESA, see Chiang (2008); Ho (2002); Huang and Yeoh (2005); Pauline Hsieh (2007); Waters (2003, 2005); and Zhou (1998).

According to the Korean Educational Development Institute, the numbers to Figure 2 are as follows: 1,562 in 1998; 1,839 in 1999; 4,397 in 2000; 7,944 in 2001; 10,132 in 2002; 10,498 in 2003; 16,446 in 2004; 20,400 in 2005; 29,511 in 2006; 27,668 in 2007; 27,349 in 2008; 18,118 in 2009; 18,741 in 2010; 16,515 in 2011; 14,340 in 2012; 12,374 in 2013; and 10,907 in 2014.
hundreds of students who have accompanied parents undertaking overseas work assignments or pursuing advanced degree overseas with their children’s education in mind (Abelmann et al.; Bae).

For jogi yuhak parents, the most desirable destination continues to be the United States. Since 2005, however, countries such as Canada, Southeast Asia (e.g., Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines), Australia, and New Zealand have been gaining popularity (Abelmann et al.; Ihm and Choi). The rising popularity of South Asian countries, in particular, has been associated with geographical and emotional proximity and the relative affordability compared to the Western nations. In the case of Singapore, the rise in popularity has also been affected by the increasing social and linguistic capital associated with Chinese language acquisition along with English9 (Ihm and Choi 27). According to the Analysis of survey on South Korean education and early-age overseas education (by Ihm et al., cited in Ihm and Choi 29), Southeast Asian countries are

---

the most common destination for primary students, but the United States remains the most preferred by high school students, while elementary and middle school-age students go to Southeast Asian countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines as a “practice round” for later high school jogi yuhak in the United States (Abelmann et al. 2).

Compared to the over two-decade and widespread ramifications of the jogi yuhak phenomena in Korea and across its border, the body of work is relatively small and recent. Studies emerged since the 1990s but have only gained momentum more recently since the mid-2000s. The work has been contributed by scholars in fields such as anthropology, education, psychology, and sociology and with much scholarly discussion employs ethnographic, sociological, and linguistic approaches to understanding the Korean jogi yuhak phenomenon.

Jogi yuhak has been explored with subjects such as identity, class (e.g., Park and Bae; H. Koo; J. Kim; Song), and global citizenship (e.g., Kang; Shin) and management of jogi yuhak (e.g, Ahn, Okazaki et al.). As much as jogi yuhak is a familial transnational educational project, most studies have focused on how jogi yuhak families manage the project and have paid particular attention to a transnational split family form—the kirogi family (e.g., Abelmann et al.; Finch and Kim; H. Koo; Lee and Koo). Kirogi10, which literarily means “wild geese,” refers to the father (kirogi appa, wild geese dad) who stays behind in Korea to economically support the mother11 and child/children studying abroad, and travels periodically to visit the family. Other forms of jogi yuhak living arrangements include the child or children residing with immediate or distance relatives, with host families (as legal guardians), or in boarding schools. As numbers of jogi yuhak migration to Southeast Asian countries have increased in the more recent years, scholars

---

10 Kirogi is also used as an adjective to denote the child/children (kirogi child) of the kirogi family. The word is not used for the mothers since that would make the mothers the wild geese of the family.
11 It is usually the mother that follows the child to as the caregiver.
(e.g., Bae; Kang; J. Park; Shin) residing in this region have contributed much to the *jogi yuhak* body of work.

**Language Ideologies**

As a middle-class strategy for class mobility and maintenance (Park and Abelmann), the steep rise in *jogi yuhak* migration, as I further elaborate in chapter 2, needs to be understood within the unique conditions of contemporary South Korea: the nation’s pursuit of neoliberal economic advancement in the competitive national and global economy and the nation’s obsession with education and the English language. In the case of English, *jogi yuhak* is a transnational linguistic investment strategy for middle-class families to prepare their children to compete on the global stage with English competency. In other words, the country’s intense competition for upward social mobility via elite education and English capital attainment has fueled *jogi yuhak* among countless middle-class Korean families (Ihm and Choi; Lee and Koo; Shin). As such, according to *The Analysis of survey on South Korean education and early-age overseas education* (Ihm et al., cited in Ihm and Choi), “to learn English/foreign language” has been the primary purpose of *jogi yuhak*, followed by the desire to improve one’s employment prospects, dissatisfaction with Korean public education focused on the college entrance exam, and the attempt to avoid the high cost of private tutoring (Ihm and Choi).

As the primary impetus for driving so many pre-college students across Korean borders, language has been the point of interest to scholars in fields such as bilingual education and sociolinguistics. Through the sociocultural and/or sociolinguistic lens, *jogi yuhak* has been analyzed and interpreted with a focus primarily on belief systems/ideology surrounding language, language education/learning, and transnational subjectivity at the intersection of language, class,
and identity (e.g., Bae; Chung; J. Park; Kang; Song). These studies on jogi yuhak with a focus on language ideologies are essential to understanding the phenomenon as certain strong beliefs about the English language and its use has been the main drive for thousands of Korean parents to send their children abroad to study. The belief systems that propelled the phenomenon are that English competency is a requirement for global competition; language is learnt and acquired best when young; and immersion learning in the target language is best for language acquisition (Park and Bae).

Many of the earlier studies relating to language thus focus on these initial and foundational beliefs and how they are manifested and renegotiated by the jogi yuhak families’ at their respective study abroad locations. For example, Chung (2008), in her ethnographic study of Korean short-term resident families with pre-teen children in a Midwestern university town, considers the jogi yuhak motivation and belief systems regarding their children’s English education and their daily lives. She finds that the parents believed jogi yuhak was for both language learning and the children’s globalized and cosmopolitan future. She also notes that the initially strong belief in children’s “natural” English learning diminished with time abroad. Similarly, in a more recent study, Song (2012) complicates the foundational beliefs that underlie transnational strategies affecting individuals’ subjectivities at the intersection of class, language, and transnationalism. Through ethnographic interviews of two graduate student families and observation of their children’s language learning practices in the U.S., Song reveals the parents’ contradictory and shifting subjectivities as they negotiate between foregrounding their roles as moral and intellectual elites acting as materialistic parents.

With emergence of non-West study abroad destinations (e.g., Singapore) since the mid-2000s, studies on jogi yuhak have complicated the workings of hegemonic English ideologies
with variance in geographical and added linguistic (Chinese) context. For example, Kang (2012) investigated how *jogi yuhak* students and their parents in Singapore negotiate and redefine the values of Mandarin, English, and Singlish\(^{12}\) in an attempt to forge their own transnational identities. She found the transmigrants’ discourses are based on multiple language ideologies (pragmatism and sociolinguistic competence in addition to the dominant notion of legitimate language) that provide the basis for Korean migrants’ emerging notions of the ‘Asian global,’ a desirable transnational subject who is more practical and sociocentric than the conventional image of high-ranking elites, with greater adaptability to various local situations. Bae (2013) analyzes *jogi yuhak* families’ strategic patterns of linguistic investment in Singapore and demonstrates Korean families’ scalar evaluation of the values and functions of languages and its values in their pursuit of multilingualism in English, Mandarin and Korean.

*English Hegemony in the US and the World*

Although aforementioned studies have greatly contributed toward our understanding of language ideologies, the *jogi yuhak* phenomenon, and its intricacies, these studies have primarily focused on the perspectives and experiences of the parents (the “managers” of the transnational project) and less about the main participants of the transnational educational project. While most studies use observations of the students’ literacy learning and practices as a backdrop of the family/parents’ experience, my study contributes to the growing body of work on *jogi yuhak* by focusing on the transmigrant students and their actual experiences as they continue their transnational education project into their young adult lives at a U.S. mid-western university. As in previous studies and the following chapters show, language ideologies are pivotal points of

\(^{12}\) Singlish colloquial name for is a local form of English in Singapore.
observation and analysis as they have shaped and are mediated by their educational migration. As the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak students reveal, language ideologies are constantly being contested, questioned, and reinforced in interaction with the specific conditions that surround students on the move (Park and Bae).

Michael Silverstein’s (1979) definition of language ideology, as a “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (193), brought attention to the language user’s notions about the relationship between language and society (J. Park). Moving away from autonomous systems of language and with greater emphasis on the social dimensions, language ideology has been defined as “self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group” (Heath 53), and as “cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 255). Thus, according to Park (2009), language ideology “provides a crucial window through which we can investigate the intersection of language and society” (15). In the era of intensified globalization and frequent transnational migrations, the intersections of language and societies for individuals are more convoluted than ever before. With this multi-sited framework, I argue that post-jogi yuhak students’ literacy and rhetorical practices at the University of Illinois need to be understood within ideological workings that underlie the global spread of English hegemony and English-Only politics of U.S. composition and higher education.

Many scholars have explored the worldwide spread of English processes, implications and consequences (e.g. Brutt-Griffler; Crystal; Jenkins; Kachru; Sonntag). In this scholarship, English has played every role from marginalization and hegemony, on the one side, to empowerment and upward mobility on the other. Unsurprisingly, recent decades have witnessed
lively, divisive debate about these issues (e.g. Canagarajah; Pennycook; Phillipson). Whether for better or worse, English is widely perceived as the language of globalization, and many nations embrace the idea to survive in the global economy. Studies that take critical approaches to the global spread of English (e.g., Bailey; Phillipson; Pennycook), in particular, identify roles of specific language ideologies that contribute to the construction of English as a hegemonic language. However, Park (2009) argues that these studies do not fully explore “the specific processes through which language ideology allows local communities to adopt English and imbue it with new meaning” (17). Filling this void, Park (2009), in *The Local Construction of a Global Language*, approaches “the global spread of English from a language ideological point of view…[developing] the links between the global hegemony of English, local and global conditions of the new economy, and micro-level practices of individual speakers” (18) as it studies the ideological construction of English in South Korea. Therefore, as much as the construction of English ideology in Korea, it is essential to consider the English ideologies of post-*jogi yuhak* students’ education locations/spaces in their transnational journey—in my participants’ case, UIUC, a U.S. higher education institution.

The spread of English as a Lingua Franca and hegemonic English language ideologies about the teaching of writing in U.S. higher education have also been a point of contention for many composition scholar-teachers. They have critiqued the tacit policy of unidirectional English monolingualism—“English Only”—has shaped the historical formation of writing instruction and continues to influence its theory and practice. It draws attention to the fact that within much composition teaching and scholarship, both the context of writing and writing itself are imagined to be monolingual: the “norm” assumed, in other words, is a monolingual “native”-English speaking writer writing only in English to an audience of English-only readers (Horner
and Trimbur). The 1974 resolution to “Students Rights to Their Own Language,” published in 
College Composition and Communication as the first official movement in composition and 
communication, has urged teachers to affirm students’ “own patterns and varieties of language—
the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style.”

In continuation of these efforts combating monolingualism, scholars in composition 
studies (e.g. Canagarajah; Horner; Lu; Matsuda; Trimbur) have participated in a movement 
towards “cross-cultural language relations in composition.” In addressing the tacit policy of 
unidirectional English monolingualism, they argue that “students need to learn to work in their 
writing within, on, among, and across a variety of Englishes and languages,” and not simply 
(re)produce a fixed set of language standards rather than “assuming the composition classroom 
as a site of simple, homogeneous language use among linguistically homogeneous students” 
(Horner 3). In Cross-Language Relations in Composition (2010) edited by Horner, Lu, and 
Matsuda, eighteen scholars have come together to contribute to the movement via various areas 
of composition (e.g., Asian-American rhetoric, digital composition, L2 writing).

More recently, with the opinion piece, “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a 
Translingual Approach” (2011) in College English, composition scholar-teachers, such as Horner 
and Lu, urge movement towards the Translingual Approach. Translingual practices are “all 
acts of communication and literacy [that involve] shuttling between languages and negotiation of 
diverse linguistic resources for situated construction of meaning” (1) and are often realized as

---

13 See Language Diversity in the Classroom (2003) for practical application of the movement.

14 See Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations (2013), written by Canagarajah, for more theoretical underpinning of the translingual practices, and see Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms (2013), edited by Canagarajah, for a collection of various translingual themes by L1 (first language) and L2 scholars.
meshing of languages and semiotic resources in writing. The *translingual* approach is an evolution of earlier efforts against the monolingual orientation to communication, as Canagarajah (2013) problematizes the limitations to the “*multi-*” in *multilingual* as the term “doesn't accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages and communities” (7). With this turn, the approach and movement has been endorsed whole-heartedly by some (e.g., Canagarajah) but less by others (e.g., Matsuda) in the field of composition. As the area is still in its early stages, much negotiation and development is expected and anticipated.

The previous sections, citing scholarly work in various areas (*Jogi Yuhak*, World Englishes, U.S. composition), explore the language ideologies perspectives that are shared in these areas. My study expands and complicates the understanding of language ideology construction as these various ideologies (constructed in different realms) intersect at a particular space and time for my study participants. For example, the literacy and rhetorical practices of the students reflect how students consciously and subconsciously negotiate and navigate various globally and locally constructed ideologies (e.g., hegemonic English language ideologies that underlie the *jogi yuhak* phenomenon and the monolingual orientation in U.S. academia) that intersect during their college lives and were reconfigured with the transnational movements. In the field of composition studies, this exploration also contributes to the development of *translingual practices*, in particular, as the language ideologies/dispositions of post-*jogi yuhak* students give a more concrete perspective on the application of translingual approaches.\(^\text{15}\)

**International and Transnational Literacies**

International education scholars have pointed out that international students tend to be

\(^{15}\) See chapter four for details on appropriating translingual approaches/disposition to the Korean single-language writing group.
treated as a mass and their needs and problems have often been generalized (e.g., Ninnes and Hellsten; Wong; Koehne). Despite such recognition, many studies concerning international college students primarily have aimed to enhance assimilation and acculturation into the U.S. academic disciplines using labels such as “international students” or just “foreigners” to refer to these students and considering them as one large homogeneous group in need of homogeneous academic support. Furthermore, in regards to scholarship concerning the literacy of international student in higher education settings, fields such as Second Language Studies (e.g., in Applied Linguistics, Education), Second Language Writing, and Writing/Composition Studies have been taking initiatives and strides in providing results beneficial and applicable for effective academic writing support. Despite pioneering work in these allied fields, little work has looked at literacy practices beyond the pedagogical/instructional aspects within classroom settings. Even qualitative studies that focus or draw on social aspects of international and ESL student literacies (Casanave; Leki; Sternglass) also share the goal of contributing to the students’ academic literacies and literate practices. The majority of the work done in second language writing (SLW), for example, addresses instructional issues. The focus is on what happens in the classroom as opposed to how the institutional contexts outside the classroom shape instructional practices. Such narrow focus on the classroom is problematic because instruction is always situated in and shaped by larger institutional contexts, including institutional policies and politics. My ethnographic study centers on international students’ literacy and rhetorical practices within their social practices at a U.S. university. Thus, the study not only informs understanding of academic literacy practices, but also contributes to the broader work on the social and academic development of college students.
Challenging the “Great Divide” or “autonomous model” theories that treat literacy as a decontextualized and decontextualizing technology, a theory of literacy as social practice was put forward by “revisionist” scholars (e.g. Gee; Street). Through the social practice paradigm, scholars of New Literacy Studies have recognized literacy as a situated social practice that varies from one context to another and one culture to another and have engaged in numerous empirical studies on the subject across various literacy events and communities (e.g. Barton and Hamilton; Graff; Heath; Lillis). Complementing and evermore complicating this theory and earlier ethnographic work on situated literacy practices, literacy studies have attended to multilingual issues within a framework of globalization (Barton; Canagarajah; Duffy). More recently, scholars (Lorimer Leonard; Vieira) have complicated how and why literacy practices travel across borders with multilingual users. They have helped us see the fluid and entangled forces that both destabilize and shape literacy practices and complicate understandings of local and global (Blommaert, Sociolinguistics; Latour; Lemke; Prior and Shipka). This research engages with several different literatures. Most significantly, it comes into conversation with scholars in the field of New Literacy Studies, specifically the emerging research on transnational literacies (Duffy; Berry, Hawisher, and Selfe; Prendergast; Vieira). Like most ethnographic studies on transnational migrant literacy, this study provides empirical evidence of a conception of literacy as not only a locally situated social practice, but practices heavily influenced by the various global factors. Thus, my study further complicates the notion of literacy contexts by presenting the contexts influencing and being influenced by literacy practices as fluid and scattered variables determined by particular circumstances of the transnational individual. Therefore, depending on the perspective and circumstance of an individual, the local is the global and the

---

16 Brandt and Clinton note that “more is going on locally than just local practice” (338).
global is the local. This analysis then suggests how local and global forces converge in situated practices, further questioning the all-too-tidy division between the local and the global. Furthermore, by exploring literacy and rhetorical practices of college students with jogi yuhak experience, from a U.S. standpoint, my project brings a foreign/overseas/global phenomenon in contact with the domestic/local context in the U.S. My research also comes at a very important period in U.S. higher education history when an unprecedented number of international students have enrolled in colleges and universities. Whereas many studies examining transnational literacy practices of migrants within the U.S. have focused largely on the immigrant experience, my study further expands this perspective by addressing the literacy practices of non-immigrant individuals, individuals having less investment and/or stakes in U.S. citizenship. More importantly, by looking into literacy practices of international students outside of the classrooms, it also sheds light on the various factors, in larger contexts, involved in their literacy development.

**Methodology and Methods**

My curiosity continuously grew with the rapidly growing Korean undergraduate student population along with overall international undergraduate student population at the university. I became vastly interested not only in the students but also the changing economic, social, and political front in Korea influencing the vastly popular transnational migration trend. Before I officially began my ethnographic exploration of the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak Korean undergraduate students, my interest was to find ways to assist Korean undergraduate students write “better” in college. In other words, my overarching objective was to examine how the students’ particular transnational experience affected their academic writing.
Through a pilot study of three post-*jogi yuhak* students, however, my interest leaned more towards the students’ literacy practices outside of the writing classroom. I began my research with these questions influenced by my pedagogical, administrative, and personal experiences:

- What local and global factors/forces influence the post-*jogi yuhak* students’ English literacy development and practices?
- What do literacy development and practices of Korean undergraduate students with *jogi yuhak* experience look like?
- How are the U.S higher education institution and writing programs responding to the growing and changing characteristics of the international undergraduate student body?

With these questions, in fall 2011, I embarked on an ethnographic journey at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) to explore the literacy and rhetorical practices of South Korean undergraduate students with specific attention to the *jogi yuhak* phenomenon. UIUC was the obvious and logical choice for my field site as it is the place where my intellectual inquiries were sparked and developed.

The University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (UIUC) is a public research-intensive higher education institution located in the mid-western region of the United States. Founded in 1867 and comprising 17 colleges with over 44,000 students (fall 2015), it is a large land-grant university and the flagship campus of the University of Illinois system. More notable and important to my research, due to extensive state budget cuts and a drive for internationalization, the university has become one of the leading U.S. higher education institutions to enroll huge number of international students. The university runs through two adjacent cities—Champaign and Urbana—surrounded by miles and miles of corn- and soybean- fields of smaller rural
towns/cities. At a glance, it might be odd to see so many international students seeking cosmopolitan status through their study abroad experience choose UIUC as their destination. For many foreign students, UIUC’s high global and U.S. ranking is a prestigious credential as they choose their study abroad destination. The institution’s world renowned prestige in fields of Engineering and Business education and high rankings,\textsuperscript{17} and the proximity to a major cosmopolitan city, Chicago, is more than enough to attract over ten thousand students from abroad.

According to \textit{Open Doors} (2014), with growth (mostly in the undergraduate population) over the past seven years, in U.S. higher education institutions, there are now 40\% more international students than a decade ago, with a record high of 819,644 in the 2012-13 academic year. Exceeding the national trend, the number of international students at UIUC increased 105\% in the last nine years (from 4,807 students in 2005-2006 to 9,871 students in fall 2014). The most noticeable increase has been in the number of international \textit{undergraduate} students, which reached 5,332 (16.4\% of the entire undergraduate population) in Fall 2014, a 370\% increase from 2005-2006 when there were only 1,440 international undergraduate students; this increase gave UIUC the second largest number of international students in the U.S. for the past four consecutive years, trailing the leader, the University of Southern California, by fewer than 40 students in 2012-2013. The largest growth has been the number of students from East Asian countries such as China and South Korea (henceforth Korea).

Due to the multi-sited (Falzon) characteristics of the project, it is important to address

\textsuperscript{17} According to U.S.News Education Ranking, as of fall 2015, under U.S. Best Colleges Ranking, UIUC is ranked #5 in the \textit{Best Undergraduate Engineering Program} category, #2 in \textit{Accounting} (ranking for overall \textit{Undergraduate Business Programs} is not provided), #41 in the National University category (#11 in \textit{Top Public Schools}), and #43 in the \textit{Best Global University} category.
the “micro-” sites or contexts within the larger university. Some of the micro-contexts or points of interaction with my participants are: the institutional (Korean Student Association), pedagogical (e.g., writing center, composition classrooms) and social contexts (e.g., social gathering, church events). The transnational realm can also be added to the site list as my student participants’ physical and virtual presence, in their accounts, narratives, and activities, transcends the university and U.S. boundaries.

To capture a full description of the post-jogi yuhak students’ and Korean undergraduate students’ literacy and rhetorical practices within the dynamics of the university, KSA, and local global context, ethnography was the natural choice of research methodology to study, know, and report about the world (Atkinson). In exploring the literacy development of my participants and their surroundings, ethnography is the methodology that adequately accommodates the particular objectives and open-ended inquiries I have regarding my participants and the contexts that they are a part of. Furthermore, the particular benefit of ethnography in literacy research is that it examines perspectives that are “misunderstood, underdeveloped, or occluded in popular understandings of an issue,” and can then inform policy, practices, and the larger structures in which literacy users are located (Sheridan 73). However, from my pilot study, I found that it was extremely difficult not to rely on my own experience, knowledge, and familiarity (preconceived notions of) with my participants\(^\text{18}\) and that I was “seeing data everywhere and nowhere, gathering everything and nothing” of [the] specific world” that I was researching (Charmaz and Mitchell 161). Knowing such pitfalls/dangers of ethnographic methodology could act as a weakness, I employ grounded theory methods to my approaches where the data would lead my research process and progress. In conducting such an open-ended research, I needed systematic

\(^{18}\) As a Korean, international student, and an English as a Second Language (ESL) learner with early study abroad experience, I share many characteristics with the participants that I study.
procedures for probing beneath the surface and digging into the scene. That is, as I drew “thick descriptions” (Geertz) to get at the patterns behind how a specific action takes place, grounded theory methods “add[ed] rigor to [the] ethnographic research by building systematic checks into both data collection and analysis” as I used an open-ended approach to studying the empirical world (Charmaz 23).

The systematic but flexible guidelines of the grounded methods in combination with my changing institutional and organizational roles have enabled my research to take on some characteristics of critical ethnography and authoethnography. Although my research site is the University and my research participants are its members, my research focus and site within the university grew more focused with the in-progress analyses and my changing and evolving institutional roles and responsibility and increased access and involvement. Given my position as the vice-president of the Korean Student Association (KSA; a registered student organization) and as the ESL services coordinator and then an Assistant Director at the Writers Workshop (the university’s writing center), I was able to not only collect data in these sub-sites but also apply some of the initial findings from in-progress analyses. For example, the Korean Single-Language Writing Group, in chapter 4, is a series of workshops that I, as the ESL Services Coordinator, created and designed based on the preliminary analysis and findings. In chapter 5, I present my personal narrative regarding my transnational cultural, educational, and language learning experience to provide not only my motivation for my research but also to present how my past and present language ideologies and practices, like my research participants, have been shaped by the local and global forces.

Through more than two years of fieldwork, my dissertation critically examines how literacy and rhetorical practices structure and are structured in the lives of post-jogi yuhak
Korean undergraduates at UIUC, my primary participants. I identified my primary participants through snow-ball or chain-referral sampling (Biernaki and Waldorf, Bogden and Biklen). At the beginning of fieldwork, I recruited and interviewed post-\textit{jogi yuhak} students that I came across in my individual consulting sessions at the Writers Workshop, undergraduate ministry at a Korean church, and through social and familial connections. Later in my fieldwork, as my roles changed in the institutions, I recruited students I met through the KSA (chapter 3) and the Korean Single-Language Writing Group (SLWG) (chapter 4) at the Writers Workshop. To note, the Korean writing group participants were recruited through the Writers Workshop’s event announcements\textsuperscript{19}.

Throughout my engagement and interaction with hundreds of students in various sectors of my micro-sites of ethnographic fieldwork, I was involved in the lives of 11 primary participants to varying extents. With IRB approval and with the participants’ consent (see Appendix A), the participants and I engaged in in-depth face-to-face and/or electronic (video and texting) interview sessions in individual and group settings. The interviews usually at the first meeting of approximately 1 to 2 hours were formal with planned and scripted questions inquiring about their personal background (e.g., familial, educational, \textit{jogi yuhak} experience). I used retrospective and projective interview questions to elicit participants’ past, present and future personal experiences and career trajectories in regards to their literacy experience. The follow-up interviews ranged from 2 to 6 for each participant, each lasting from 30 minutes to 2 hours in duration. These informal and casual conversations took place in more serendipitous and spontaneous circumstances in various moments of life on campus. For example, interviews with primary participants who were staff of KSA were often conducted after individual and team staff

\textsuperscript{19} See chapter 4 for details on the Korean Single-Language Writing Group and its recruitment and participant information
meetings or organized events. In these interviews, I was able to capture the more implicit aspects of their college lives that came out through their narrations.

In addition to my primary participants, I engaged with my secondary participants, including but not limited to, non-\textit{jogi yuhak} Korean undergraduate students, instructors, and university administrators at UIUC. In all, there were 21 secondary participants (see Appendix B) that were recruited through personal and professional networks in the community. Except for the two Korean undergraduate students\footnote{Like my primary participants, the data from these two non-\textit{jogi yuhak} students are from both formal and informal interviews conducted over the period of my research.}, my interviews were formal and with scripted questions about role and responsibilities pertaining to international student support at the university. For each secondary participant, again excluding the Korean undergraduate students, I planned one 1-hour interview per interviewee. In some cases, the interview lasted up to 2 hours as some interviewees were more interested in hearing my thoughts and preliminary findings regarding my project. Interviews with some university administrators (e.g., Nicole Tami, Un Yeong Park) and staff were at the beginning quite formal, but my expanding administrative capacity and involvement in the responsibilities regarding international students later allowed me to engage in more “natural” conversations.

For the interviews with my Korean primary and secondary participants, Korean was the primary medium of oral communication. This was a natural occurrence as the participants were all aware that I was a Korean national and my first language was Korean. Although I did not direct choice of language, my Korean student participants wanted to use Korean in the interviews and this allowed for fluent expressions and conversations of deep and abstract thoughts. All the formal interviews were audio-recorded (the Korean Second Language Writing Group was video-taped), transcribed, and translated (if conducted in Korean). For many of the spontaneous
conversations conceptual notes were taken and then analyzed. During these conversation and interviews, although some used English more than others, Korean was main medium and when English was used it was mostly for lexical code-shifting. Through out this dissertation, words are bolded in quotations to indicate use of English (and not a translation) in the students’ original speech.

The other two methods of inquiry involve ethnographic observations of the participants in the “natural settings” of their everyday college lives and the collection of artifacts such as personal texts (e.g., course papers, blogs) and institutional texts (e.g., university brochures, blogs, reports). I have observed students in environments and circumstances such as classrooms, group studies, social gathering, and church meetings. Observations across a wide range of both academic and non-academic sites and the analyses of personal and institutional artifacts give a holistic picture of the students’ literacy experiences during their college lives. Artifact collection was conducted on two levels, personal (participant) and institutional. I have collected textual artifacts that participants identified as significant to their literacy development. I examined texts that my primary participants regularly read or produce (e.g., magazines, books, public blog posts) and private texts that participants volunteer to share with me (e.g., school assignments, personal letters, non-public online posts). In the process, I also collected institutional artifacts (e.g., brochures, blogs, documents, reports, policies) that reference post-jogi yuhak and the international student life experience in higher education.

I have employed grounded theory (Charmaz) and examined interviews, observation data, and institutional documents and continuously pursued my hunches and potential analytic ideas about them. I have identified key themes that emerged in our discussions and related them to various themes. This process was used with rhetorical analysis of institutional (KSA and UIUC)
documents (e.g., websites, brochures, reports) collected from a span of two years (2011 to 2013). Grounded Theory methods have enabled my categories and data to evolve and, like my participants’ lived experiences, it has dynamically developed and continues to develop even as I write and rewrite. In addition to my own experience in various teaching and administrative capacities on campus, I have constructed data through observations, interactions, and materials that I gather about the topic or setting. As I write my ethnographic story, I embed the categories from my analysis. The process was less linear, more multi-dimensional and considerably less clear cut. Through these data, I was able to identify various contexts and forces that influence, and are influenced by, the research participants’ literacy practices. However, considering that my research is informed by “data” long before my “official” research began, a constellation of the “data” that I have lived through during my life journey 2003, the sources for my ethnographic project exceed and extend the temporal time and space indicated here. To “construct” theory from my data, it is important to situate my project amongst the conversation of scholars that significantly informs and contextualizes my study. By qualitatively examining post-jogi yuhak students’ past, present and professed future paths of literacy development across physical, virtual, and conceptual spaces and times, I explore the multiple and complex dynamics between and among various “participants” in the students’ literacy development, including individuals, institutions, texts, and technologies. Such exploration helps illuminate how these “participants/contributors” are part of the dynamic and organic nature of individuals’ literacy and rhetorical strategies and practices.
Chapter Overview

My dissertation explores the literacy and rhetorical practices of Korean undergraduate students with pre-college transnational education experience both before and after enrolling at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. To make sense of the practices and the relationships among the fluid, messy, and scattered local and global contextual boundaries, the following chapters draw out more of the salient historical, national, institutional, and ideological contextual layers that flow through local and global boundaries and co-exist specifically for a particular group of students (and many others) at a particular locality at a particular time in history.

In this chapter, I have established the contextual, methodological, and theoretical framework for this study of post-jogi yuhak undergraduate students’ literacy and rhetorical practices in college. I have briefly set the stage by explaining my immediate research field site, the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and the transnational context of literacy experiences that post-Jogi Yuhak students bring to the university. This chapter also demonstrates the usefulness of grounded theory methods and the theoretical implications that are foundational to my research.

Chapter 2, “Doing English Well,” explores post-jogi yuhak students’ past, present, and projected future literacy trajectories to understand their literacy development and how they construct ideologies about “doing English well.” Given the still-in-progress relocation of my participants, I draw attention to the migrations these students make as they merge multiple local and global literacy practices and ultimately reconfigure themselves and the transnational spaces in which they live. Contrary to the diverse language and literacy environment they have been exposed to before, during, and beyond their jogi yuhak years, I have found that their English
language ideology, conflated with racial ideologies, suggests that “good English” is “White English,” an ideology that has been reinforced and reimagined across quite complex literate and language trajectories. Because many of the students believe they will never “do English well,” they have abandoned the goal of acquiring “good English” and aim to be just good enough to get by in college.

“Korean Islands in American Water,” my third chapter, centers on the literacy and rhetorical practices of the Korean Student Association (KSA), a registered student organization on campus with more than 90% of its staff members being post-jogi yuhak undergraduate students. As the KSA has not emerged in a void, this chapter examines the climate and reactions to the sharp increase in recent years of the international population in U.S. higher education in general and at the University of Illinois. I argue that KSA and its members, in response to a rather indifferent climate for international students, work to build, reestablish, and preserve their identities and respect within the university through engaging in “Korean ways” of using language/literacy and through rhetorical practices conditioned by the Korean language and ideologies. For example, one of KSA’s stated missions is to help Korean students connect to the broader university community, yet its email and print communication, and even its public events, are almost entirely in Korean. The literacy and rhetorical practices emerging within the dynamics among the university, the KSA, and individual histories ultimately shape a literacy ecology that seems more oriented to returning “home” than adapting to the U.S. university.

With the preliminary findings, in chapter 4, “Recovering Rhetorical Identity,” I reexamine, reaffirm, and interact with the students’ identities and ideologies related to English and U.S. academic writing. This chapter argues for building programs and curricula that recognize and cater to the specific needs and characteristics of students. To do so, I investigate a
set of writing group sessions for Korean undergraduate students that I organized and facilitated, mainly in Korean, at the university’s writing center. Through time and encouragement, students in the writing group sessions (composed mainly of post-jogi yuhak students) freely shared, (re)negotiated, and found explanations and solutions for their current writing practices. These discussions pushed students to think beyond their self-perceived English deficiency and the idea that “good writing” is “White writing,” with “correct” grammar and expression and to focus more on the rhetorical choices they made in their texts, whether at the global (e.g. idea, organization) or local (e.g. sentence) level. The writing group helped students themselves break away from a deficit model of English language learning by understanding and respecting individual literacy experiences and, in turn, helping them take ownership of their English literacy practices.

My concluding chapter synthesizes the preceding chapters and suggests implications for rhetoric and composition scholarship and higher education institutions impacted by international undergraduate ESL students. To provide a historical perspective, I discuss the changing landscape of Korean international students in U.S. higher education with my own jogi yuhak experience and my father’s study abroad experience as examples. With an in-depth exploration of the post-jogi yuhak undergraduate students’ literacy narratives and my own, I consider how the strikingly transnational trajectories of this early group of students have ironically reinforced quite traditional language ideologies.
CHAPTER II
ABANDONING “DOING ENGLISH WELL”

During my research, as well as in my personal and professional encounters with many traditional and post-*jogi yuhak* Korean international students, one of the more significant observations was that it was rare to see Korean post-*jogi yuhak* undergraduate students using English amongst their Korean peers. It was as if it was an unspoken rule, shared by most Korean undergraduate students on campus. Most of the students in the study felt that they lacked the English competency they thought they should have acquired during their many years studying abroad. Students didn’t feel that they had lived up to the promise of the *jogi yuhak* project—a nationally fetishized transnational education project premised by the belief that earlier is better (and immersion in the target language is best) for language acquisition. Because they believed they did not accomplish the goal of acquiring “perfect” English skills, they hid their English language (abilities) from others, other Koreans in particular, as much as they could. So in their everyday literacy practices among their Korean peers, English words and phrases may have come up sporadically in casual settings, but elsewhere, Korean was the language of choice. Such literacy practices—the choice not to use the English language amongst Korean peers—of the post-*jogi yuhak* students should be understood within the U.S. university context and also within the Korean national context—how English has been taken up, how it is used, and why people choose to use the language in their respective contexts (Shim and Park). This simple but surprising observation, I claim, should not be taken lightly as it opens up windows to entangled workings of language ideologies constructed and shared within national and global boundaries.

This chapter explores post-*jogi yuhak* students’ past, present, and projected future literacy trajectories to understand their literacy development and how they have been constructing
ideologies about “doing English well” during the transnational movement. Given the still-in-progress relocation of my participants, I draw attention to the migrations these students make as they merge multiple local and global literacy practices and ultimately reconfigure themselves and the transnational spaces in which they live. Contrary to the diverse language and literacy environments to which they have been exposed before, during, and beyond their jogi yuhak years, I have found that their English language ideology—conflated with their own racial ideologies (also constructed across national borders)—suggests that “perfect English” (wanbyeokhan yeongeo) is “American English” (mikook yeongeo) thus implying “White American English” (mikook beakin yeongeo), a quite seemingly traditional English language ideology shared by Koreans since the post-colonial era. This process may seem as a simple reproduction and circulation of hegemonic language ideologies underlying jogi yahak but it is rather “a process through which such ideologies are negotiated and reformulated in interaction with various conditions of the student’s transnational itinerary” (Park and Bae 367). The language ideologies of post-jogi yuhak students have been reinforced and reimagined across quite complex literate and language trajectories and because many of the students believe they will never “do English well,” they have abandoned the goal of acquiring “good/perfect English” and aim to be just good enough to get by in college.

This chapter, drawing on insights from earlier studies that highlight language ideologies of jogi yuhak phenomenon, presents the language and racial ideologies behind Korean post-jogi yuhak students’ literacy practices constructed locally and globally. In other words, I demonstrate how these practices encompass a rearticulation of the hegemonic English language ideologies of Korea, conflated with particular racial ideologies across space and time, and now working within the unique language and racial ideologies at work within U.S. higher education. In the following
sections, I lay out the major factors and contexts that have influenced and molded the particular ideologies behind post-jogi yuhak students’ literacy and rhetorical practices. I first present the relationship between English and Korea (its history, society, and education system) focusing on the development and ramifications of *Education Fever* and *English Fervor/Frenzy* in Korea. The following sections, through the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak Korean undergraduate students at a U.S. university, will demonstrate how these language ideologies have been progressing within the dynamic Korean cultural, transnational, and U.S. collegiate borders.

**Korea, English, and Globalization**

*Fierce Competition*

English is at the center of the intense competitive society that South Korea (henceforth Korea) has become today. English competency is perceived as one of the key “skills/credentials” to a successful life (on the personal level) and to the nation’s survival strategy (on the global level). This strong belief has been represented as an epidemic that has afflicted the nation and its people with “English Fervor” (*yeongeo yeolpung*), referring to the relentless pursuit of English at extreme costs. As elaborated in chapter 1, short- and long-term study abroad (*Jogi yuhak* and/or post-jogi yuhak) is one form of the extremes surrounding English and others include: English as a medium of instruction from elementary to higher education\(^\text{21}\); English villages or themed-parks devoted to practice of English; English-only kindergartens; split-tongue surgery; and, most notably, for everyday Koreans of all ages, the massive private market for English learning (e.g., tutoring, *hagwons*). In 2009, the private market for English language learning in Korea was

\(^{21}\) See Piller and Cho (2013) for more details on “English as a medium of instruction.”
worth over 1.3 billion dollars (1.5 trillion won), which accounted for 40% of the public education budget (Piller and Cho 11).

The “strong beliefs about English and Koreans’ relationship to the language motivate a heavy pursuit of English at all levels of society, thus constructing English as a hegemonic language” (Park 4). The status of English has become so extreme the value of English exceeds its practical use, as English is more or less contained within specific linguistic domains such as popular culture but not used much in the everyday lives of the people (J. Park, Park & Abelmann). The most prominent cases are English evaluations through examinations such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication). These standardized tests are widely used gate-keeping mechanism for various educational and employment transitions in Korea. Minimum scores are required for college entrance, specialized high school entrance, and employment and/or promotions. Although English is recognized as a “required” skill for global competitiveness, most employees in major companies do not use English in their daily duties. As noted, for most Koreans, English is a key “symbolic” resource that indicates one’s preparedness for competition in the global market” (emphasis added) (J. Park). And this gives some perspective as to why so many middle-class Korean family would “invest” thousands of dollars\(^\text{22}\) on their child/children’s study abroad and endure split family transnational living arrangements.

Studies on the global spread of English have already pointed to the status of English being a social construction that is established, spread, and promoted widely by “native” speakers and local “non-native” speakers (Crystal, Phillipson, Pennycook). Thus, to understand the spread and dominance of English in Korea, one needs to look beyond language to its relationship with

\(^{22}\) For example, the families of international students at UIUC spend over 35 thousand dollars in out-of-pocket tuition annually, plus thousands more in living expenses.
the nation’s sociocultural, political, and economic contexts within its history (Park, Piller and Cho, Shim and Park). With the end of Japanese colonization in 1945, English began to gain importance with more ties to the United States government (e.g., military presence in Korea, international trade) in the process of modern nation making. In the 1980s, coming out of its long years of dictatorship and the stronger desire to rise to the global stage, the Korean government promoted the learning and use of English among the people (Shim and Park). For example, with the 1986 Asian Games and 1988 Olympic Games, even everyday Koreans felt the importance of learning and speaking the language\(^{23}\) (Baik). To the Korean government, these global events were “important symbolic resources for the construction of a highly specific connection between globalization, modernization, and English” (Shim and Park).

The status of English grew extensively in the 1990s with the Korean government’s adoption of Segye\(\text{-}\)ehwa (“globalization”) and its neoliberal and utilitarian reforms to enhance competitiveness in the global market (S Kim, Song). As in the economic domain, ideological construction of English continued with policies in education reform mandates. For example, under the seventh National Curricula in 1997, English language education was enforced four years earlier than the previous mandate, at third grade level in elementary school (Lee) and in some regions English immersion programs were set up. As discussed, the symbolic events, national policies, actual practices, and the Korean media\(^{24}\) have been and are vehicles in propagating the hegemonic status of the English language. The propagation of English as a

\(^{23}\) Anxieties over having to learn and speak English were felt from workers in the service sector. In my early teens, I vividly remember a taxi driver expressing the need and his frustrations over having to learn and speak English as the Olympic Games were only a few months away.

\(^{24}\) For more detail, see “The Domestication of South Korean Pre-College Study Abroad in the First Decade of the Millennium” by Kang and Abelmann (2011).
marker of privilege and success has been evermore accelerated with the growing competitiveness in the Korean society.

Since the country’s liberation from 50 years of Japanese rule in 1945 and more precisely after 1953 when the Korean War ended, education has been the nation’s only hope for it to rise from the disgrace of colonial rule, to rebuild a nation utterly destroyed by war, and, on the individual level, to survive the ruins and advance the social and economic class of the family. As widely used labels like Education Fever and Examination Hell show, education (and various entrance examinations to various education levels) has been at the heart of the competitive Korean society. Beginning in the late 1990s, the intensity of the competition to succeed in life with higher and better/prestigious educational/university credentials coupled with economic insecurity, triggered by the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997/98 and austere globalization measures, as Piller and Cho claim (2013), has driven the status of English language to the extremes embedded in Korea’s “structure of [extreme] competition,” (12) making it inevitable for many Koreans to buy into English.

As elaborated above, the status and meaning of English in Korea is constructed intrinsically within the local circumstances and with its inextricable global ties—the global economy and hegemony of the United States. Understanding the construction of American English hegemony within the context of Korean modern history is fundamental in unraveling the development of English ideologies behind the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak Korean students in my study. In the following sections, to apprehend why students avoid using English and cling to Korean, I elaborate on their meaning of “Good/perfect English,” and their entangled language, racial, and cultural beliefs.
“Doing English Well”

In the winter of 2012, a close friend of my husband, from Korea, visited Champaign during his trip to New York. He brought my daughter Pororo dolls (a very popular children’s character) as well as books. During our conversation regarding popular characters for children here in the states and in Korea, he mentioned why Dora, a character that had won over millions of children’s hearts in the U.S. at the time, including my daughter’s, didn’t “succeed” in Korea. (He knew this well because a friend of his bought the license to the character.) He explained that it was a sensation at the beginning but that it slowly lost popularity among not necessarily Korean children but Korean mothers. I was very surprised (but not too surprised) to hear that Korean parents were worried that their children would pick up the “wrong type” of English and not “correct” English.

The perception of what “correct,” what “wrong,” or what “standard” English is supposed to look and/or sound like is also intrinsically embedded in the construction of the language status. “Correct” English or “doing English well” that positions white, modern, Western speakers as legitimate users of English is evident in many of my interviews and conversation with Korean undergraduate students, both with and without jogi yuhak experience. The students that I’ve interviewed, in one way or another, all mentioned that “expression/vocabulary” and “pronunciation/accents/intonation” were the two most important elements of “good” English. Between these two, however, it seemed as though there was more emphasis on the “importance” or “significance” of acquiring the “American” pronunciation/accents/intonation. It was interesting to notice that when talking about English and English ability it was mostly about the spoken aspect and not the written.

25 For “Labels given to the English of Successful Learners in Data (Table 1)” in Korean media, see Table 1 (12) in Park (2010) “Images of ‘Good English’ in the Korean Conservative Press.”
Jihyun, a Sophomore in the Division of General Studies, transferred from a Community College in St. Louis before coming to the U.S. Her entire family of five left for the states in her second year in high school (equivalent to Junior year in the U.S.), very abruptly, when both of her parents in their late 40s decided to do their doctoral studies in theology. She remembers when she was in her first semester in the high school (had to downgrade to Sophomore year), in a history class, all she could hear was “Turkey” and everything else was a blur. She remembers being proud of herself in the second semester when everything was clearer. Jihyun talked about how her English improved greatly within the first year after she arrived but didn’t progress as fast in the following years. She did, however, acknowledge that her English did get a bit “natural,” a vocabulary she chose to use as an equivalent to “sounding more American.” She explained how she pays much attention to not only vocabulary and spelling but also “accent and intonation”:

I put effort into listening to it a lot and try to imitate it. I take this into consideration because, with something like intonation, I think you need to acquire it to really feel like you are speaking like an American. So this is why I put huge emphasis on it.

Jihyun expressed how very self-conscious she felt when she had to speak English in the presence of other Koreans. She said she was “pretty good” with the English “subject” in Korea where most of the tests were based on memorizing vocabulary and filling in the blanks. But when it came to speaking, particularly around her Korean peers, she felt too self-consciousness about the way she might sound to others since she also becomes “attentive” when she hears other Koreans talk.
When a Korean speaks English, [I think to myself] so that person speaks English that much/well. I tend to make “judgments.\textsuperscript{26}” My friends also tell me they do this. Even before asking how long they have lived [here in the U.S.], I would think something like statement like ‘Her English pronunciation is good or not good.’ This might be because a sense of inferiority in myself. But this makes me worry how others will evaluate [my English]. Yeah, when it comes to [using/speaking] English…Even when my friends in Korea ask me to ‘talk in English’ or ‘write them in English,’ I tell them ‘no no I’m not good at English.’ I know they wouldn’t say anything like it but lots of burden if I make a grammatical error, they might say something like ‘hey, you even got this wrong?’

Throughout my conversations with her on multiple occasions over a year, it was interesting to see how the emphasis on “sounding like a native,” did not change much for Jihyun. The burden of speaking English was not only around Korean peers. In another occasion, Jihyun talked about how frustrated she got once when she was not able to pronounce “sheet” right and would pronounce it as “shit” and also how she was not good at differentiating “wood” from “would.” She explained it was important to “fix” it because she was here in the U.S. and she thinks it’s “part of the [American] culture.” “I know I can never become perfect [in pronunciation],” […] but I do want to at least be similar since I think [sounding like an American] is a standard in speaking English” (emphasis added). Then she went on, “Plus, it’s not that I get offended whenever an [American] friend jokingly corrects my pronunciation or an expression […] but it does lower my “self-esteem.”” My interactions with Jihyun made it evident that she held

\textsuperscript{26} As explained in chapter 1, most of the interviews with my primary participants (post-\textit{jogi yuhak} students) were conducted in English. The interview quotes in the dissertation has all been translated from Korean into English. However, within block quotes, words and phrases in double quotation marks (“ ”) were originally spoken in English.
strongly to the belief that American English speakers spoke “perfect” English, or rather sounded “perfect,” and it was the “standard.”

Sun, a freshman in biology, who had spent more than 8 years in Malaysia before coming to UIUC, was more overt about his definition of “doing English well” and its connection to bek-in in our conversation.

Sun: To me, doing English well is communicating, no, I mean no difficulties in communicating, exchanging intentions/meanings when talking with foreigners, and also, for me, when the pronunciation is good. I tend to think that [someone is] doing [English] well if the pronunciation is good when communicating.

Me: Do you mean when talking like an American (mikook saram)?

Sun: Yes, talking like an American.

Me: Whom do you mean by Americans exactly?

Sun: American White person (bek-in), without question!

This dominant native-speakerism (Holliday 2005) ideology was found, to varying degrees, among my study participants. Despite the geographical, cultural, and educational heterogeneity of the students’ pre-college experience, their notions of “doing English well”—literally translated from Korean “yeonyeo lul jarhada”—were quite homogeneous. Regardless of what country they had studied abroad in before coming to the U.S., for post-jogi yuhak students, “doing English well” meant doing English like an “American (mikook saram)” which implicitly and unconsciously meant “White person (bek-in).” This was detected in Jihyun’s remark when she expressed how “Asian[-Americans] do not have an accent […] so they don’t get treated differently,” inadvertently differentiating Asian-Americans from the “real” Americans, the “White person (bek-in).”
Language Hierarchy

Korean students in my study demonstrated lack or avoidance of English language practices more among their Korean peers because they don’t want to be judged or evaluated poorly for their English competency. This was surprising to me at the beginning of the research because the majority of the Korean undergraduate population have had three or more years of studying abroad before enrolling at UIUC, giving rise to the notion that they possess a fairly good grasp of the everyday spoken English and even of American and Western culture in general. As noted at the beginning of the chapter, most post-jogi yuhak students in the study, felt they lacked the English competency that they should have acquired from many years of studying abroad, failing to achieve one of the main goals of the transnational education migration -- namely, mastering English and thereby becoming global elite citizens--a project premised by the belief that earlier is better for language acquisition. Because they have not yet, in their minds, accomplished the goal of “doing English well”, they hide their English language from others, fellow Koreans in particular, as much as they can.

Soo-Jin, the director of the LET\textsuperscript{27} Team in Korean Student Association (KSA) at the time of the study and a junior majoring in journalism and a reporter for the campus newspaper, the Daily Illini (DI), adhered to the Korean language in the KSA and also among her Korean peers in general.

If I try to use English I feel a wall somewhat. Also, I get conscious of how they [Korean peers] will think of my English. Since such thoughts come endlessly, I become very

\textsuperscript{27} The acronym stands for “Language Exchange Table.” Only the acronym is used in the KSA because the words themselves lost their literal meaning as the team expanded its activities beyond teaching English to Koreans (mostly to non – UIUC students) in the community. The English language conversation classes are only one of many activities that include volunteer and outreach initiatives.
careful when speaking. So [I think to myself whether] this is something that I can say in English or not. Because I would hate to be looked down upon. I don’t want people telling others things like “I spoke with her in English once and she really sucks at it.” That’s why I purposely use Korean instead of English.

Soo-Jin felt that she had reached only “50% to perfection” with English competence, and like others interviewed and observed, refrains from speaking English around Korean peers for fear of evaluation and criticism. And this avoidance was also evident among their White peers with Sun’s experience.

When I’m by myself, when I go to a restaurant or in my “Rhetoric” class [first-year composition course] and if there are more bek-in, then I feel extremely “unsecure.” I don’t feel “secure.” Although I know how to do the English, I get this feeling right smack at the beginning, ‘I am not good at English compared to them.’ And when I feel I’m lesser than them, it makes me freeze and I don’t say anything. You know, I talk a lot, I’m a VERY talkative kid but when I’m with bek-in, I don’t talk.

Sun’s insecurity with English language use, Soo-Jin’s sense of half-reached English competence, and Jihyun’s belief that she “will never be perfect” in English, can be explained by one of three prevalent English language ideologies shared by Koreans—self deprecation. Joseph Park (2009), in The Local Construction of a Global Language, argues persuasively that Koreans hold three English language ideologies:

- **Necessitation:** This ideology views English as a valuable and indispensable language...
- **Externalization:** This ideology views English as an external language, or as a language of an Other, treating it as a language that is incongruent with and opposed to the identity of one’s group…

- **Self-deprecation:** This ideology views Koreans lacking sufficient competence to use English meaningfully, despite the abundance of English education they receive… (26).

I identified all three language ideologies among the post-*jogi yuhak* students in my study but the most salient of the three ideologies was *self-deprecation*. According to Park (2009), *self deprecation*, a belief that perceives Koreans as competent and meaningful users of English, a term he also applies to “cultural and social constructions of linguistic competence in order to understand how a community may subordinate itself within a hierarchical relation of power through the mediation of such constructions” (26).

This hierarchical relation of power was found in how Sun and Jihoon placed Singlish way at the bottom of their language hierarchy list, whereas American English was at the top. Sun and Jihoon both did their *jogi yuhak* in Southeast Asian countries. Sun in Malaysia, as noted, and Jihoon in Singapore. Whereas Sun moved to Malaysia, with his family, at the age of 9 and attended American international schools, Jinhoon was sent to a Canadian international high school, alone, at the age of 16. Due to their similar language experience, they had become instant friends as soon as they arrived on campus and coincidently sat by each other on a church shuttle bus. In our interviews together, they talked much about how they often used Singlish and Malaysian English (which was similar to Singlish) with one another in person and almost always via text (See figure 4). With zeal, they also mocked a simple dialogue explaining what it meant and how the same word like “hello” in Singlish and American English would have different
pronunciation and intonation. They even showed me a text message received during our interview and directed me to a couple of youtube sites with good examples of Singlish.

They explained, although not as good as the “locals,” due to its complexity, they used Singlish and/or Malaysian English because it was convenient. However, there was a taboo—they would “never” use it in front of American English speakers. So they would find themselves cringing or sighing whenever a word or intonation came out unconsciously and they would vow they would never to do it again. Their devaluation of the languages was rather perplexing since they had been using the East Asian Englishes so enthusiastically amongst themselves. Towards the middle of the interview, the reasons became clear as, at one point or another, they alluded to the impurity of the languages, as it was, to them, a mix-match of various languages without any structure or order, and the “cheapness” of the pronunciation was “no-good” compared to the
“legitimate English.” Sun, in particular, was very proud of himself for being able to learn the American accent and more so being able to code-switch for different circumstances, but admitted sometimes he would slip.

These ideologies and devaluation of South East Asian Englishes were rooted in both their family members and schools. Sun explained how his grandfather, who he respected dearly and frequently visit his family in Malaysia, “loathed” the Malaysian English accent and would repeatedly ask him keep his English “clean.” Sun also talked about a time his father felt so “embarrassed and shameful” and “regretted” the time a Singlish phrase—*sa tul la ge*—unintentionally came out when ordering at a restaurant in New York. As for Jinhoon, he talked about his “trauma” learning English in Singapore at an international school and his Canadian English teachers often scolding his classmates from Singapore, Vietnam, and China for their English accent and telling them “if they keep it up, they’ll never be able to speak English.” Such devaluation of these varieties of Englishes and conceptions of “doing English well” transcended borders, molded, and reinforced these seemingly demographically and linguistically diverse educational sites.

*Language and Racial Hierarchy*

In the individual interview in the following semester, Sun talked more about his family and his eight years in Malaysia. As Sun talked about his school life and the *jogi yuhak* landscape in Malaysia, it was interesting to hear him justify his family’s choice of the *jogi yuhak* location. One of the rationales he presented was quite revealing.

---

28 As noted in chapter 1, the west nations (e.g., U.S. Canada) are the most popular and desired *jogi yuhak* destinations.
When Koreans students go directly to [western] countries like the United States. Well my friends [who came to the states for jogi yuhak] told me they at least once would get depression or like “self-esteem” would go “down” and they go through it at the beginning. But if you go to Malaysia [for jogi yuhak], even if you don’t do English well at first, because you have [lot of] Korean students and your parents near, I think you can [learn English] really really fast. If you are diligent […] I think the level of English for people who did jogi yuhak in Malaysia and who did it here [U.S] are the same. I don’t think I really thought of any Korean here and said ‘wow, that person does English well.’

He further noted how “kids” who did their jogi yuhak might sometimes have “smoother” accent but do not necessarily do English well. Then again, he went on about why Malaysia was a better place for jogi yuhak but this time his explanation was rather alarming (although I did not show it at the interview).

Korean society people think “lower/less” of people from Southeastern Asia. So if you study there [in Malaysia] the probability of going through depression and [lack of] self-confidence is much lower. Because the first people you see is “Whites” who do English well and they feel they [“Whites”] won’t hang out with you. That’s why they [Koreans studying in U.S. high schools] are usually alone at the beginning and later look for other Koreans. In Malaysia, you have more foreign friends than Korean friends. So it’s a bit loose [the pressure to speak good English] and you can hang out with people you click with. But here Koreans only hang out with Koreans.

Wanting to hear more, I probed by asking who he meant by “foreign friends.” He started by saying “people who weren’t Korean,” and “people who can communicates in English” and went one to say:
Just from the people I’ve met, white people are [at] the top, then it’s us [Koreans] and the rest are low-level (hadeungin) people, right? Umm…well…when you see a Chinese or an Indian, your response is different from seeing a White person (bek-in). To me, “white people” are good looking, and also do English really well and look cool and sophisticated. But when I look at Indians or Chinese…you don’t get that good feeling. So, it is rare that you feel inferior. So in such an environment [in Malaysia], I think you gain more confidence. Because of this foundation, you’re able to gain confidence and really make strides in improving English.

And when I reminded him that English is India’s official language, he said he knew but he was still able to use and improve his English around them because of the “superiority” mindset. I was a bit startled by Sun’s frank racial statements as it went against the positive and mature person that I had come to know Sun as. The lack of hesitation or reservation in his elaboration, however, shows his beliefs about racial order constructed shuttling back and forth between Korea and Malaysia, for Sun, is the truth/fact about the world he lived in and the truth he believed most Koreans (even me) share. Thus, my findings not only show the “hierarchical relation of power” of language ideologies is closely tied to the students’ beliefs about the racial hierarchy, but also how it can shape the literacy development.

*Racism: “An American Thing”*

Like Sun, although my participants’ English language ideologies suggested, in varying degrees, their belief systems regarding race, most students in the study were rather distant from or unfamiliar with issues of race and racism in the U.S. context or perceived racism as “physical violence, something they imagined was in the past” (211) as An (2015) found in her qualitative
study of high school *jogi yuhak* students’ experience with racism in the U.S. Korean students that I have encountered felt they were more attuned to and sensitive toward bias and discrimination surrounding language—treatment that, they indicated, they experienced on a daily basis. Soo-Jin, who defined racism as “being treated differently than others,” angrily narrated an incident in a course in the previous semester that she felt was “unfair”: an instructor gave another classmate a better grade when it was “so apparent” she had put in much more effort all semester, while the other “white girl” had missed classes and assignments. When I asked if the professor was known for racial discrimination, Soo-Jin answered, “No. Since there are no other Koreans [to compare with]. I’m just ranting but [I] don’t really think [he is a racist]. I just came to that conclusion because I don’t understand why [she got a better grade].”

With the racist implications of the banner incident during KSA’s Korean Week (see introduction in chapter 1), I became curious about students’ perceptions and experiences with race and racism in their college lives. When I asked if they had encountered any other racial discrimination on campus, most were ambivalent toward or even uncertain about the concept of racism within its long history in the U.S. Kyung-Won searched her memory and shared with me an incident that had occurred to her and her Korean friends at a train station in Chicago. When her party attempted to complain to the ticket office, the attending agent that began responding suddenly called someone from the back room to explain the issue since “they don’t seem to understand English.” Kyung-Won said she felt mortified and explained to the person that they understood everything and it was the agent who was not understanding. But after her account to me, she adjusted her thoughts and reflected, “I’m not really sure though. Now that I talk about it, it seems like we were treated that way because of our English. Maybe we just sounded different to [the agent]” Woo-Bin, one of the staff members of the PR Team, was so unacquainted with
the idea of racism that he asked me, “Isn’t it something like white people looking down on nonwhite people?” After giving me a few examples of what could be racism he went on to say, “I’m not sure. It’s such an American thing.”

Student accounts show language development in process with complicated workings of various perceptions and beliefs about language and race across transnational borders—an ongoing development. And these ideological workings have contributed to, as the next section and chapter 3 will further elaborate, the particular literacy and rhetorical practices post-jogi yuhak Korean undergraduate students at UIUC. Next, the final section demonstrates one traditional Korean cultural factor that is affecting literacy practices.

**Practicing Respect Through Honorifics**

On December 16, 2011, shocking news hit the Korean newsstands. A celebrity’s son, who was sent off to do jogi yuhak at a private school in LA, went into a coma during a fist-fight with another Korean student and passed away two days later. More intriguing is the reason for the fist-fight; as one news website reported “피해자와 가해자는 같은 학년이지만 2 살 차이의 나이 때문에 형,동생 호칭을 놓고 갈등을 빚어왔다고 한다” (Daum News). Literally translated, “the victim and the perpetrator, although in the same grade level but of two years in age difference, have been in long standing conflict over titles hyung (형, a title used for elder brother) and dongseng (동생, a title used for younger brother or sister). To reiterate, the celebrity’s son, 19 years old student, and a younger student, 17 years old, got into a fight due to a conflict over the

---

29 See Daum News for article: http://media.daum.net/breakingnews/view.html?cateid=1005&newsid=20101218020705295&fid=20101218032604280&lid=20101218015104570
30 The title “hyung,” more strictly used among siblings, is used alone or followed by the person’s name (e.g. John-hyung).
use (or in this case, non-use) of the honorific title “hyung.” To put it simply, the 19-year old was upset that the 17-year old was not addressing him with respect.

In contrast to English, where the verb form changes to whether the subject of the sentence is singular or plural, in Korean sentences, the form of the predicate is sensitive to the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the addressee in regards to power (age, educational grade level, social status, etc.) and solidarity (Choo 113). With respects to power and solidarity, not only do sentence forms change but particular titles also change to the status of the relationship(s). These honorifics, however, are not static as the relationship status among people is fluid and complicated. Also, in this day and age where transnational movements are frequent and common, some Koreans and not others have adapted their registers to language conventions that are less strict depending on various circumstances. For example, in most immigrant Korean families, with the use of English without honorific registers, younger siblings do not use the title *hyung* to indicate their older sibling (but some still do).

In the Korean undergraduate social context, an effort to adhere to such cultural norms and conventions, for example, is most frequently observed in the first time introductions. When two or more Korean undergraduate students meet for the first time, from numerous observations I made, the first personal information that they would exchange would be their name, age and major. The age, in particular, determines not only the title and linguistic register but also the attitudes towards the counterpart. In more detail, once age is revealed, individuals also share whether they are “early year born,” meaning born in January or February that attended school at higher grade-level with peers one year older—another element influencing the status of the relationship. Such adherence to honorific registers changes as one gets older as age and grade-level is no longer the sole status setter and as changes in power identifiers (e.g. social status)
complicate the relationships. Hyun-Jung remembers her first week enrolled in an all-girls high school in the U.S. and being called outside of the school building.

An unni (언니, a title for older sisters) at our school called all the newbies together and made us stand in a line. They made us tell our names and age. Then they took turns and told us their names and ages. They wanted to set the hierarchy straight at one setting so no one would get confused. There were only 14 or 15 Koreans at our school so it was hard to ignore such a tradition.

As elaborated in the first section, Post-jogi yuhak students try not to/refrain from using English when with other Korean students. One of the reasons that they mentioned is because they do not want to be “evaluated” or be viewed as “showing off.” Especially when they are in a group of people of different ages, they don’t want to be disrespectful by “showing off” by speaking English. In addition to these language ideologies, these traditional Korean conventions, which may seem extreme to many unfamiliar with the Korean norms, are an important part of Korean undergraduate student life at UIUC. It also become a crucial element influencing the way these student use English or not.

As I participated in the activities of the Korean Student Association at Illinois, I became increasingly interested in how language ideologies and transnational histories were shaping its linguistic, literate, semiotic, and rhetorical practices. During my activities in the KSA as a vice president, I was able make observations on how such cultural norms deterred the Korean students from using English in their KSA work. Below are some text messages that Haejoo, the team director of KSA’s Public Relations team, and I exchanged at the beginning of Fall semester when I was first introduced to her via email. She sent me the message via phone.
Haejoo: This is ksa PR team yunji =) jal boo tak deu ryeo yo!

(This is KSA team Yunji –smiley face. I’m looking forward to working with you!)

So I replied – It took me a long time to figure out how to read/decipher it in Korean:

Me: Judo jal boo tak deu rim ni da. Woori yol sim hee he boop si da.

(Looking forward to working with you, too. Let’s work hard.)

Haejoo: Absolutely! :]

When I asked Haejoo a few months after why she did not just write in English, she explained that she felt it was rude or impolite to just start using English with a Korean who is much older than her.

I also noticed that at times when communicating electronically via emails, Facebook, and text messages, Haejoo apologized for “typing” in English, though she only does so when using a school computer on which Korean characters are not accessible. In an official email sent out to entire the KSA directors and staff, she began her message with an apology—sorry about typing in English—to avoid being perceived as rude (figure 5).

Figure 5. Email message from Haejoo

The decision for Koreans to use the Korean language in a Korean club might seem obvious on its face. And to those familiar with the hierarchical Korean society and culture and the complex honorific/hierarchical indexicals native to the Korean language, it might seem
obvious that Koreans might refrain from using English, which cannot express these honorifics, among other Koreans. However, I contend such a seemingly “obvious” phenomenon needs to be understood within the complex ideologies surrounding language, race, and power and how they play out in the literacy lives of the Korean students on a U.S. university.
CHAPTER III

KOREAN ISLANDS IN AMERICAN WATERS

In Chapter 1, I opened my dissertation with the disappearance of the KSA banner (see figure 1 in chapter 1). To recall, on the Saturday morning before Korean Week, the KSA banner that hung on the Alma Mater commemorating the Korean Week was gone without a trace. On the following morning, the Korean and U.S. flag bound to the hands of the Alma Mater disappeared as well but this time with a trace—in front of the statue, the words “I hate” was found in the Korean emblem chalk graffiti. The incident not only dampened the celebration but also concerned the KSA staff members. Throughout Korean Week, as the KSA successfully implemented all the planned events, much talk and speculation surrounding the issue of “racism” on campus continued to surface. The KSA staff members speculated on possible culprits of and motives for the offensive act: a domestic student who was bothered by the increasing presence of Asian students on campus; a domestic student who was offended by a foreign national flag being hung up on “his” Alma Mater; a disgruntled Korean student with bitter sentiments against the KSA. A local TV broadcasting station also aired the incident as its headline for the evening news and alluded to hate crimes on campus, noting that, at least officially, none had occurred for several years. Despite all the commotion over the who’s and why’s of the incident, talk of potential racism gradually faded amid the busyness of the week and semester.

A semester after the disappearance of the Korean Week banner, I brought up the banner incident in my interview with Kyung-Won. As noted in Chapter 1, she recalled her fascination with the incident and how she had felt fortunate to be “a part” of the unfortunate incident. In our dialogue, as she went on about her leadership in designing and making the banner, she also
talked about how that sense of recognition and achievement had made her somewhat “addicted” to KSA work overall. Kyung-Won expressed how she would constantly check her email inbox for more work orders and how she would think of ideas for the KSA at the oddest, most unexpected times. But this, for Kyung-Won, was a positive aspect in her college life. Later in our conversation, she mentioned how lucky she felt to have joined the organization.

K: The KSA is a place where I can do something. It’s where opportunities are. It’s a platform where I can feel free to do what I want.

Me: But why not other RSOs or clubs?

K: I think it’s because of culture and language. I know that there are clubs that Americans run. But even if I go because there is a “subject” that I like. Regardless, I think there will be a limit to how much I can participate.

Me: Why?

K: I still feel that I have limits in expressing. For example, I’m doing a project with an American girl now [for class]. But whenever I meet with her, I work as I feel the limit. It’s even hard to explain [ideas] in Korean, so to do it in English is harder. I think and organize as I talk but then to do that in English is so hard. Too many times I stumble with the [English] language. The KSA is comfortable, no language wall. Can speak out when I want to, so I like it (emphasis added).

The sense of freedom to be and act afforded her by the KSA conferred emotional benefits as well: at the end of the conversation, Kyung-Won mentioned how people (Koreans mostly) posted praise on the KSA website for her unique and professional design of the K-Card discount card (see figure 4). She explained that such acknowledgments are an important motivation for her and also a stimulus for her to devote endless hours to her work at the KSA. As an Industrial Design
major, she went on to declare that she had never felt so proud and that despite the indifferent atmosphere at the university described above, she ultimately felt she had made a good choice to attend the university. A senior in fall 2013, she felt that she was really a “member of the university.” To Kyung-Won and many others that I had worked with and observed, KSA was a comfort zone where Korean language use was valued. As I further demonstrate in the next sections, the perceived lack of self-worth and respect in the university waters is realized in the KSA Island where limits due to language are less of an obstacle in fulfilling a college life.

Much as Ralph Cintron explored how Mexican-American gang members in an Illinois town worked rhetorically through various linguistic and semiotic means to “create respect under conditions of little or no respect” (x), this chapter illustrates how Korean undergraduate students, under conditions of “no respect,” worked to build, reestablish, and preserve Korean identity at the University of Illinois, to create conditions of respect and legitimacy through what I call literacy and rhetorical practices of localization. By localization, I am pointing to the active (but not necessarily intentional) ways in which individuals respond to multiple layers of local and global contexts in taking up a particular stance to being in their locality. In other words, literate practices become a means of responding to the exigencies that emerge at the locality, the active making and shaping of the locality. Thus, this chapter focuses on the Korean Student Association (KSA), the key point for localization at the university. In the case of KSA and its staff members, contrary to the jogi yuhak movement to become global elites fluent in English, with quite conventional language ideologies, localization focused here on “Koreanness,” fostered not only through widespread and sometimes surprising use of the Korean language in a Midwestern town dominated by monolingual English speakers, but also by institutionally rebuilding Korean social practices and networks (that had become strained over their many years of study abroad) to
return to work in Korea.

In addition to the examination of the broad contexts of past and present national/Korean economic, educational, and social conditions as well as the specific contexts of (English) ideologies surrounding the jogi yuhak project in the previous chapter, this chapter further teases out the entangled literacy contexts and practices of localization of post-jogi yuhak students at the University of Illinois. Using a “rhetorical approach to literacy” (Duffy 42), this article portrays how post-jogi yuhak students “use language and other symbols for the purpose of shaping conceptions of [their] reality” (Duffy 41). Specifically, this chapter demonstrates how the KSA and its members’ rhetorical literacy practices have been influencing, and have been influenced by, the transnational and institutional conditions they inhabit physically and psychologically. As it does so, particular attention is paid to the ecology of literacy development that shows how literacy is “tied up with the particular details of the situation and that literacy events are particular to a specific community at a specific point in history” (Barton 7). The following sections, although distinct in their organization, portray the blurriness of boundaries and the messy relationships among various contexts (e.g., institutional, ideological) and practices of localization that stem from tensions within the dynamics of the dispersed local and global. Drawing attention to the contradictory qualities imbued within the contexts and practices, I argue that within such contextual layers, the students are rereading the institutional, national, and global landscape and reframing their own and our understanding of the term globalization.

In the following sections, I examine one particular identity-based group of learners in (and apart from) the university – the KSA. In examining the literacy and rhetorical practices of the KSA and its staff members, I first lay out the larger university context that the KSA is situated in: a context that had been shaping the literacy and rhetorical practices. Then the chapter
explores how the KSA fosters literacy practices and rhetorical education toward two outcomes, which are often in tension: identification within the group, and identification with the larger university community. This chapter argues that, as participants develop alternative discourses/literacy practices for plugging into and yet remaining critically apart from the university, the intimate practices of this group provide a means of participating in and transforming the university economy.

The “Diverse” American Waters

With Brown v Board and Regents of the University of California v Bakke, the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that the United States had a compelling interest in creating an integrated society of learners. In the wake of these decisions and the social movements that led to them, many institutions of higher education have made diversity a key term in their institutional discourse. Throughout the decades, the University of Illinois, a land-grant institution, has espoused this agenda of ending segregation and incorporating a “diverse” student body. In the words of the university’s Diversity Values Statement,

As the state’s premier public university, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s core mission is to serve the interests of the diverse people of the state of Illinois and beyond. The institution thus values inclusion and a pluralistic learning and research environment, one in which we respect the varied perspectives and lived experiences of a diverse community and global workforce. We support diversity of worldviews, histories, and cultural knowledge across a range of social groups including race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, abilities, economic class, religion, and their intersections. (emphasis added)
With this statement, the Inclusive Illinois-One Campus, Many Voices initiative, and the Chancellor’s Campus Commitment to “prohibit discrimination and harassment […] and to ensure] a truly diverse, welcoming, and inclusive community of students, scholars and staff,” (“Campus Commitment.”) the University of Illinois embraces the integration of its campus community as a priority. Yet the ethos of honoring diversity has not always manifested itself in policies or programs that support the linguistic needs of international students. Since the inception of “Students’ Right to Their Own Language,” a 1974 College Composition and Communication resolution that called for literacy teachers and scholars to affirm the dialects and language patterns mostly of African-American students, there have been no professional documents or policy that so much as acknowledge “language diversity” within the student body by the University. Furthermore, language or linguistic discrimination is omitted in the University of Illinois Non-discriminatory Statement and under the list of Types of Discrimination/Protected Classes on the university’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Access website. Given the recent soaring enrollment of international students, adding to the already linguistically diverse student body, the failure to institutionally and publicly recognize language as a possible site of discrimination is particularly noteworthy.

Attending to “the problem of self-segregation” in her book The Intimate University, Nancy Abelmann argues that (self-)segregation at the university is not merely “a matter of cultural

---

31 The university’s commitment to diversity might also be questioned in other areas given. For example, controversy around the Chief Illiniwek (an American Indian mascot for athletic events) mascot misappropriating Native American cultural figures and rituals lasted for more than two decades before the university retired it as a mascot in 2007. More recently, the controversy over the (non)hiring of Steven Salaita compromises the university’s vow of diversity.

32 CCC (alone) has 5 position statements on language issues, SRTOL and 4 later ones, including the CCC statement on Second Language Writing and Writers of 2000.

33 For more information, see the University of Illinois Non-discriminatory Statement (http://diversity.illinois.edu/discrimination-and-harrassment-prevention.html).
comfort” (3). Rather such “comfort zones” at a college are negative because college is supposed to be about valuing diversity. Thus, comfort zones oppose this aim, in effect “thwarting personal and academic growth” (5). But, as Abelmann further argues, there are larger forces behind the phenomenon—the zones are not solely the choice of the students but also the product of race and racism. Extending Abelmann’s argument to international students in general and the KSA and KSA members in particular, I argue that students’ segregation, self and otherwise, is driven by the lack of tolerance for language diversity at the university—by an unfavorable academic and social campus atmosphere suffused with monolingual ideologies and limited literacy support.

_Lack of Language Support_

At the University of Illinois, all incoming first-year students are required to take one to three composition courses. During the period of this research (2011–2012), international students in particular, depending on their TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language)/IELTS (International English Language Testing System) and/or ACT scores, were channeled into one of three course options: ESL writing courses (at least the final course in the sequence ESL 113, 114, and 115) provided by the Department of Linguistics; Rhetoric courses (Rhetoric 101 and 102—with a 100 tutorial linked to each, 103 and 104, or 105) offered by the Department of English; or Oral and Written Communication courses (Communication 111 and 112) offered by the Department of Communication. After the students complete whatever course or courses are required in their first year, they are on their own to seek language and writing

---

34 Incoming first-year students may fulfill the General Education requirement for Composition 1 through testing out on proficiency measures (English ACT or AP English) or through taking one or more courses in one of three programs (Linguistics for ESL writing courses, English’s Rhetoric Program for general writing courses, and Communication’s sequence on speaking and writing).
assistance during their remaining years in college. For many English as additional language (EAL) learners, this composition track, while typical to U.S. colleges and universities, is insufficient to “succeed” or, according to Hyun Jung, “survive” in academics throughout college. During a writing group specifically for Korean undergraduate students, Hyun-Jung, a senior majoring in psychology, talked about the lack of writing/language support at the university:

When I took the Rhetoric class, truthfully you really can’t ask about things like grammar. I was afraid the natives [speakers] would say something like why is she bringing that up here. So [even if I had a question regarding language] I would just forget since I would have other classes to think about. Even if there was something to ask the [Rhetoric course] instructor. I mean things I want to ask might be about content but there are times when I want to ask ‘how do you articulate’ an idea [that I can’t in English]. You know, for natives that’s not that difficult. [Because for them] translating the idea to English is not difficult. It’s the making the logic that is difficult. So, during office hours, the instructors usually expect you to have questions about the reading but not about grammar or how to express things. I think the expectations are different [for the instructor and the student]. And because I know what the expectations are, I talk about the reading with [the instructors] and they tell me to take the language and grammar issues to the [university’s writing center].

There are “advanced composition” courses, but these offer uncertain support for literacy development. An advanced composition course can be anything from a general education course with some attention to writing to an intensive capstone course, depending on the student’s major and course selection.

Between Spring 2011 and Spring 2014, as a staff member of the university’s writing center, I organized writing groups for Korean and Chinese undergraduate students, facilitated in their respective languages.
As Hyun-Jung reveals, what is lacking is not only the number or type of language courses but also the instructors’ understanding, training, and/or aptitude for supporting ESL writers in their composition classrooms. This is a common characteristic of composition classrooms not only at UIUC but also in higher education institutions across the U.S. Horner and Trimbur (2002) point out that a tacit policy of unidirectional English monolingualism has made the privileged varieties of English—“Standard English”—the only conceivable way of dealing with language issues in composition instruction. Matsuda (2006) further problematizes U.S. college composition programs for their “myth of linguistic homogeneity,” which assumes that the students in the composition classrooms are “native” English speakers by default.

*Perpetuating and Transcending Language Ideologies*

What is more astonishing about Hyun-Jung’s previous response are the implied monolingual assumptions about language and language use in U.S. classrooms. For one, Hyun-Jung believes grammar and language concerns are not “expected” in the mainstream composition classroom by the instructor and her “native” peers. Another assumption is that language articulation and critical thinking are discrete abilities, and “native” speakers might struggle with generating ideas but not with articulating them in English. In this section, building on the discussion of monolingual and deficit English Language ideologies in chapter 2, I illustrate how some of these conventional ideologies were constructed in the Korean context, transcend national borders, and were perpetuated in the monolingual university atmosphere.

Chapter 2 depicted Soo-Jin’s anxiety over acquiring “perfect” English and Woo-Bin’s allegiance to Korean language use. These stories and Kyung-Won’s experience of English as a *limiting* factor in college life, depicted at the beginning of this chapter, all reflect the converging
language ideologies shaping post-*jogi yuhak* students’ literacy and rhetorical practices. The shifting and reshaping of ideologies within the dynamics of multiple local (e.g., the university, US race relations) and global (e.g., Korean ideologies, neoliberal ideals) contextual layers are reflected in the contradictory literacy and rhetorical practices of *localization*, where their actual practices of Korean language and culture override the pursuit of “doing English well” and thus becoming global elites. Like the ideas and ideals of language and language use, I further elaborate on the emotional aspects (e.g., feelings, sentiments) around the students’ experience with English language use at the university that influence their literacy and rhetorical practices and their sense of legitimacy and self-worth.

When Kyung-Won’s previous three years in college are put into perspective, her earlier comments about finding achievement and fulfillment in the KSA become especially striking. Kyung-Won had declared that, entering school, she had no doubts about “succeeding” in college because she had adapted so well to her three years of high school in a small rural town in Arkansas, where her English advanced more than she had ever hoped. This rapid growth convinced her that she would ease right into a US college. However, that was far from the reality. Kyung-Won’s first year, as she remembers it, was a “complete disaster.” She was failing most of the “challenging” courses and barely surviving even in subjects she liked and had assumed would be easy. She felt that she could not say a word in class or group discussions out of the sense that her professors, instructors, and classmates were not as patient as her friends from high school. For a group project in an art studio course during her sophomore year, Kyung-Won recalled, her “White” group members gave most of the petty and behind-the-scenes tasks to her while they were recognized and credited for delivering the presentation in “perfect English” in front of the class. Kyung-Won confessed that she felt “invisible” and that her “English somehow
was not ready for college.” Her self-esteem was so low and she became so depressed that she eventually took a year off and spent time at home in Korea with family, exploring and regaining confidence.

Many post-jogi yuhak students that I have met with during my years of research and beyond associated negative, disappointing, and embarrassing moments in their college lives with their perceived English incompetency. Soo-Jin knew too well the importance of the English language in her college life. During our numerous conversations and also through my observations of her various life events, Soo-Jin used words such as “상처 (hurtfulness)” and “창피함 (embarrassment)” when a newbie got the promotion she felt she had earned, when a peer at the Daily Illini, university newspaper, somewhat jokingly identified her as speaking “the worst English [of anyone] that I know,” and when she received a B on a paper that, in terms of content, was not even worth a C (Soo-Jin thinks the instructor gave her a better grade because the instructor overlooked the content issues blinded by the language issues).

The sense of humiliation and defeat intensify and resonate with Korean students even from observing their Korean peers’ uncomfortable interactions with English-speaking monolingual peers. For example, Yong, a participant in the Korean single-language writing group (Korean SLWG)\textsuperscript{38}, recalled observing an incident during group work in his Accounting course. He saw his friend, who was seated near his group, being disrespected and ignored by the three other group members. When Yong asked his friend what was happening, his friend told him about how he was ignored during group discussions and even when the others would not show him the handout distributed to the group. According to his friend, when he asked to look at

\textsuperscript{37} Soo-Jin also used words such as loneliness, discomfort, wall, obstacle, low self-esteem, and limitations over numerous interviews and conversations during fieldwork.

\textsuperscript{38} The Korean single-language writing group is described in-depth in chapter 4.
the handout, one member responded, “you wouldn't be able to understand even if you looked at [the handout].” Not being able to take the humiliation, he eventually dropped the mandatory course mid way. During Yong’s story, Min, another participant in the Korean SLWG, suggested, based on his experience, there needs to be at least two non-native speakers in the group to avoid being overtly disrespected or ignored by their white classmates. Min also added a story about his friend who had been dissed for his English by other Korean peers during group work. Although Min tried to persuade his friend to stay, his friend went back to Korea saying he wanted to “take a break.” Like his friend, Min and others in the group agreed English was too much work, work that could never be perfected and, at times, resulted in frustration and humiliation.

In the field of second language acquisition, teaching, and learning, scholars have defined the causes, roles, and solutions of anxiety among students learning a second (or third, fourth, etc.) language in a classroom (e.g., Horwitz et al.; Kitano; MacIntyre and Gardner). However, less is known about language anxieties students experience in their campus lives outside of the classroom. The psycho-physiological symptoms such as anxiety of humiliation, etc. hinder the language-learning experience of second language learners (Horwitz et al.). Such emotional and psychological burdens are common and prevalent among the students that I have met through my research as well as through various writing courses and at the university’s writing center. However, these symptoms are not yet acknowledged within the university’s official institutional discourse.

The burdens felt by the post-jogi yuhak and Korean students at UIUC are created and compounded by the academic and campus climate: a climate where the students do not enjoy adequate literacy support, a climate influenced by a “tacit policy of ‘English-Only’” where “the ‘norm’ . . . is a monolingual, native-English-speaking writer writing only in English to an
audience of English-only readers” (Horner 569), a climate where international students are constantly identified with and by their English language “deficiency.” The only possible outcome in such a climate is the perpetuation or exacerbation of existing deep-rooted monolingual assumptions and a self-deprecating linguistic ideology. For these students, as detailed in chapter 2, “doing English well” was “doing English like a white person,” an unattainable ideal, embodied throughout their transnational journey. This sense among students that their English was not strong enough and that it was not an appropriate medium for most communication with other Korean students meant that Korean became quite a dominant language in the KSA. This is all the more why the KSA and other Korean islands provide a comfort zone, a place where Korean language use is valued, for Korean undergraduate students. On the KSA island, where Korean is used, students are able to compensate for the lack of respect and low self-worth as language are less of an obstacle in fulfilling a college life.

These accounts not only point to the many tangible and intangible factors that indicate the insufficient support and unwelcoming academic climate that exists at the university but also the students’ own monolingual ideologies as some of the forces interacting in literacy and rhetorical processes of localization. As I further elaborate in the following section, this kind of unfavorable climate at the UIUC has been escalating as the university seeks to further “diversify” the campus by bringing in an unprecedented number of international students but without sufficient preparation by university administrators, faculty, and staff.

“Putting Out Fires”

In the past decade, the atmosphere at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for international students has suffered with the university’s lack of preparedness for dramatic
demographic change in the undergraduate student body. In the name of internationalization—but many suggest in response to the reality of deep cuts in state funding—many public higher education institutions are “diversifying” and “globalizing” their campuses by increasing the number of international undergraduate students. University administrators at public institutions have been seeking more out-of-state students, and international students in particular, to shore up school revenue. Since the mid-2000s, higher education institutions across the U.S. have admitted unprecedented numbers of international students, primarily from such South Asian countries as China and South Korea. As noted in Chapter 1, amidst the steep growth of international students between 2004 and 2014 in U.S. universities, Illinois stood out, increasing its international students by 105% (and international undergraduate students by 370%). This increase gave UIUC the second largest number of international students in the U.S. for the past four consecutive years, trailing the leader, the University of Southern California, by fewer than 40 students in 2012–2013.

With this huge increase, international students have been included, surely but passively, in UIUC’s existing discourse on diversity: the university has used this growing population figure to tout both its diversity and its internationalization and globalization efforts. However, it has taken limited measures to effectively integrate the diverse population into academic and campus life. Thus, it is evident that UIUC was, and many claim that it still is, far from full and true integration, as the university faculty, staff, and students have not been adequately prepared to take on such a daunting task. According to UIUC’s enrollment records, there had long been a steady growth in the number of international students (particularly in graduate programs).

39 Through my continuous administrative work with other units and programs on campus, many claim their efforts in international student integration is steady but still is in need of a more campus-wide interest and investment.
Nevertheless, the first steep increase that began in Fall 2005 caught various units, departments, and programs by surprise. The first impact was felt by ESL writing courses, according to Dr. Randy Sadler, the director of ESL Writing Courses program. Just two weeks before the 2005-2006 academic year was to begin, Dr. Sadler recalled in our interview, someone in the “upper office” telling him something to the effect of, in his words, “I just want to make sure you guys are ready for the rise in the international student population which is going to start happening this fall.” He reported that this late and informal “check” was actually the first warning his program received, leaving almost no time to adapt. He recalls the office being “furious” with the last minute notice and the staff going “insane and [not] getting enough sleep.” His office scrambled to find instructors and teaching assistants to teach ten newly added ESL writing course sections, space for approximately 200 more students.

Although the numbers continued to multiply, it was not until Fall 2011 that some departments, units, and programs came out of their respective corners to tackle the “problem” of international students. In that year, a series of cross-disciplinary (e.g., ESL Issues Campus Meeting) and in-college (e.g., LAS: International Education Symposium) meetings were called. Despite efforts to come together and seek opportunities for long-term collaboration, the few meetings and email exchanges ended with merely the recognition that everyone on campus, especially departments and programs with strong writing components, were struggling through difficult times, coping with whatever resources they had. The meetings also made it clear that many were feeling furious at the failure of top administrators to properly support and prepare them for the soaring number of students from overseas.

In an interview with me, Dr. Alan Mette, a professor and Executive Associate Director of the School of Art and Design, recalled that he definitely felt the impact of the surge in
international students. Dr. Mette, who also taught Art History, a requirement for all incoming freshman at the College of Art and Design, noticed that a significant number of international students were failing courses like his with heavy writing requirements (e.g., weekly journals and three to four short and long writing assignments). He remarked that there had always been international ESL “individuals that needed more assistance” in these courses, and that that had been manageable when there were only a handful. But now that these students constituted up to 15 to 20 percent of the class, instructors and teaching assistants were struggling. He lamented that, while needing to be just as prepared for the course as before the rise of international students, he “felt like [he] was putting out fires rather than being proactive” due to the lack of preparation. Enrolling all these students and not being prepared for their needs, Dr. Mette argued, was “really unethical,” elaborating that it is “wrong inviting and accepting a group of students and they’re paying a great deal of money to be here much, more than our domestic students.” He also worried that the sudden increase of students that need “extra help” might reinforce the stigma that they are “bad writers,” where the unpreparedness on part of faculty has been the actual root of the “problem.”

The shortage of staff and resources to attend to the rapidly increasing number of international students was a concern echoed by various administrators in both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Through my campus outreach work at the university’s writing center, I had the chance to meet and collaborate with many of the administrators across campus who had been directly impacted by the large number of international students in their respective units and programs. Andi Cailles, an assistant director at University Housing, explained during an interview, “We just don’t have the staff […] [or] the resources to match the demonstrated need [much less] the anecdotal [one].” Many others, in units such as the university’s counseling center
and career center, echoed this frustration, finding themselves overwhelmed with the “extra work” added on to their existing duties.

Since Fall 2013, towards the conclusion of data collection for this study, there have been many initiatives to improve the transition, orientation, and support services for international students. In an interview with me, Nicole Tami, the Director of International Student Integration at the time, stated that UIUC was putting efforts into substantially increasing and improving services for international students in collaboration with campus units and registered student organizations across campus. Despite such recent top-down efforts of the university, my experience in the first-year composition program and the university writing center, with the KSA, and on campus suggest that much more needs to be done to cultivate a welcoming and nurturing academic and social environment for the ten thousand international students and to promote true integration and diversity for all university members. More importantly, all participants in this process need to meticulously define and redefine what “promoting integration and diversity” is for them and others as well as what that might look like. But until then, these post- japon yuhak students are finding ways to make the most out of their college lives in seemingly “segregated” ways as they continuously redefine and make sense of globalization through their own transnational educational journey.

---

40 In response to the increasing demand for support for international students, new positions across campus, including the Director of International Student Integration, have been created in Fall 2013 to manage and facilitate International Student Integration at the university. Yet since Director Nicole Tami left campus in summer 2015, the position and duties have disappeared from Illinois International’s bio webpage (“Illinois International Leadership”).
The Korean Island

As premised in the previous chapters and taken as a given in Kyung-Won’s reflection of KSA work, the dominance of Korean language usage, not only in backstage planning but also in public events, is a striking aspect of the KSA. This section explores how, despite the KSA leadership’s recognition and call for more campus integration and despite the students’ own preliminary goal to acquire “perfect” English through such integration, KSA activities and programs eventually fostered more exclusiveness, localizing Korean culture and language. To the Korean undergraduate students at UIUC, these literacy practices of exclusionary activities were actually their attempt to strive towards inclusiveness, as Kyung-Won’s statement at the beginning of the chapter attests, to finally becoming a respected member of the campus community. The KSA ended up engaging with an interesting and complex set of contradictions as desires for greater integration with the university community clashed with desires to build cultural and communicative practices. The KSA and its members were engaged in activities that promoted exclusiveness as they honed their own notion of inclusiveness by taking up a particular kind of US-college-student identity that would pave a way to return home to Korea.

The recognition of the lack of and need for more overall support for international students was evident in my interviews with university administrators. The awareness and importance of language diversity at the university, however, as it was the case with the public university documents, was missing from their dialogue. These unfavorable conditions for respect for language diversity, coupled with students’ own experiences with, and ideologies of language and literacy has been one of the key factors influencing the literacy practices of localization and why Korean undergraduates hold that priority so enthusiastically. Thus, I claim that the university’s monolingual climate and Korean students’ monolingual ideologies have powered literacy and
rhetorical practices of localization that have inadvertently and ironically escalated language diversity for the university. But how this inadvertent language diversity will interact with monolingual atmosphere of the university needs further exploration.

Korean Student Association

In the 2011–2012 academic year, the KSA, under new and centralized leadership, evaluated, revamped, and for the first time documented its mission and purpose within the university and the larger Korean community. The KSA was one of approximately 1100 registered student organizations at UIUC and one of seven registered student organizations of Korean students on campus during the period of my research in 2011-2013. With over 100 staff members, the KSA at UIUC prides itself for representing the world’s largest Korean student population in a higher education institution outside of Korea. The KSA has adopted a rather sophisticated and rigorous organizational structure that resembles that of a Korean corporation rather than of a campus club. Among the issues addressed, the new leadership was particularly concerned with the problem of self-segregation among Korean undergraduates on campus. In the 2011-2012 Academic Year Business Plan, one of the ten objectives listed was to “pull international students out of the Island,” or [섬 sum], a metaphor for the various small and large Korean groups or enclaves. To “help achieve ideal/good learning and experience,” the KSA pledged to “[provide] opportunities and information for students to volunteer and build relationships/networks with the American mainstream society and the various ethnic groups in the community.”

With this proposal to tackle the problem of self-segregation, according to their 2011/2012 annual report, the KSA leadership bore two broader missions in mind: one, to comply with the
US college institutional ideals of personal growth through the experience of *diversity* and, two, to comply with the ideals of the transnational educational migration project of many Korean undergraduate students. This gesture outward was also signified in the KSA’s membership qualifications: “the KSA membership is open to Korean students, Korean immigrant students, and *all UIUC students who are interested in the Korean culture and Korea*” (emphasis added) (*KSA 2011/2012 Annual Report* 5). Despite such explicit recognition of the need for and value of outreach, however, the organization went forward with practices that perpetuated the “problem” of self-segregation by existing as a comfort zone for so many. Throughout the 2011–2012 academic year, despite tactics and encouragement from the top leadership (who were well aware of and worried about this phenomenon) to connect with the various groups and university administration, most events and efforts by individual teams within the KSA centered on cultivating a stronger Korean circle, which led, for example, to promoting and practicing Korean language and culture within the circle.

*Inclusiveness through Exclusiveness*

In spite of many events and efforts to build unity and solidarity both within the KSA and with the larger university, the fact is that the Korean language was clearly dominant in all of KSA’s modes of communication to its members and the public through media such as email exchanges, the KSA website (http://illinoisksa.org/xe/) and Facebook (https://www.facebook.com/illinoisksa). Thus, the KSA has been increasingly promoting exclusiveness rather than inclusiveness. In addition to the Korean language, various visual texts and designs used in these media were permeated by distinctively Korean themes and forms. The KSA emblem, the K-card (a discount card), and other displays on the organization website are
mostly of traditional Korean letters and motifs, some dating back to the Josun Dynasty of the
1500s (see figures. 6-9). For example, the K-Card (see figure. 6) and the KSA emblem (see
figure. 7) were designed with early versions of the Korean alphabets; the KSA emblem, in
particular, uses Korean script—ᄌ, ᴾ, ᴿ—to denote the English letters K. S. A. (the similarity
of the shapes of the two scripts when the orientation shifts is a very neat semiotic effect). The
red dot, a vowel letter in the very first version of the Korean Writing system, was used to mark it
clearly as the Korean alphabet from the 1500s.

Figure 6. Korean K-Card issued in the 2011-2012 academic year. The card was a discount card, which was sold to anyone and could be used at various stores in the University community.

Figure 7. Korean Student Association emblem representing Roman alphabet (KSA) with traditional/early version of the Korean alphabet.

Figure 8. Front page of an electronic card for the lunar new year. Literally written “New Year” in traditional Korean calligraphy (you can see the brush strokes).
According to the design team, much research and learning of Korean traditional cultural artifacts had to be undertaken before the final designs could be achieved. The Korean language and visuals did not come “naturally,” according to Jin-Hyuk, the director of the Internet Team responsible for posting announcements and responding to posts and inquiries. Jin-Hyuk spoke of having to “train” his team members, who were all post-jogi yuhak students, to write “proper” Korean, explaining that “the students who attended high school in other countries did not have the vocabulary or the cultural aptitude to do the job right. It’s been a few months and they are now getting the hang of it.” It is not only the traditional texts to which they were reoriented: the re-acculturation of these students extended to the highly traditional Korean visuals created and selected to represent the group. In recognition of the jogi yuhak transnational education that, to some extent, led students away from Korean culture and language, the KSA aimed to re-acculturate students to Korea so that there is a pathway home. Localization then is a very specific set of practices in this case that are adapted to the resources and contexts of the UIUC campus but oriented primarily to Korean forms of life.

Career Services

Among the numerous activities and events organized and hosted by the KSA, perhaps the most notable has been Career School Illinois (CSI), a four-session series designed to provide
programs for Korean undergraduate students pursuing employment in Korea upon graduation. With the objective to prepare students for re-entry, the four-day, three-to-four-hour sessions (usually held in the evenings or weekends) were strategically organized and dedicated to such practical topics as “Intro to Current Korean Job Market” and “Understanding the Korean Corporate World” and to such rudiments of job training as how to take Korean aptitude tests, draft personal essays, and deliver group presentations in Korean. The first page of the 35-page KSA record of the CSI sessions lists information regarding several Korean companies and states the four “Employment Realities of Current Korean Study Abroad (International) Students” (emphasis added). The use of the word “realities” in Korean indicates the recognition of daunting career prospects. Summarized, those realities are: 1) that the US employment rate of international students after graduation is only 10%; 2) that most U.S. companies are reluctant to employ international students due to the costs of and challenging process of supporting visas for employment; 3) that most UIUC international students and Korean students in particular, return to their respective countries upon graduation; and 4) that despite the need and efforts of the students, Korean study-abroad students have neither a suitable environment to prepare them for employment nor an understanding of the Korean corporate world.41

Addressing these “realities,” the decision by the KSA’s new leadership to overhaul the group’s prior organizational structure with a more sophisticated and rigorous structure resembling that of a Korean corporation rather than a campus club was not accidental. According to Un Yeong Park, then the KSA president, the intentional and rigorous transformation was brought on by the specific and concrete goals of not only “supporting the Korean undergraduate students by bringing out them out of their respective hiding places” at the university but also

41 Although not discussed in this paper, it is interesting to note that the CSI documents contain no suggestions that language issues are a factor in the low employment rate in the U.S.
“helping the students to be more competitive in the job market back home in Korea after they graduate.” Although the organization’s Career Development Team was responsible for career related activities, the activities of the entire organization were geared towards cultivating and training the students to reenter Korean corporate society. The way the team was structured (with the director, co-director, and staff members), the implementation of budgeting management teams, the hierarchical reporting system, the strict use of titles and honorific registers, and the building of active alumni networks were all aimed at reconnecting students with Korean culture and Korean society.

The decision to focus on Korean job preparation and to restructure the KSA as a modern Korean enterprise came primarily from Park’s observations and experiences during and before his time at the University of Illinois. Park recalled that in the early 2000s, when he served as an executive at a prominent headhunting company in Seoul, returning study-abroad students were hotly desired by companies in Korea, presumably for their acquired “globalness” and their English language. However, this demand soon subsided with the companies’ realization that these graduates from U.S. colleges were not adjusting to Korean corporate culture, which is extremely competitive and austerely hierarchical. The companies gradually came to see that U.S. university graduates with jogi yuhak experience were more likely to quit than endure the severe environment and, most of all, that their English, according to Park, was “not as impressive” as they had imagined. When Park began working as a graduate assistant at UIUC’s career center, he was surprised that Korean undergraduate students were not coming to the career center to seek help, despite their well-published struggles with career development. Park was also disappointed that the university could furnish no one to specifically help international students at the center, suggesting, if not outright indifference, at least an obliviousness to the students’ particular needs.
and wants. The CSI, which has grown in popularity among Korean undergraduate students since its founding, seems to have filled this vacuum. Beginning in Fall 2012, six programs have produced more than 150 students who have completed the program and earned their certificates. The demand for the CSI is increasing with more sessions, more students, and more transnational outreach/networking activities connecting UIUC/KSA and Korea.

Most of the students covered in my study began their transnational journey strongly aspiring to participate in the US workforce as “global citizens” upon graduation. As these hopes gradually but significantly faded as they moved from freshman to senior year, the students increasingly looked for alternative paths to global citizenship. However, when they realized there are no options other than to return home, they also realized that they had not been properly prepared for the competitive workforce climate in Korea. Through programs like CSI and other activities on a large and small scale, the KSA is laying a path for the students to renew their cultural ties and re-integrate into Korean society.

The KSA has come to offer a thread of hope for students returning home to Korea. As the vision of a Korean student body integrating into the campus community and, ultimately, into U.S. society writ large became a vision of repatriation, so has the integrative goal of pulling students out of the Korean island in central Illinois been replaced with the goal of building a richer, more Korean island as a stepping stone back across the Pacific. It is this localization of Korea—of Korean language, culture, and job preparation practice—that has become the guidepost for many post-jogi yuhak students at the University of Illinois and that has begun to build a framework for respect and identity at a university that otherwise has offered an uneven degree of welcome, recognition, and specialized support.
Conclusion

In the name of globalization, in their early years in life, many Korean students embarked on a journey abroad to be trained as global citizens, to be equipped with broader, more heterogeneous perspectives and with advanced skills in the global language, English. After years devoted to this jogi yuhak pursuit, the Korean undergraduate students’ actual literacy and linguistic practices show that they are contradictorily engaged in rhetorical practices of localization rather than globalization. In other words, it is not the idea of globalization or becoming global elites that is driving the students’ daily practices, but this idea of localization, specifically of re-building their Koreanness, their Korean credibility, and their Korean social network.

In the name of internationalization and globalization, many universities actively recruit various social, cultural, and national groups while simultaneously erasing their presence on campus in order to represent, in Prendergast and Abelmann’s words, “a safe, secure, and only incidentally diverse community” (37). Part of the fallout from these conflicted efforts to value and devalue student diversity is that, once groups of learners have arrived, they may be rhetorically isolated, provided insufficient resources, and confronted with barriers in the academic and social climate to integrating into the university. As these groups become socially, culturally, and academically segregated, they are left to navigate a dubious space that is both welcoming and exclusionary.

Korea’s jogi yuhak students’ literacy and rhetorical practices of localization offer a particularly complex example of this general phenomenon prevalent in many universities across the U.S. As an organization, the KSA has thus emerged in a very complex and challenging ecology. It is an organization firmly rooted in the particular microenvironment of UIUC. It
would not exist without the contexts of a global US research university and its attendant complications: dominant monolingualism, depleted state funding and rapidly increasing international undergraduate enrollments, and limited academic and social support systems for this growing international, mostly Asian, body of students.\textsuperscript{42} It is further predicated on participants whose study-abroad experiences have attenuated their home language, literacy, and culture. The KSA, then, has worked to fill the void left by this institutional and historical failure. Redirecting the rhetorical and literacy practices of the students more toward Korean language and culture, it has taken stock of their struggles and, accordingly, recalibrated its own mission: to act for students as a home away from home, a place in which to ground a particular kind of mobile identity as college students in a U.S. university. The students are negotiating their liberal or rather neoliberal college dreams through seemingly Korean ways of language and literacy, ultimately redefining the meaning of globalization (by scrambling to adapt to the conditions that they haven’t sought out) and paving their return to Korean society.

\textsuperscript{42} I should stress that, based on my readings (e.g., Stephens) and my experiences talking with faculty and students from other universities, I do not believe the situation I am describing is at all unique to the University of Illinois. However, Illinois may have reached a particular pinnacle of Korean student response to these conditions.
CHAPTER IV

THE KOREAN SINGLE-LANGUAGE WRITING GROUP

The previous chapter demonstrated how Korean undergraduate students may experience linguistic isolation in a context of insufficient academic atmosphere and language resources for them to succeed at the university. Such discourse on lack of language and academic support for ESL (English as a Second Language\textsuperscript{43}) students and writers in higher education is nothing new in Second Language Writing (SLW) scholarship (see edited collection by Matsuda et al.). For example, Kubota and Abels (2004) recognize the lack of literacy support for international ESL students and elaborate on the lack of support at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, echoing many higher education institutions in similar situations where not nearly enough support is provided despite the needs and demand. The rapid and dramatic increase of international students in more recent years in many U.S. higher education institutions has made this phenomenon more prominent and in need of attention more than ever before.

As the number of international students, undergraduate students in particular, rapidly increased from 2005 on, the Writers Workshop, the university’s campus writing center, experienced a sharp increase in writers who self identified as ESL writers—writers who have been using language(s) other than English growing up and/or at home. Between fall 2005 and spring 2014, the percentage of the undergraduate students with ESL/multilingual backgrounds coming to the writing center increased from 54.7\% to almost 80\%\textsuperscript{44}. As a primary source of

\textsuperscript{43} ESL (English as a Second Language) has been a terminology of dispute/contestation. Here in this study, I use ESL as an inclusive label that refers to not only second language but also third, fourth, and so on. I use ESL and multilingual interchangeably in this chapter and dissertation.

\textsuperscript{44} The increase in Writing Workshop visitation numbers reflect the very sharp increase in the number of undergraduate international students at UIUC (see figure 1 in chapter 1) and also the broader wave of
campus-wide literacy support, the Writers Workshop has been striving to provide more and better support for its growing international ESL clientele. The changing demographics prompted the center to revamp the center’s regular in-house services such as one-on-one tutorials, workshops, tutor training with more and up-to-date information/study on ESL writers and international students. It also motivated the center to explore new services such as short-term writing groups for ESL students and to collaborate in new ways with units, programs, and departments across campus.

In this chapter, I focus on one of these efforts in providing more and better support for international ESL students/writers: I call it the Korean single language writing group (SLWG). Based on preliminary findings of the larger study and many years of consulting and administrative experience at the Writers Workshop, in spring 2012, I created and led the Korean SLWG, a short-term ESL writing group. The Korean SLWG was a series of 6 sessions conducted primarily in Korean, the students’ first language, and customized with the characteristics of the Korean undergraduate students’ literacy practices in mind. In the data analyses and interpretation process of the Korean SLWG, I find the translingual approach (e.g., Canagarajah, Horner et al.) to be a productive lens in understanding the findings in this chapter. Based on empirical evidence, I argue that in this writing group, Korean international undergraduate student writers were able to develop a translingual orientation to their English academic writing using Korean as their main communication medium. The translingual orientation worked against the deficit models that had overshadowed their English writing experience through their transnational journeys. The translingual dispositions developed allowed the students to situate their current academic writing experiences within Korean language.

international students in many higher education institutions across the U.S during the past decade (see figure 2 in chapter 2).
ideologies and their history as Korean transnationals.

The rapid increase in the number of international students, and the university’s underpreparedness in supporting them, heightened and altered the role of the Writers Workshop, making it a hub for international student support and a central source for administrator and teacher training. Using my administrative experience from fall 2012 to spring 2015, at the end of the chapter, I lay out implications and recommendations for Writing Center and Writing Program Administration. Broadly, I argue that writing centers need to reinvent and reassert their role in the midst of internationalization in order to support literacy development in both curricular and extracurricular contexts of international students’ college experiences. Specifically, I discuss how the increase in the international ESL population prompted the Writers Workshop at Illinois to re-evaluate how it defined the purpose and scope of a writing center for not only ESL writers but for all writers we serve at the university.

Writing Center and ESL

Despite the presence of ESL/multilingual students and scholars both domestic and international in U.S. higher education even before the first appearance of the writing center in the 1930s, little exists on ESL issues in the field compared to the large body of writing center theory and practice. The majority of writing center theory and practice, like that of writing studies in general, has been developed with monolingual writers in mind. The 1993 article “Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options,” published in College Composition and Communication (CCC), by Harris (writing center scholar) and Silva (Second Language Writing scholar), both of whom were faculty in the English Department at Purdue, is one of the first notable pieces regarding how to work with ESL writers in writing tutorials. Since then, a handful of articles regarding ESL
writers and writing at writing centers have emerged sporadically in journals such as the Writing Center Journal, CCC, and TESOL Journal. Like Harris and Silva’s article, most writing center work on ESL focuses on introducing, informing, and training its directors and tutors, the main audience. The body of work deals with various types and characteristics of ESL students, applicable Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories and studies, and effective methods to attend to ESL writing in various linguistic and writing topics (e.g., error correction, sentence-level issues, plagiarism) while maintaining the core writing center principles of writing tutorials—collaborative, student-centered, and non-directive approaches.

In parallel with Composition Studies, in its early years of establishment writing centers have adopted three pedagogical models—current traditional rhetoric (focus on writer’s grammatical correctness), expressivism (focus on writing as a means of self-discovery), and social constructionism (focus on writer’s sociocultural and historical settings)—that persisted well into the mid-1980s (“The Tutoring Process,” 3). Then onward, as with the field of Second Language Writing, writing center work has been influenced by L1 composition theories including cultural studies, postcolonial, postmodern, and post-process. Much of the prominent work with these influences are assembled in the first (2004) and second (2009) editions of ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth. These books, used in writing centers across numerous institutions across the U.S., hold valuable and applicable work of practitioners and scholars in fields such as writing centers, second language writing, and composition studies. It is true its interdisciplinary characteristics have contributed greatly to writing center scholarship, yet, as Williams (2006) argues, writing centers are often blind to the issues of its students. Williams argues for formal needs analysis, which “has been largely absent from work with L2 writers in WCs [writing centers]” (118). Thus, more on-going research is
needed to keep up with the continuously changing students and their educational, cultural, and transnational backgrounds.

The Korean SLWG that I explore in this chapter is a good example of research current with an on-going global phenomena. For example, in the first chapter of the 2nd edition, Leki (2009) describes common linguistic backgrounds of ESL college students (e.g., generation 1.5 students, international students). Although informative, today as demonstrated through chapter two and three, the categories identified are too simplistic to represent the complexities of many multilingual linguistic lives that trace complex educational paths across the globe. The Korean SLWG complicates these categories by further exploring the complex and nuanced linguistic and transnational educational experiences of post-*jogi yuhak* students in a pedagogical context. Furthermore, the Korean SLWG further demonstrates how a writing center program can be tailored to the needs of a certain group of students sharing a similar history of language practice and ideologies. In the case of the Korean undergraduate students, teaching them the norms of writing in academia was not as urgent as the need for them to explore, understand, and counter the language ideologies, racial hierarchies, and educational histories behind their current language and literacy practices behind their monolingual ideologies. This revelation does not only open up possibilities for creative programing of writing center work but also points to a re-examination of writing center work and its goals: the goal of making better writers and better local and *global* citizens.

Within the framework of *translingual* approaches, the following sections flesh out some of the notable aspects of the Korean SLWG. The workshops were not necessarily about teaching and learning *Standard English* or “White English,” as the students call it. It was about helping students recognize the language ideologies and racial/racist dispositions behind their past and
current literacy practices and ideologies. In other words, it was about combating students’ monolingual ideologies and English hegemony cultivated within Korea’s unique geopolitical, economical, and global forces in modern history\(^{45}\) reinforced by the particular language and racial relations of the U.S.

**Language Diversity**

In the field of Writing/Composition Studies, the 1974 College Composition and Communication resolution “Student Rights to Their Own Language” was its first official call to embrace language diversity. Since that resolution, there were four more language related resolutions including the *CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers* in 2000 and the exploration and pursuit of linguistic diversity has been active in Writing Studies and its adjacent fields (see Horner et al., “Cross-Language” and Mao et al., “Representations”). In January 2011, with the publication of “Language Difference in Writing” in *College English*, *translingual*, a relatively new term to the field, took center stage. Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur called for a paradigm that promoted linguistic diversity and opposed traditional *monolingustic* approaches to writing (i.e., Standard English or Edited American English) in our college classrooms. Furthermore, as translingual scholars acknowledge, the movement to promote, accept, and practice non-*monolingustic* orientations to language has been explored across various disciplines (e.g., bilingual studies, translation studies) under labels such as “bilingualism,” “multilingualism,” and “pluralingualism.”

Although the big ideas behind the translingual approach have been gaining attention and momentum in the past few years, more recently, there have been tensions over what the

\(^{45}\) See chapter two for more information on language ideologies
outcomes of the approach might or should look like in our college classrooms and in students’ writing. For its novel and somewhat sensational appearance of mixed-languages within composition classrooms, Matsuda (2014) criticized translingual scholars (“tour guides”) for promoting translingual writing which he views as a “problematic trend […] luring” scholars and teachers (“tourists”) with alien writing […] obscuring more subtle manifestations of the negotiation as well as situations where writers make the rhetorical choice not to deviate from the dominant practice” (482–3). I see his concerns as somewhat understandable as many translingual pedagogical strategies have so far more or less focused on code-switching or code-meshing as its visible end product. Although translingual scholars have presented living translingual literacy practices in various communities in the United States and around the world (e.g., Ayash, Canagarajah,) and introduced pedagogical applications providing tools, evidence, and guidelines for teachers, tutors and learners (e.g., Hanson, Jerskey), much has exemplified “putting together diverse semiotic resources for meaning” (Canagarajah, 6). Still in its infant stage and with room for development, however, through my experience as a teacher-scholar with training in both L2 and Writing Studies, I see the translingual approach as a productive tool in helping L2 student writers make conscious rhetorical choices whether to deviate or conform to the dominant practices (e.g., U.S. Standard Written English).

The motives and rationale behind the Korean SLWG emerged well before the current “turf battle” broke out between second language studies and translingual approaches (see Canagarajah “Clarifying”; Matsuda, “The Lure”). In fact, the writing group emerged initially less from a theoretical alignment with translingual theory than from a felt sense that Korean students needed a space where they could be mentored in fluent Korean about their linguistic, literate, and rhetorical practices and ideologies. In addition to the visible aspects of translingual literacy, the
meshing of languages in writing, a translingual approach also points to the less-visible 
dispositions that “constitute assumptions of language, attitudes toward social diversity, and tacit 
skills of communication and learning” (Canagarajah “Introduction” 5). This orientation, 
according to Canagarajah, “includes an awareness of language as constituting diverse norms, 
willingness to negotiate with diversity in social interactions, and attitudes such as openness to 
difference, patience to co-constructed meaning and acceptance of negotiated outcomes in 
interactions” (5). Not only was this disposition scarce in the Korean undergraduate students but 
also their narrow perceptions of the language were stunting their English literacy usage and 
development overall at the university. Thus, the single-language writing group was an 
experiment to address the students’ specific language and racial ideologies. I see my exploration 
of the Korean SLWG in conversation with the growing body of translingual literature not solely 
because the group used the Korean language, the students’ first language, as the main medium to 
talk about language and writing, and not because the study presents how students used their more 
familiar semiotic resources to produce writing—in fact, they did not code-mesh or code-switch in 
their academic writing. Instead, I argue that the group developed translingual dispositions by 
understanding and attending to their particular monolinguistic English language dispositions 
shaped by national and transnational experiences. I claim that the Korean single-language 
writing group was a translingual site for Korean undergraduate students with particular language 
ideologies and of literacy practices to make changes in the way they think about language use 
influenced by racial and geopolitical issues on the global level.
The Korean Single-Language Writing Group

Methods, Setting, and Participants

Acknowledging a need for a group solely for Korean undergraduate students, I proposed, designed, implemented, and studied the Korean SLWG because of some interesting but somewhat troubling preliminary findings from the larger ethnographic and auto-ethnographic dissertation research on the literacy and rhetorical practices of the Korean post-*jogi yuhak* undergraduate students. Through the larger research, for example, as elaborated in Chapter 2, I found that many of these students were carrying self-deprecating ideas about their own English language that stunted them from using English in their college lives. Instead of striving to improve their English—one of the main goals of their study abroad endeavor—these students had given up on the idea of acquiring “perfect English.” With these preliminary findings from my research, I was motivated to explore, design, and facilitate a literacy learning experience that took into account this ambivalence toward English and explored the educational, cultural, and linguistic histories these students brought with them.

Whereas snow-ball or chain-referral sampling (Biernaki and Waldorf, Bogden and Biklen) was used to recruit participants for the larger project, the Korean writing group participants were recruited through the Writers Workshop’s event announcements. There were eight Korean undergraduate students at the beginning but one student dropped out after the first session, leaving seven participants until the end. The participants included five post-*jogi yuhak* students, one traditional international/study abroad student (a student who came directly to the UIUC upon high school graduation), and one transfer student (an international student who had transferred to UIUC from another U.S. college) (See Table 1). They were all Korean students.
who had come to the U. S. for their higher education at different stages of their study abroad journey and points in their lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yong</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Junior/ Transfer Student</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun Jung</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior/ Jogi yuhak in U.S.</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyung-Won</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Junior/ Jogi yuhak in U.S.</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je-Soon</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sophomore/ Jogi yuhak</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sooho</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Freshman/ Traditional International Student</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung-Soo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Freshman/ Jogi yuhak in U.S.</td>
<td>Undeclared/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Senior/ Jogi yuhak in Indonesia</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sophomore/ Jogi yuhak in New Zealand</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Korean Single-Language Writing Participants

The Korean SLWG met once a week for an hour and a half over the course of six weeks. Each session originally was organized around a topic of their concern with more structured lecture-type instructions and controlled practice tasks in the first half. The second half was meant for applying what they had learned in their own writing. With IRB approval and the students’ consent, I recorded all the sessions and also conducted group interviews immediately after the sessions. Follow-up one-on-one interviews were also conducted as needed. As in the actual writing group sessions, Korean was the primary medium of oral communication in the interviews. Using Korean allowed for fluent expressions and conversations of deep and abstract thoughts. After transcribing the recordings of the sessions and interviews, as with the larger research, I employed grounded theory (Charmaz) to identify key themes that emerged in our discussions and related them to broader themes in the full ethnographic study.
ESL writing groups was one of several lectures and workshops (e.g., personal statement, dissertation writing groups) in addition to the one-on-one writing tutorials that the writing center provided to students, faculty, and staff on campus. The Korean SLWG was one of short multiple series of ESL writing group sessions already in session since the semester before its implementation at the Writers Workshop in spring 2012. With the increasing number of international ESL students visiting the workshop, these writing groups were a means to serve more students that were being turned away due to the limited resources. The series of workshops for the ESL writing groups was titled *Navigating Academic Writing*. To maintain continuity, the Korean SLWG was also titled *Navigating Academic Writing but with an added subtitle: Writing Groups for Korean Undergraduate Students*. The basic structure of the Korean SLWG conformed to the previous ESL writing groups with the first half of the workshop focused on lectures and the latter half focused on students working on their own writing/papers.

As stipulated in the Korean SLWG announcement/flyer (see Appendix C), like the previous ESL workshops, the overarching goal for workshop was to attend to students’ own questions pertaining to the US academic writing. Besides the overall structure and overarching goal of the workshop, other details were quite different from the previous ESL workshops. To participate in the Korean SLWG, in particular, the students had to attend the information meeting before the first session and agree to attend all four sessions of the workshop. At the information meeting, I handed out student information sheets (see Appendix D) to collect information on their personal information, English literacy/education background, and their personal goals for the course. In the two-hour workshop, the first section was used to introduce and review the topic of the day and do some controlled practice with resources found on writing websites (e.g., Purdue OWL). For example, in the first session, together we glossed elements of *rhetorical*
and then analyzed the rhetorical situation of a sample paper first individually and then as a group. In the second half of session, the students had to analyze the rhetorical situation of their own writing and further discuss as a group through peer reviews.

Although the structure of each two-hour session was relatively fixed, the topic(s) of each session was fairly organic in its development and process. Depending on the issues raised during the discussions, the topic or topics of the following session were decided before the end of each session. If another topic should come up during the session, we would divert from the original topic and attend to their concerns by discussing them and/or searching for resources online. The topics include organizing ideas, understanding different kinds of writing tasks, understanding instructors’ responses, and using sources. In this process, students were prompted and encouraged to explore and reflect on their English literacy experiences. The following sections are ramifications of how the single-language writing group became a translingual site where students were able to explore and engage their rather monolingualistic ideologies behind their language development or the lack thereof.

Why Single Language?

During my research, as well as in my personal and professional encounters with many traditional and post- jogi yuhak Korean international students, I discovered that it was rare to see these students using English amongst their Korean peers. It was as if it were an unspoken rule. This insight is what led me to consider a university academic writing group facilitated not in English but in the students’ first language (L1), Korean. To most Second Language (L2) scholars and teachers, the decision to use the students’ L1 as the primary oral communication in an English-language learning context might seem counter-intuitive as it goes against the strong
belief that the target language is learned and acquired through immersion in the target language, in this case, English (Magnan and Lafford). To others, the use of one’s L1 may seem obvious, considering its convenience to the speakers. My decision to use Korean in the writing group, however, was based on neither L2 literature nor convenience, but based on the particular English ideologies post-jogi yuhak students carried with them. Throughout my research, my participants revealed repeatedly that these ideologies shaped their everyday literacy and rhetorical practices at UIUC. To understand the literacy and rhetorical practices, it is important to understand how language ideologies were constructed in the history and context of the local and global.

As introduced and detailed in chapter two and demonstrated in chapter three, most of these students in the study felt that they lacked the English competency that they thought they should have acquired during their many years studying abroad. Students didn’t feel that they had lived up to the promise of the jogi yuhak project (premised in the belief that earlier is better and immersion in the target language is best for language acquisition). Because they believed that they did not accomplish the goal of acquiring “perfect” English skills, they hid their English language (abilities) from others, other Koreans in particular, as much as they could. So in their everyday literacy practices among their Korean peers, English words and phrases may have come up sporadically in casual settings, but elsewhere, Korean was the language of choice.

The negative sense of their own English abilities and their representations of English as owned by White Americans led me to implement the single-language group with the Korean undergraduate students. I chose the Korean language to accommodate the students’ practical and psychological language preferences. My research showed that these students did not have a space for fast, fluent, meta-talk about language, about literate practices, and about rhetorical issues. They needed the richness and comfort of their first language to negotiate the complexity of their
academic immersion in English. I, as the group facilitator, needed that fluency to challenge their language ideologies. As evidenced in chapter three, a Korean student organization’s active operation and achievement was (and still is) facilitated by the use of Korean as its main communication medium. Korean was the language that helps them feel confident and respected. The Korean SLWG was a space to untangle the racial, national, and cultural elements intertwined with their English language use or the lack of.

**De-constructing Ideologies**

*Judgmental English*

Many ESL writers who come to the writing center want reformulation of their writing—not wanting it more grammatical but more idiomatic and “native”-sounding. As I assumed, all the participants of the writing group wanted reformulation of their writing (and speech) which involves “native-speakerism” L2 writing in hopes of sounding more American in their writing and speech. On their student information sheets (see Appendix D) at the information session before the actual sessions commenced, they stipulated that they wanted to learn “writing skills,” and improve their “expressions” and use them like a “native speaker.” Even with secondary education in English speaking countries and first-year writing requirements at the university, it was disheartening but not that surprising to find students with confined definitions of what writing was—in their words, paragraphs of “native-like perfect English” with flawless “expressions,” grammar, and mechanics. As they had longed to speak “accent-free” like a bek-in, their long term goals was to write “accent-free” like an American. Because the students were overtly concerned about sounding and writing “right,” they had been missing the opportunity to critically explore and experiment with the language in the meaning-making process.
The avoidance of speaking English among Korean students because they did not “do English well” was conspicuous amongst the participants from the first session. It was in the second half of the writing group session, devoted to peer review activities, in which I observed the students’ avoidance extended to sharing of English writing. Despite several reminders during the informational session and email reminders to bring their current in-progress writing to the session, only one student arrived with his writing (and that writing example turned out to be a polished edited version already submitted for a course in the previous semester). My curiosity, however, as to why the students didn’t bring their papers was partially answered during that same session. As I elaborated on the usefulness of peer reviews and asked what the students thought, there was silence. Then Min, who did his early study abroad in New Zealand, broke the silence in a quiet voice, “I don’t show it to my Korean friends because I think they are just going to judge [my English].” All smiled and nodded at Min’s response. Then Hyun jumped in right away and said, “It’s not only that but I don’t think the writing will get any better [with their feedback].” And all nodded again. In addition to the fear of being judged, the students refrained from seeking help from their Korean peers because they had doubts about not only their own English but also about their peers’ English as well.

*Getting to the Roots: TOEFL Writing*

As we were reviewing one student’s draft, Hyun-Jung, a senior in psychology, expressed frustrations with her repeated use of the word “because” and her inability to diversify sentence structures. As she began to talk about her frustrations, she partly blamed the “habit” of using “because” on her past “TOEFL Training.” When I encouraged her to elaborate, she said:
I think because I lack “expressive ability,” when I want to add explanation I think I use “because” a lot. I used because a lot [in TOEFL writing] - to show the relationship between sentences. [We were taught in the TOEFL writing training that we] needed to use a lot of reasoning [in U.S. academic writing].

She also went on to say:

I learned from TOEFL writing [sessions] that if you begin a sentence with “because” it is grammatically wrong. You have to use **this is because** [at the beginning of a sentence] to make the [sentence] grammatically perfect and avoid score reduction. Because I’ve learned so much to use **this is because** to avoid grammar [scores] from being reduced, it won’t shake off. It’s because they make us memorize.

With Hyung-Jung’s remark, something clicked and the group had a lively discussion about the influence of “TOEFL training.” TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) is a standardized English proficiency test that, according to ETS, “measures your ability to use and understand English at the university level. And it evaluates how well you combine your listening, reading, speaking and writing skills to perform academic tasks.” Although the cut off score might vary, most higher education institutions require TOEFL scores. I use the phrase “TOEFL Training” because it is commonly used by Koreans. During our talk, Yong explained how he had studied for the writing section of the exam.

You mix it up one [new] essay is created. There are 8 modules. There are eight paragraphs. Each [paragraph] has a different meaning (topics). But if you combine this one with that, one writing (essay) of one topic is created. Again if you combine this one with that another topic [essay] comes out. So we memorized the all eight paragraphs entirely. We memorize all of the contents.
Being intrigued but not completely surprised, I urge him to go on by asking if how that could result in a completely different essay. He explains:

But it’s interesting how combining two [of the eight modules] will create an essay regardless of what topic is given [on the test]…We had to memorize the content [regardless]. I specifically remember one about a female succeeding in the fashion industry. I would always use that one…[chuckle].

As Yong continued on with his explanation, as if he was trying to recall and understand the process as he remembered it. Hyun-Jung eagerly jumps in to further clarify Yong’s explanation.

So, they [hagwons] make us memorize the flow [and] structure verbatim. So it’s not actually memorizing the exact sentence in [the essay] but. [For example], a sentence would begin with ‘most people say’ or ‘so and so believes’ or something like this. And [they teach you] bla bla bla must be used in the introduction. Also [hagwons teach us to use] ‘first’, ‘second,’ [and] end with ‘in conclusion.’ And there are flows that Hackers\(^{46}\) distribute. If you know the template […] because you have to write it fast, [when you memorize such phrases] you don’t have to think too much and you just can [write] ‘most people say.’ You can write it exactly the same and write first [and] second and then [include] your words/stories. There were about two to three such templates. [The templates] would start with [phrases like] first of all [or] first and at the end [phrases like] in short [or] in conclusion, something like that.

Hyun-Jung later explained how she would use this format to help her write papers in her courses in college. It was comforting for her to fall back on formulas where she did not have to worry about whether it was right or wrong. She also felt at ease when she used the three-section

\(^{46}\) Hackers is one of the largest private language institutions that is popular among Koreans preparing for U.S. standardized tests (e.g. TOEFL, GRE, SAT).
outline—Intro, three body paragraph and conclusion—where the introduction paragraph was general and the conclusion more specific. When I asked her if this worked for her every time she drafted a paper/assignment, she said:

If I don’t follow [the framework], if I follow it, it’s clear. Although I might lack expressive ability, [using such a structure] it will be easier for the professor and teaching assistants to identify the argument so I think it’s a safe zone. It works sometimes and it doesn’t sometimes.

The students acknowledged that the TOEFL training gave them the impetus to start thinking about what the American Academic essay for college would be like, but the past training also has been a deterrent in writing in college. They resented how the training has been limiting their structure/organization and word/phrase choices more than they realized.

TOEFL is not only required in applying to higher education institutions abroad, but it is pervasively used as a gatekeeper in the education and corporate world in Korea. Furthermore, most Koreans preparing for the TOEFL exam and all the students in the group had one or another experience with rote TOEFL training at a TOEFL hagwon—private English learning institutions ubiquitous in Korea and perceived as mandatory to receive high scores on the TOEFL exam.

The lively conversation naturally extended to other English learning experiences in Korea and their transnational educational journey. The TOEFL training was just one small window into the culture of English language in Korea—how English language is taught, ideologies surrounding English are constructed, and (narrow) conceptions of the language are reinforced in Korean by Koreans home and abroad. For post-jogi yuhak students brought up and educated in the eye of the English fever, it was a chance for them to step back and view the metalinguistic
landscape and factors that influenced or has been affecting their English language lives. As they were reviewing their own and peers’ writing, they were also reflecting on their related past and current literacy education. One student shuffled through vague memories about his first private tutoring experience before Kindergarten, another frowned remembering his strict middle school English teacher posting test scores for all to see, and one even showed tears as she recalled her first week studying abroad in a foreign land. During this animated session, the students went through their papers eager to identify other remnants of the TOEFL training and their English “training” in Korea and abroad. It was a catalyst and opportunity for the group to think about language and language use with their own past experiences and literacy histories. It was an opportunity for them to engage with their existing dispositions and to make room for translingual ones.

Rhetorical Flexibility via Translingual Dispositions

With continuous encouragement, persuasion, and discussions about the benefits of peer-review and conceptions surrounding English, the group gradually became a space that was safe enough for not all but most of the students to share their rougher drafts. Having them consciously and continuously put their concerns aside about being judged, we found ourselves spending more of our time talking about phrases and words, at the sentence level, in rhetorical ways. For example, we would stop at a seemingly simple word like “about,” and with dictionaries and thesaurus, we would explore the connotations of other options such as “regarding, concerning, with reference to” for different meaning and intentions. Or they would compare words like “next”

---

The students appreciated the introduction to online collocation dictionaries (e.g., Just-the-Word). The collocations dictionary was useful as students were mostly concerned about “correctness” in the use of “expressions” and word combinations.
and “following” and examine the connotations and difference in usage that best suits the writer’s intentions. The students and I, together, as we explored the specific connotations of similar words, also discussed the difference in meaning each word would bring to the overall meaning of the sentence in question. At this point, their concerns were not about sounding or writing like a bek-in (White person) but more about making rhetorical choices and thus developing a rhetorical identity for themselves in learning and using the English language in their writing.

In writing center theory and practice the non-directive or minimalist tutoring has been considered the ideal approach to working with writers in one-on-one writing tutorials. As such, much emphasis has been put on attending to the global concerns (e.g., organization, thesis) much more than the local concerns (e.g., vocabulary, grammar). However, second language and writing center scholars’ work on L2 writers (e.g., Powers, Rafoth, Sharon) have argued this notion to be counter-effective for many L2 students. This is not only in the writing center tutorials, it is prevalent in college composition courses where much of the focus is on rhetoric and idea generation—the more “global” concerns in writing. Focus on the global aspects of the writing has been beneficial to ESL students who have mostly approached writing as assemblage of grammatically correct vocabulary, sentences, and structure. For the Korean SLWG participants, however, they claim their lack of lexical flexibility and “inability to express” have made them rely on the use of “formulas” and “templates” in their past writing training.

Orienting the students to be open to translingual training afforded them the opportunity to find themselves not as incompetent language users through their White gaze but as legitimate users of English making rhetorical choices. In a follow-up individual interview, Kyung-Won expressed how it was very refreshing to “spill her secrets to the world.”
Wow! I had so much to say. I really like the way we conversed. It was good just for the fact that I was able to share my concerns. I, first, felt that I gained something, gained confidence and will. [I thought to myself] so, it’s not just me but others have these worries too. I realized by talking about such issues and I look back [on my past experiences]. I don't think I could this could have happened if it was done in English.

The writing group sessions at one point or another seemed like therapy sessions. It was a space to share their concerns, reveal anxieties, and also devise strategies to cope with their literacy realities. Overall, it provided a safe space to process their language and literacy practices.

Kyung-Won affirmed my initial hypothesis for the writing group with her last statement: namely that the first language would facilitate the writing development process by lowering students’ anxieties that were driven by self-deprecating English language ideologies. The first language did lower language anxiety and promote deep thought and honest expression between the members. But more importantly, the Korean language afforded them the opportunity to break out of their self-deprecating ideologies and deficit identities as English language learners by developing rhetorical identities in the language learning process.

I had a chance to meet up with Kyung-Won roughly a month after the writing group ended. As we talked about her jogi yuhak experience in Arkansas before coming to the university, she mentioned whenever she felt inferior amongst her White peers because of her English, she consciously and intentionally reminded herself, “It’s okay. I don’t have to ‘do English’ that way [like a bek-in]. It’s my second language. They don’t know how to speak Korean. So it’s okay.” She admitted it was not easy to go against her “natural thoughts.” She also mentioned how she had more freedom to use English without being too worried about “sounding foreign.” Although she seemed ambivalent and less confident from time to time about her stance even during our
hour or so conversation, it was certain that her *translingual* disposition was growing, not only affecting how she used English but also various aspects of her life as a U.S. college student and as a global citizen.

**Implications of the Translingual in the Transnational Context**

*Pedagogical Implications*

The translingual approach in language use has been gaining popularity amongst scholars and teachers of Writing/Composition Studies. Despite concerns that the translingual movement might be a “fad” prompting “linguistic tourism” (Matsuda “The Lure”), a translingual orientation is being welcomed by many who have longed for explanations and remedies for working with the language diversities in their composition classrooms. Some second language scholars have expressed concerns that translingual pedagogies do not consider the students’ choices—the choice to learn “Standard” written/spoken English—and that they will enforce using students’ other language or languages. In this respect, it is important to note that, in the Korean SLWG, I did not tell students what language or languages to use. I simply indicated they could use Korean and created a context where that choice would include all present. I also did not encourage them to use Korean in their academic writing. It was up to the students to negotiate and choose the linguistic resources that aligned with their learning goals.

This chapter does not present students’ writing with visible translingual semiotic elements. This chapter also does not provide step-by-step How-To’s for running a single-language writing group. The Korean SLWG, rather, provides evidence for implicit workings of translilingual orientation in the students’ writing process. Also, the single-language writing group is not a one-size-fit-all remedy for all international students or multilingual students. The Chinese
single-language writing group that the writing center ran gives this claim some perspective. With the success of Korean SLWG, in the fall of 2012 and spring of 2013, the writing center provided a single-language writing group for Chinese undergraduate students, the first with a Chinese facilitator and the latter with a non-Chinese speaking facilitator (me), respectively. Although the groups were successful in tending to their writing needs, the Chinese language was not a key element in terms of tapping into their language ideologies and practices. Compared to the Korean students, Chinese undergraduates in the group were less concerned about not being able to produce “perfect” English. Because the English language ideologies and practices of the Chinese undergraduate students were not thoroughly examined and applied to the pedagogical strategies, the Chinese single-language writing group did not yield similar results, despite high expectations. Therefore, the Korean SLWG may not represent a specific tool for teaching, but rather gives impetus for teachers to investigate, acknowledge, and utilize the language ideologies and practices of the particular group or groups of students by “[resisting] thinking of identifying students and our teaching in terms of fixed categories of language, language ability, and social identity” (Canagarajah “Clarifying”).

The Korean SLWG provided opportunities and spaces for multilingual students to explore, understand, and negotiate their own language ideologies and practices in promoting translingual orientations. The group offered an example of what Jerskey (2013) calls the safe houses, the contact zones that provide “social and intellectual spaces where groups can constitute themselves…with high degrees of trust, shared understandings, temporary protection from legacies of oppression” (40). For Korean undergraduate students in this particular context, the SLWG was a translingual safe house, a safe house that “moves us beyond a consideration of individual or monolithic languages to life between and across languages” and language
ideologies (Canagarajah 1). It was a safe house where students began, if they had not already, acknowledging and negotiating pre-conceived monolingual and translingual language orientations against their own past and present literacy and rhetorical practices during their transnational education journey.

Administrative Implications

The confusion and under-preparedness of U.S. higher education institutions in the midst of the increase in international students that I present in Chapter 3 is not easily identified in published work. Through conferences and personal networks, however, common concerns and antidotes have been shared among many writing center administrators and tutors from various institutions across the U.S. To prove this point, during the past several years, it has been easy to witness interested and concerned administrators and tutors fill conference rooms with presentations regarding international and/or multilingual issues. And at these summits and meetings, I have shared Writers Workshop’s efforts in serving the increasing linguistically diverse students beyond the individual writing tutorials. One of these topics has been on the series of the ESL writing groups and the experimental SLWGs for Korean and Chinese students that I have presented earlier in this chapter.

Compared to the large emphasis on the writing tutorials at the writing center, not much is said about services besides the tutorials and about its benefits. Severino and Knight (2007) describes the small writing center which can be overlooked but argue for implementing programs like the Writing Fellow Programs. Rather than seeing the writers only at the center, the training of writing fellows in other units and programs on campus allows the center to use resources beyond the center walls. Similarly, the Writers Workshop at UIUC has been struggling to effectively serve its university of approximately 45,000 students (and this is not counting the
staff and faculty that we open our services to) with approximately 30 tutors/consultants at hand. And the recent years of the rapid increase in the number of international students, and the university’s underpreparedness in supporting them, has heightened and altered the role of the writing center, making it a hub for international student support and a central source for administrator and teacher training. In response, the Writers Workshop has been expanding its role. In collaboration with the WAC program, the Workshop worked with the College of Fine and Applied Arts to support their staff and teaching assistants.

The Workshop also initiated and organized “Working with International Students,” a cultural sensitivity program for administrative staff on campus who were responding to such a large international student population for the first time. These series of workshops were, at the beginning, a collaborated effort by two other interested individuals in the Department of Communication and Intensive English Institute. After three workshops in one semester, the demand grew for more workshops not only for secretarial staff but also for academic advisors. With the increasing demand, the collaboration grew to include the student affairs units like the International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS). Due to the nature of the workshops and to maintain continuity under the university’s larger internationalization initiatives, since fall 2014, the program has been under the International Programs and Services directly under the supervision of the Vice Provost for International Affairs and Global Strategies.

Through her book, Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers, McKinney (2013) argues that the writing center grand narrative, writing centers are comfortable, iconoclastic places where all students go to get one-on-one tutoring on their writing, has misrepresented and created a “collective tunnel vision” for the scope of writing center work (5). She acknowledges “the types of work accomplished in writing center tutorials are so complex and varied—and
individualized—that we have not yet been able to come up with sound bytes that illuminate what we do” (qtd. in Harris 75). My writing center administrative experience confirms the shortcomings of the grand narrative that we share with the writing center and the non-writing center world. But I further argue that even McKinney’s long list of duties of writing center directors (e.g., meeting students’ needs at tutorials, tutor training, keeping up with the latest research) is still confined to how writing tutorials can be expanded and complicated as the role of the writing center grows. Writing centers need to reinvent and reassert their role in the midst of internationalization in order to support literacy development in both curricular and extracurricular contexts of international students’ college experiences. Such campus-wide collaboration creates “ripple effects” that allow for reconceptualization of traditional writing center models of its role in higher education institution.

Conclusion

This chapter illustrated how the Korean SLWG was a successful pedagogical intervention in helping Korean undergraduate students experience their first language, Korean, as a resource rather than a barrier in honing English rhetorical flexibility. My work on the Korean SLWG seeks to contribute to the current conversation on the development of translingual approaches and pedagogies by highlighting the importance of providing space (both physical and psychological), by suggesting that a translingual approach to writing, where multilingual students can negotiate existing language ideologies, can not only be developed through the mixing of languages, but through using one’s first language to unsettle ideologies embedded in the target language. In this chapter, as multilingual students rise, I elaborated on the need and importance of expanding the writing center roles beyond the writing tutorial with programs like
the SLWG and involvement in units and programs not only under academic affairs but also under student affairs in affecting students’ literacy in their social lives at the university. Due to its positioning as a campus-wide literacy support service in most higher education institutions, it is an ideal location to not only foster “better writers” but also to cultivate critical thinkers and language users within the global currents beyond the refracted Western lens.
“My name is Yu-Kyung” and “I go bathroom” were the very first words of English my mother made me practice right before the first day of school in the U.S. back in 1982. I remember being led into a classroom full of children with unfamiliar skin, hair, and eye tones. I still remember vividly sitting in that second grade classroom very scared and bewildered by what, then, sounded like “buzzing” all around me. With my ESL teacher’s persistent help and consistent exposure to the English language, the buzzing turned into meaningful words naturally and gradually as days and months went by. Into my sixth month in the U.S., I remember being amazed at how much I could understand what once was just ambient noise. At the end of fourth grade, after two years of ESL supplement classes, I was officially certified and marked as proficient enough in English to attend regular classes. I did not know what being proficient exactly meant then but I do remember being praised for having less of the “Korean accent” and sounding more like my “native” English-speaking peers. Little did I know then this English experience would directly and indirectly impact every turn in my life over the next 30 plus years.

I start with this snippet of my past because my project today would not have existed without it. My curiosity about the jogi yuhak phenomena and the literacy practices of Korean undergraduate students with such pre-college study abroad experience stems not only from my professional experience in various teaching and administrative capacities at UIUC but also from my own personal pre-college (1980s) and post-college (2000s) study abroad experience in the U.S. These experiences have sparked, initiated, and projected themselves into my current project. Thus, as introduced in the first chapter, I find it crucial to elaborate on my own lived experiences
with and revelations surrounding English in transnational contexts. In this process, using my own jogi yuhak experience and my father’s study abroad experience in the 1980s as examples, I also provide a historical perspective of the changing landscape of study abroad and English in Korea.

With my literacy and study abroad narrative, I consider how the strikingly transnational trajectories of the contemporary group of study abroad students have ironically reinforced quite seemingly traditional educational and language ideologies despite the changed times and study abroad objectives. This paradox, which has led to the focus on building national identities in the home language for my informants (e.g., Chapter 3), complicates both the learning of English for academic purposes and social adaptation to the wider culture of the university. I end this chapter and the dissertation with implications and recommendations from the previous chapters in hopes of contributing to the rhetoric and composition scholarship and higher education institutions impacted by international ESL undergraduate students.

**My Transnational Education Narrative**

*Living the Extremes as Norms*

In the spring of 1987, when my father completed his PhD studies in the U.S., it was time for our family to go back home to Korea. For me personally, it was difficult to imagine leaving the U.S. teenage life and culture that I had just become so immersed in. Little did I know that the leaving was not the difficult part of the journey. I soon found out re-entering the rigorous Korean education system would be the hard part. Having used mainly Korean at home during our time in the U.S., I was able to speak and read the Korean language fairly well in the social context. I, however, was not prepared to use it in the stringent Korean educational context. I was not prepared to join the intense school life cultivated around what Koreans call *Education Fever*.
The college entrance examination in Korean—referred to as Examination Hell—is a good example of the nation’s obsession with education. Surprisingly, the depiction in a November 12, 2015 NPR article, titled “Even The Planes Stop Flying For South Korea’s National Exam Day,” does not differ from the depiction of the national exam day in November 1999 that Seth (2002) placed at the beginning of his book “Education Fever.” On this day not only are the Seoul skies silent but the streets, usually filled with heavy traffic, are empty as opening hours are delayed for most work places. It is a monumental day for Korean high school seniors for it is the day they take the college entrance exam they have been preparing even before elementary school. It is the day that will determine the university(ies) that they will be able to apply to, the university that will determine the course of their adult life, supposedly. The students have endured their arduous school days oriented to preparing for this day, the school life justifying the title Examination Hell.

I, with thousands of students in Korea, depending on the grade level, started my typical school day at 8am (some earlier) in the morning and ended the school day somewhere between 5pm and 12am (with short and long recess periods in between), again depending on the grade level and the school. In my 2nd and 3rd year in high school, I remember getting up before the break of dawn and heading out the door with three packed meals (for morning snack, lunch and dinner) to school. The day that started early was filled with back-to-back classes during the official class hours, supplemental core subjects (Math, English, Korean) in the late afternoons,

---

48 The name and the format of the college entrance exam has changed from College Entrance Examination (대학입학학력고사, 1982-1993) to College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT, 대학수학능력시험, 1994-present) but still maintains its significance in the Korean society. 49 Second and third grade of high school in Korea would be equivalent to junior and senior year in the U.S. high school system. In Korea, there are three years of middle school and three years of high school making it six years of secondary education.
and long study sessions in the evenings. One main reason or excuse not to attend the late evening study sessions was to head to a hagwon and/or private tutoring. So when classes ended, including the supplemental ones, a long line of motor vehicles would form in front of the school gate with parents and hagwon bus drivers. And off we went to hagwons to work on our English and Math.

Although more than two decades have passed, the stringent school system persists and the private-education market accelerated with the deteriorating conditions of the current Korean labor market. Aside from the grand narrative of becoming global elites with perfect English, the grueling school life is one of the major and immediate reasons why many students choose to do jogi yuhak during their secondary school years. When my participants expressed how lucky they felt for “escaping” the gruesome high school life in Korea, I was able to somewhat empathize with their sense of relief. Although I eventually “adjusted” to the Korean school system and culture, there were many moments when I wished I had stayed back in the U.S. The “American” school life I had left behind was something of a longing at that point.

_Riding the Privileged Currents_

The Korean school life, high school life in particular, was hard. Confirming my parents’ worries even before returning to Korea, I struggled immensely. I adapted to the Korean social and school culture with ease but the schoolwork was impossible to overcome. The most difficult part was retaining the information from lectures and textbook readings as schoolwork mainly

---

50 The study sessions were labeled optional but compulsory for all students. All day, the students would stay in their classroom and the teachers would come in to teach their respective subjects.

51 According to Ministry of Education and Human Resource Department and the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), the total employment rate was 67.3 percent for four-year college graduates, but only 49.2 percent of the employment was full time.
required rote memorization. Even math involved memorizing formulas and solutions. Not even long hours of “studying” were able to improve my test scores. My test grades reflected my struggles, making me an average or sometimes below average student in Korean standards.

Fortunately, there was one subject that saved me from being labeled as a mediocre student—English. Despite my average grades in most subjects, at a school of approximately 2000 students, my English put me in the category with the “smart” and “cool” crowd or maybe a category of its own since there was no one else who had come back from the U.S. at my school or even in the whole city. My English or rather my American-like English accent afforded me a unique status labeled and admired as the “USA girl” to those beyond my friend circle. I was frequently called on in English classes to read or pronounce or sometimes even teach a lesson. My English became an exotic symbol to many that experienced U.S. culture only through the eyes of the media.

This makes sense given the Korean political, economic, and social-cultural circumstances of the time when our family returned to Korea in the mid/late 1980s. Coming out of decades of dire poverty, the nation was experiencing rapid economic growth and had aspirations to compete on a global level. Seoul was on the world’s stage, hosting the 1988 Olympics; however, at the same time, anti-U.S. sentiments were pervasive in Korea due to a strong military presence that was seen as another form of colonization. Nonetheless, the English language was gaining recognition and prestige. The attention that I received because of my rare and novel ability to speak and read English would be unimaginable in today’s Korean society where so many Koreans travel, live, and study abroad. Based on the number of Koreans studying abroad today

\[52\] In the 1980s, when my dad embarked on his study abroad journey, studying abroad was an exclusive opportunity and experience for the “intellectual elites” selected and funded by the government, the employed company, or the hosting institution.
(over two hundred thousand since 2008), connections with the larger world now become the norm for the middle- and upper class (see figure 2 in Chapter 1). Ironically, however, years of globalization has extenuated English as a symbolic resource that mediates class, privilege, and authority of the elite.

\textit{Intermission and the Second Wave}

My well-paved way came to a screeching halt when it was time for me to apply for college. Unfortunately, and rightly, my English was not enough to help me score high on the college entrance exam. The score was not even near close to helping me make it to one of the SKY\textsuperscript{53} universities or even second tier universities in the Seoul area that were perceived to be the ticket to a prosperous life, the ultimate goal of life time of schooling in Korea. Instead of heading to Seoul for college like most of my friends, I entered a third tier university in my hometown Daegu\textsuperscript{54}. I had a pretty simple and happy life in college. English was not a big part of my college life except for the private tutoring jobs here and there. When it was time to graduate and set goals and plans for post-graduation, again, everything stalled. Not wanting to go into fashion for my future career\textsuperscript{55}, I needed to explore a career plan with my English in mind, which seemed obvious and logical at the time.

\textsuperscript{53} SKY refers to Seoul National University, Korea University, and Yonsei University, the top three universities in Korea all located in Seoul. Koreans perceive the enrollment in/degree from these three university to be a secure job and lucrative life via upward social mobility.

\textsuperscript{54} Daegu is the third largest city in Korea approximately 140 miles south of Seoul, the nation’s capital.

\textsuperscript{55} My decision not to pursue a career in fashion was not necessarily because I did not like it or want to. It was because the fashion industry in Korea back in the 1990s (and still now) “required” a graduate degree from either Parsons School of Design or Fashion School of Technology (both located in New York) to ultimately “succeed” in the fashion world. The cost of study abroad/living expenses estimated at approximately over two hundred thousand dollars was an impossible hurdle for a middle-class family.
When I graduated from college in 1997, my younger sister, who was already in preparation, encouraged me to prepare and apply for the Graduate School of Interpretation and Translation\textsuperscript{56}, a very prestigious and coveted program at that time and currently. During the several months preparing for the program, I also was intrigued by newly established graduate programs specializing in International Studies. In the mid- and late-1990s, Korea’s drive for globalization was in full force. Under the name segehwa (globalization), the Kim Young Sam regime carried out a top-down globalization reforms in all sectors. In the higher education sector, the education ministry selected and generously funded nine universities, mostly top tiered institutions mainly in the Seoul, to establish and/or revamp graduate schools of international studies. Charged with training/cultivating “international specialists,” the schools touted their foreign trained (mainly from United States) faculty, fully funded domestic and international students, and exclusive use of English in their program. I attended a hagwon and prepped and took the written and oral/interview exam, was accepted, and enrolled in one of these programs. The entire process was done in English.

All through my young adulthood journey, I rode the tides of privilege in a nation permeated with English fervor\textsuperscript{57} within its relentless globalization. Even as a fashion major, my English afforded me opportunities that made my college life financially stable. With my “American” English accent as my only credential, without any formal training in teaching English, I was able to secure private tutoring jobs all throughout my college years and beyond. I did group tutoring for kindergartners, one-one conversation tutoring, and English college exam prep tutoring. The English private tutoring market had been booming with high demands. So it

\textsuperscript{56} The Graduate School of Translation and Interpretation gained popularity and prestige by the general public during the Gulf War in 1991 when professional interpreters’ simultaneous translation of CNN media reports were televised live in Korea.

\textsuperscript{57} See chapter 2 for more information.
was obvious to tutor on weekends as I spent my weekdays with my full-time job in the global marketing division at a major IT (Information Technology) cooperation. At one point, I was making approximately $100 an hour (in the late 1990s!) from tutoring conversation English to high society housewives. My “American” accent and my social skills were enough to satisfy their needs.

*Neo-liberalistic Pursuits*

In March 2000, after exactly two years into my job at the IT company, I decided to take my side-job to a professional level. My decision to quit my job and pursue another masters abroad in my late 20s was inconceivable to my traditional Korean parents. (Their six years studying abroad in the U.S. did not make much impact on their Korean cultural norms of the time.) Despite my parent’s desires for me to get married and lead a “happy life,” I was set on pursuing a career in teaching English I have grown to enjoy. I was motivated to “teach” as many people as I can to sound like and even gesture like “native” American English speakers, something I thought to be the ultimate goal of learning English. Thus much of my tutoring curriculum had been created around helping people with “American” pronunciation and intonation. To shamelessly admit, the lucrative English teaching/tutoring market in Korea also motivated me to pursue the career. I was confident, with a U.S. degree and my “native” sounding English, I would become one of many well-known English teachers with annual paychecks in the millions at corporate hagwons.

Such opportunistic ideologies around success and happiness continued during my

---

58 Note the emphasis on the global. Although I was hired for my English (based on my TOEFL scores), English was hardly used/needed in my responsibilities. This reflects the symbolic value of English outstripping its practical use mentioned in chapter 1.
graduate studies in the MATESL (MA in Teaching English as a Second Language) program at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (UIUC). With a goal to return to Korea and lead a financially prosperous life doing what I thought I was good at was enough for me to diligently take courses such as phonetics, syntax, and TBI (task-based instruction)\textsuperscript{59}. It was when I literally stumbled into Writing Studies with my MA thesis advisor’s encouragement that my ideologies began to change. Again, to shamelessly admit, initially there was no scholastic motivation to pursue a PhD degree in the field of Writing Studies; I was merely attracted by the \textit{Writing} part of the program name. I knew out of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), writing was the most avoided and dreaded “skill” by Korean English language learners. I also remembered, at the time of decision-making period, one English professor in Korea, before I left for my studies in the U.S., telling me to specialize in “writing skills” as all the other skills were oversaturated. My return to Korea to a lucrative life would be postponed but a few more years’ investment for a higher credential (doctoral degree in \textit{Writing}) seemed to be worth the wait.

\textit{Problematicizing White-English Privilege}

Throughout my previous chapters, I have, explicitly and implicitly, problematized Korea’s and Koreans’ obsession with \textit{White/American} English pursuit for neoliberalistic gains by providing evidence of its manifestations on Korean undergraduate students’ literacy practices at UIUC. Although I take this stance, as revealed from the previous sections, I have been a full beneficiary of the Korean society’s blindness for this \textit{White} English. Throughout my post-\textit{jogi}

\textsuperscript{59} I think my ideologies might have taken a different turn if the program provided courses like \textit{World Englishes} and/or \textit{Critical Approaches TESOL}. The courses in MATESL program were very much skills-oriented without much critical intervention.
yuhak days, I had taken full advantage of the American-like English accent that I had acquired from my own jogi yuhak experience.

The gradual revelation through my graduate studies in Writing Studies led me to “repent” for being a culprit in having benefited from and perpetuated the language ideology that divided the haves from the have-nots. My studies, involving foundational work on educational equality (e.g., Freire) and more diligently on linguistic diversity in the U.S. composition classrooms (e.g., Canagarajah, Horner, Matsuda), brought to light the world of inequalities that I had been living in and contributed to. I felt compelled and obligated to take part in breaking/interrupting the flow of deeply-rooted language ideologies so many students, domestic and international, enter U.S. colleges with. I realized acquiring the privileged form of “Standard English” might seem to be gaining immediate power but pursuing it intensifies the dichotomy of “native” and “non-native” that renders ownership of the language and thus disempowers the “non-native” English speakers.

Through my studies, not only did my language ideologies take a turn but my notion of language learning and writing also made significant transformations. As discussed, in my secondary education in Korea, I was bred in an educational and cultural atmosphere that esteemed the ability to memorize “right” answers, emulate “correct” templates, and regurgitate “nonnegotiable” knowledge. This focus on exactness at the expense of exploration was particularly true with my English-language learning in Korea and also, surprisingly to me at that time, in the U.S.: I was most concerned with sounding and writing “right”—whatever that meant. In my doctoral studies I came to understand and experience that writing is a meaning-making process and not necessarily a set of skills and techniques for translating existing ideas. Thus, my future aspirations have been shaped by these revelations.
In this section, with my personal lived narrative, I have shared something of the motivations, justifications, and enthusiasms that drove my research. I, the global ethnographer, tell the story of my “space and time” to make sense and connections to my research participants’ “space and time.” I presented my story to help readers get a broader sense of the landscape of the jogi yuhak phenomenon, thus giving my ethnographic findings meaning in the larger picture of the continuously changing educational, economical, and political contexts of Korea and the world. In the next section, I present implications derived from my study and my own transnational experience in striving for a true global education in Writing Program Administration work (narrowly) and also University Administration (broadly).

**Implications for Writing Program and University Administrators**

A key goal of my research has been to examine the literacy practices of Korean students at UIUC as a way of theorizing and thinking through the challenges of supporting language and literacy among international students in the 21st century, particularly given the dual effects of globalization and new communication technologies. The UIUC’s upper administrators have welcomed the large number of international students as a source of diversity and revenue, but for many of the administrators, faculty, and staff on the front lines, a sudden and unanticipated increase of international students prompted confusion, showcased incompetencies, and overwhelmingly increased work responsibilities. As chapter 3 details, one program chair described the attending to the issues arising from the dramatic increase in the international student population was like “putting out fires.” Under these conditions, for example, units and departments unsure of how to address the language needs of international students often turned to the Writers Workshop for assistance, prompting the center, despite its limited funding and
resources, to develop new programs (internally) and build relationships with various units across campus (externally). Drawing on findings from the Korean SLWG, from my overall exploration of post- jogi yuhak students’ literacy and rhetorical lives, and from my own professional and personal experience at the university, in this section, I present suggestions and guidelines in hopes of informing scholars, teachers, administrators, and students in higher education wanting to make a difference in the lives of our international/transnational students.

Knowing Our Student Writers

As evidence through my literacy narrative and the various interview responses and actions of my research participants, the goals and the educational and literacy trajectories of the international student population on our U.S. campuses are complex and diverse. In the case of many Korean undergraduate students at UIUC, it was pertinent to examine and recognize students’ literacy and rhetorical practices in both learning and social settings at the university, in Korea, and at their respective early study abroad locations. It was with in-depth knowledge of the particular and peculiar literacy and rhetorical practices and the language ideologies behind the practices that I was able to create the single-language writing group for the Korean undergraduate students. For example, aware of the fact that the students avoided using English amongst their peers, I was able create a specific environment for the students to freely discuss their issues with writing. Without knowing the students, the Korean Single-Language Writing Group (SLWG) would have been unthinkable.

A number of writing center scholars (e.g., Condon, Denny, Cox et al.) emphasize the importance of knowing the students we work with. When working with multilingual writers, various questions about the writer and writing should emerge. Who are the writers? In what
contexts (e.g., social, educational) did they learn English? How do they use (or not use) English on campus? What language goals do they have for the particular paper and their undergraduate/graduate education? These questions and more are simple but paramount in how we can effectively engage with the students as individuals as well as a collective group. As discussed in chapter 4, the Korean SLWG is not a one-size-fits-all solution. It is, however, an impetus for scholar-teachers/tutors to get to know our multilingual/translingual students from abroad and use the knowledge in effectively designing and creating programs, curriculum, instruction, and environment meaningful for the not only international but all students. It is clear that administrators, program directors, and teachers should not, at this point in history particularly, make assumptions that they can predict much simply from knowing an international student’s home country. A Korean student might have grown up and gone to school solely in Korea, but might also have spent many years in Early Study Abroad contexts in multiple countries. Understanding students’ specific trajectories of education, language and life is critical.

The Need for On-Going Research

With my personal and professional interest in the Korean student and international student population’s literacy practices in general, I was intrigued by the subtle and stark differences of their literacy and language practices and needs in comparison to the traditional Korean undergraduate students without jogi yuhak experience seen through teaching and tutoring in ESL classrooms, first-year writing classrooms, and particularly working at the Writers Workshop—the university writing center. In my administrative capacities at the Writers Workshop for more than three years, exposed to the field of Writing Center scholarship, the need for research and innovation was hidden behind the business of the day-to-day writing center
work. Writing Program Administration (WPA) work needs to be based not only on theory-grounded awareness of the increasing complexity of students’ experiences, practices, and goals, but also by on-going research that helps us see patterns that are new, complex, and highly local.

Just as teachers and tutors should not impose certain writing practices on students/writers, writing program administrators should not blindly enforce certain teaching practices on teachers/tutors. Even the most touted teaching practices and policies should be examined and adapted to the particular characteristics of the students/clients it is serving. Thus, it is crucial to always question and investigate for improvement. For example, as noted in the previous section, the knowledge of students participating in the Korean SLWG would not have been known without questioning and researching on the Korean student population at UIUC. Another example at the writing center is the creation and implementation of the tutor note-taking guidelines in Fall 2014. During a Fall 2013 new-tutor orientation, a consultant raised ethical concerns about the ways in which writers, who were mostly international multilingual students, might be (mis-)represented in the notes tutors write at the end of each tutorial. In addition to the details of the issues worked on (e.g., main accomplishments, challenges) during the sessions, there are words and/or explanations of writers that could represent writers as deficient or as a problem to be solved. Rather than imposing a rote set of best practices, in search of more conscientious ways of representing writers in tutor notes, administrators suggested and guided opportunities for active discussions, qualitative research, and the exchange of ideas with both our own writing center staff as well as scholars and practitioners at national conferences. The development of writing program practices and policies should involve continuous examination and research as it keeps practices and policies accommodate the continuously changing needs of the students and the field.
Collaborating, Mainstreaming and Sustaining Support

Most of my interviews with administrators across campus, during the time of my fieldwork, expressed the need and desire to provide more support for international students. Andie Caillas, an assistant director at the Residence Hall expressed the task at hand, saying it “[felt] like a mountain but everybody that [she’s] been around wants to climb that mountain…from the leadership down…all across the board, the desire is there.” The reality, however, was far from the administrators’ desires. In spite of the national and local criticism for seeing international students as sources of revenue, my conversations with administrators through work and research interviews revealed that work related to international students felt like a side-job for most. The desire was there but money and time was not and the “extra” workload added, with the increase in the international student population, to their existing responsibilities felt like a burden. As Andie went on, “we just don’t have the staff…my work is filled with from recruitment to student death in the residence halls. There are just so many hours in a day.”

Institutions that embark on extensive and especially rapid internationalization need to be prepared to creatively adapt administrative structures and student support resources to respond to needs of students, teachers, and units. The specific needs are likely to be difficult to anticipate, but the emergence of specific needs should be predictable. If UIUC was initially not prepared to deal with such needs, it is also true that much has progressed since the time of initial data collection in Fall 2011. Across units and programs, there has been increased support and much development in the services for international students. One notable development was the International Student Working Group (ISWG) formed in 2013. The relatively small group (of 13 participants as of Fall 2015) consists of university administrators of various student affairs and academic units and program across campus who come together to share news/events and to find
points of collaboration. Working groups represent one model to try to manage rapid change that existing institutional structures were not designed to handle. Such collaborative efforts certainly make sense at a large decentralized institution like UIUC, where there is often limited communication amongst units and colleges. As a “literacy” representative, I have been participating in the meetings to inform and be informed of the various programs and support efforts for international students across campus but also to probe ways of creating and/or integrating literacy support into various programs in the students’ college lives.

As argued and demonstrated through the previous chapters, literacy education and development for undergraduate (and graduate) students transcend far beyond the classroom walls into their daily lives on our campuses. With this recognition, at the Writers Workshop, in addition to in-house program development like the SLWGs, another notable change in writing center work was the increased attention to building connections with the larger university. For example, my responsibilities, as the ESL services coordinator and assistant director from 2012 to 2014 at the Writers Workshop, were heavily focused on collaborating and networking with various units and programs across campus. This outward focus was much more intense than had been common and was clearly driven by the challenges of so many programs faced with increasing international student enrollment, especially at the undergraduate level. With training in Writing Studies and Second Language Studies, I devoted much of my time to creating and conducting workshops with programs and units such as Writing Across Curriculum, the College of Business, and the Career Center. To reach the students at various places and stages in their college lives is important because students’ literacy development is closely tied to the global and local and institutional and personal contexts and circumstances past and current.
Challenging Dispositions, Transforming Landscapes

As U.S. colleges and universities continue their mission to internationalize and globalize their institutions, scholars have been calling for WPAs to “serve as agents in bringing meaningful change for students, faculty, and institutions” in these times of escalated transnational contexts (Martins 4). Responding to this call, we are beginning to see focused scholarly responses. For example, the authors of Transnational Writing Program Administration (2015) collectively problematize WPA work and examine it within the realm of transnational positioning, language, and engagement. Such statements call for WPAs to address their stance on issues of language diversity and “standard English.” Bruce Horner (2001) argues that it is important to consider how certain language practices are legitimized while others are delegitimized based on existing power relations in a particular location, and how it is equally vital to create a favorable classroom environment for students to negotiate politics of language (734). Therefore, as demonstrated in chapter 4, translingual approaches are another sign of scholarly adaptation to significantly more multilingual student demographics. In this light, I see the Korean SLWG, a space where students/writers were able to discuss and critique conventional ideologies, as an intervention in the ecology of language development, an apparatus bringing meaningful change within the continuously growing transnational landscape of the university. The Korean SLWG acts as both a rhetorical move for the writing center in the transnational context and as a hub for literacy education in higher education institutions.

In Chapter 4, I demonstrated how the Korean Single-Language Writing Group was a non-conventional literacy support, which acted as an institutional intervention contributing to the literate ecology of students’ transnational experience. It was an attempt with an objective to shape language ideology development in line with translingual dispositions, thus interrupting the
reproduction of language inequalities that have been perpetuated and not only on U.S. soils but also on the global stage. U.S. universities see international students as a source of diversity enriching demographics. We as educators and scholars need to remember that international student subjects are also in need of education on diversity, not only in the U.S. context but, again, with the global context in mind. To “nurture and develop truly global citizens,” I would call for a more intricate literacy support with the students’ complex past and present literacy trajectories in mind. In case of post-jogi yuhak students, and echoing Greenfield’s (2012) words, we need to empower our students so they can make “choices about language use based on their own critical thinking” (58) and not necessarily by enforcing “Standard English” but having them make choices on the language varieties of use. We need to empower students to take active roles in their writing process, and educate faculty to value such roles.

Despite efforts in some academic pockets, the U.S. has been one of the most resistant countries in the world in embracing multilingualism. The world has been accommodating the dominance of our monolingualism for decades now, but that era is ending and we need to forge a new translingual stance in the anglocentric world and in our language pedagogies. As U.S. higher education institutions further internationalize and scholars-teachers in language and education value linguistic diversity, there need to be practical strategies to spread the value of multilingualism/translingualism. In first-year writing programs and in many writing centers, second language issues are dealt with on “special” occasions (e.g., beginning of the year orientations, one-time professional development) or as one part of a larger event (usually under

---

60 As evidence in chapter 3, acknowledgment of language diversity and language discrimination was missing in the university’s public document. Public discourse needs to be established to promote and celebrate linguistic diversity on the university level. Here is an example from Reed University [http://www.reed.edu/diversity/language_diversity.html](http://www.reed.edu/diversity/language_diversity.html).
the same category with “non-traditional” students). If “linguistic homogeneity” is not the norm of our student population (Matsuda 2012), multilingual issues should be a part of all conversations by default. One-time workshops, orientations, and events can certainly be critical in informing faculty, students, and staff about multilingual/ESL issues, but these issues need to be embedded within the regular programs and curriculum continuously and consistently.

Much of the research on international students in the U.S. for decades has been focused on students’ adaptation to American culture and the American academic environment. The rhetoric of this framework seems to divide the “host institutions” from the “guests.” Although the studies acknowledge the host universities need to facilitate the integration of foreign students into campus life by providing cultural events, friendship clubs, intercultural fairs, they have yet to turn their focus to educating and integrating the administration, faculty, staff and the domestic students to a global perspective, to emphasize intercultural and global competence for all members of the academic community.

Taking a Sociocultural and Institutional Perspective

Since the first significant appearance of international students in U.S. higher education in the early 1990s, English language literacy has been a central focus to literacy teachers. Despite the plethora of studies concerning students’ second language proficiency, primarily aiming to enhance assimilation and acculturation into the U.S. academic disciplines, not many studies have looked beyond the pedagogical/instructional aspects within classroom settings. Under labels such as “international students,” “ESL/multilingual learners/writers,” or just “foreigners,” the students have often been considered one large homogeneous group in need of homogeneous language support. To understand the limits of such a blanket approach and to avoid deficit ideologies that
focus primarily on what international students lack in language and literacy, I have been exploring the past, present, and projected literacy experiences of South Korean undergraduate students with early study abroad (ESA or jogi yuhak) experiences. Here in my dissertation, I have argued that the language and literacy practices of these undergraduate students (henceforth post-jogi yuhak students), with pre-college education in English speaking countries - including the United States, Canada, Australia, Singapore and Malaysia - continuously develop within the larger global and local contexts. My study therefore complicates not only categories of transnational students but also approaches to pedagogy. This sociocultural understanding of the complexity of multilingual backgrounds is crucial to the field of Rhetoric and Composition at a pivotal time when U.S. higher education institutions are experiencing an unprecedented increase in the number of international undergraduate students.

My project highlights the literacy and rhetorical practices of post-jogi yuhak students, a particular group of international undergraduate students who have been fairly unknown to non-Koreans on campus and to composition and rhetoric scholars despite their significant presence in U.S. higher education institutions. My ethnographic project has provided in-depth articulation of ways post-jogi yuhak students’ literacies and literate selves do and do not develop as they navigate college life. As my study demonstrates, post-jogi yuhak students sought out (or were directed into) a transnational educational experience early in their lives to learn English and become “global” citizens/elites, yet at Illinois, I claim that they are heavily engaged in, what I have called, localization of their “Koreanness” not only through their use of the Korean language and regular participation in Korean social media sites, but also through the institutionalized

\[^{61}\text{Recall that at the University of Illinois, the public higher education institution with the largest international student population at the time of this research, Korean students were the second largest international group and more than 80\% of them had jogi yuhak experience.}\]
rebuilding of Korean social practices as seen in the KSA activities. These practices ultimately helped them ground particular kinds of identities as U.S. college students. Their literacy and rhetorical practices were shaped not only by and within global and local politics but also within the everyday dynamics of a particular institutional climate and policies.

As the literacy experiences and needs of international undergraduate students in general, and post-jogi yuhak students in particular, differ from those of traditional international graduate students in U.S. higher education, they complicate already established notions and remedies for academic success at the university. This understanding of the complexity of multilingual backgrounds complicates singular notions of international students and suggests the need for institutional and pedagogical awareness of literacy varieties. The post-jogi yuhak students today foreshadow the more complex transnational trajectories that we should expect of international (and national) students in an increasingly globalized world.

Work in composition studies and applied linguistics has addressed the increasingly multilingual, transnational, and transliterate character of academic worlds (Canagarajah; Horner et al.; Lu; Lillis and Curry; Matsuda). To understand the limits of such a blanket approach and to avoid deficit ideologies that focus primarily on what international students lack in language and literacy, my work has aimed to go beyond this focus by illuminating the extracurricular literacy and rhetorical practices of Korean undergraduate individuals with particular transnational experiences within the larger institutional, national, and global contexts. As Prior (1998) argues, literacy practices are “laminated, not autonomous, that every moment implicates multiple activities, weaves together multiple histories, and exists within the chronotopic networks of lifeworlds where boundaries of time and space are highly permeable” (277). The KSA and its members’ practices of localization, practices at times contradictorily evolving within layers of
multiple and fluid contextual boundaries, foreground the idiosyncrasies of literacy and linguistic practices that we should expect in all students.

To further explore these issues, I anticipate following and examining my participants’ literacy development into their post-college years. In doing so, I plan to track how their literacy and rhetorical practices evolve as they go on to enter the professional world back in Korea and how their literacy experiences influence or are influenced by their changing transnational contexts. This research will allow a better understanding of the influence/impact academic writing program and writing support systems in U.S. higher education institutions have on the graduates in the global work force. In addition to work on transnational literacies, I also plan to continue research on the role of institutional literacy support systems—campus policies, academic programs, and pedagogical approaches—on students’ language development and enculturation in the ever increasing and diversifying student population in the U.S.

Finally, I would eventually like to pursue a project that I have been thinking about since the beginning of my administrative work in the Writing Studies program at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Again, with a transnational approach, I would like to compare parallel writing programs and writing-support systems in South Korea, China, and other East Asian countries by investigating the effects of institutional and global contexts on the students’ language learning. Specifically, I plan to examine the administrative and pedagogical philosophy and practices of writing centers in these countries where such writing support is still a novel idea to many education institutions. In this process, it will be crucial to consider the complex histories of writing programs oriented to English, as You (2010) exhibits it in his study on the history of English composition in China. Furthermore, in pursuit of a personal inquiry, using qualitative methods and text analysis, as Casanave (2002) explores Japanese bilingual academics working in
the U.S., I would also like to explore how the writing of U.S. trained foreign scholars shape academic writing in their respective countries after their graduate studies in U.S. These future scholarly efforts would contribute to Christiane Donahue’s (2009) call for internationalization and transnationalization of composition studies and writing program administration.

Understanding the complexity of multilingual backgrounds is crucial to the field of Rhetoric and Composition at a pivotal time when U.S. higher education institutions are experiencing an unprecedented increase in the number of international undergraduate students. As an administrator, researchers, instructor/tutor, mentor, and ESL graduate student at the university, and as a legitimate member of the university, I hope scholars, teachers, and administrators are able to take note and embrace the complexities that our students bring with them to the university. I hope the efforts in attending to the needs of our international students (all students) do not create a rhetoric that sees unpreparedness or just the fact of the international student population as a “problem” that needs to be solved. The post- jogi yuhak students I have studied, and indeed who I have been a part of, foreshadow the more complex transnational trajectories that we should expect of international (and national) students in an increasingly globalized world. I consider this research to be just one early step in understanding our students, campuses, and the world today.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORMS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Informed Consent for Primary Participants

Jogi YuHak and the Promise of Literacy:
The Transnational Lives of Korean Undergraduates

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research I, Yu-Kyung Kang of the Department of English, am conducting under the direction of Paul Prior, also of the Department of English. I am interested in exploring how literacy (e.g. reading, writing and speaking) is practiced and developed among South Korean and Korean-American Undergraduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, with study abroad experience before matriculation. I intend to gather case studies like yours in order to examine students' rhetorical and literacy strategies and practices to as the students navigate through their lives in college and beyond. I hope that this research will provide valuable information on the rhetorical and literacy development of South Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad experience before entering college.

What the Study Involves
If you agree to participate, I will work with you to decide which texts and contexts to study and discuss. In general, I will ask you to consider four kinds of participation. First, I will ask you to participate in approximately 2 interviews (each interview may last up to 2 hours) with me about your experiences with writing and language, specific texts you have shared with me, the contexts in which you write, read, and speak, and, in general, your past, present and future literacy trajectories. In addition, if needed, I may ask you to participate in 1 to 2 follow-up interviews via face-to-face, phone calls, or emails. Thus, you may be asked to participate in 3 to 4 interviews in total. Second, I may be interested in attending some class sessions, taking notes on class activities, and classroom documents (e.g., handouts, assignments). In some cases, I may ask (with permission and of the instructor and other students as well) to audio- or video-tape classroom activities. In addition, audio- or video-taping of social gatherings will only be done with the consent of others in the environment. Third, I may ask to sit in on and possibly audio- or video-tape social meetings/gatherings to observe rhetorical and literacy practices outside of class. Finally, I may ask you to provide copies of texts that you have written for both academic and non-academic purposes. If you agree to participate, we will negotiate the specific texts and contexts to study.

Publication and identifiability
The result of this research may be published in journal articles, electronic publications, or books and may be presented in professional conferences, lectures, and workshops on teaching for professors and teaching assistants. I may quote from and describe recorded activities or interactions, any texts you have written that you have made available for the research, and any interview comments you have made. I may play excerpts of audio- or video-tapes in oral
presentations of the research or in electronic publications. It is likely that you could be recognized by people who know you if they heard, saw, or read such reports of the research.

To limit your identifiability, I can use a pseudonym for your name in all drafts and final reports of this research. (However, if some of the texts you provide for the research are already published texts, then we would need to use your real name in our research reports to include that data. You may also wish to be identified to assert your authorship of the work, ideas, and texts reported.)

Regardless of whether you are referred to by a pseudonym or not, to safeguard your privacy, we will keep any identifying data (audio-tapes, video-tapes, copies of your writing, interview transcripts) in a private office where others will not have access to them and we will never release raw data to anyone else. All data will be kept in a secure location and kept indefinitely until the research is finished.

Your Rights, Benefits and Concerns
You may benefit from the opportunities this research offers to reflect on your rhetorical and literacy development in general. The primary benefit of this research is to increase our basic understanding of 1) population at focus (Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad prior to matriculation) 2) the ways their rhetorical and literacy are developing in college and 3) how their surroundings influence and adapt to their rhetorical and literacy circumstances and needs. Such understanding may eventually improve both pedagogical and administrative aspects in educational settings. The most likely risk of participating in this research would come from loss of privacy and potential to be identifiable to others in research reports. However, the safeguards described above in the section, "Publication and Identifiability" minimize these risks.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Whether you choose to participate or not has no bearing on your access to or use of any services that I or others offer in any context. You may withdraw at any time after signing this form should you choose to discontinue participation in this research. The decision to participate, decline, or withdraw from participation will have no effect on your grades at, status at, or future relations with the University of Illinois. There is no remuneration for participating.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Yu-Kyung Kang (224-489-6228; ykang6@illinois.edu) or Paul Prior (217-333-3024; ppprior@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, you can contact the UIUC Institutional Review Board (528 E. Green Street, suit 203, 217-333-2670; irb@illinois.edu). If you are out of town and identify yourself as a research participant, you may call collect.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep

 Please review and check off the options below to ensure that we know how your data may be used. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask them.
• I agree to participate in interviews about my rhetorical and literacy experiences as a undergraduate student, with the understand that my interview comments might appear in reports of this research. Yes [ ]  No [ ]

• I agree that any texts that I have written and provided for this research may be used (quoted or paraphrased) in written publications, electronic publications, and/or oral presentations associated with this research. Yes [ ]  No [ ]

• I agree that any audio- or video-taped recording of activities may be used (quoted or paraphrased) in written publications, electronic publications, and/or oral presentations associated with this research. Yes [ ]  No [ ]

• Choose one of the following:
  
  _______ I would prefer to be referred to by a pseudonym rather than my real name in all reports of this research.

  _______ I would prefer to be referred to by my real name in all reports of this research.

I have read this informed consent form and checked answers to the questions above, I am 18 years or older, and I agree voluntarily to participate in this research.

__________________________  __________________________
(signature)                  (date)

__________________________
(print name)
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_Jogi Yuhak and the Promise of Literacy: The Transnational Lives of Korean Undergraduates_

**Purpose of the Study**
You are invited to participate in a research I, Yu-Kyung Kang of the Department of English, am conducting under the direction of Professor Paul Prior, also of the Department of English. I am interested in exploring how literacy (e.g., reading, writing and speaking) is practiced and developed among South Korean and Korean-American Undergraduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, with study abroad experience before matriculation – my primary participants. I intend to gather information regarding your experience/encounters with these students’ literacy experience in order to examine their rhetorical and literacy strategies and practices as the students navigate through college life and beyond. I hope that this research will provide valuable information on the rhetorical and literacy development of South Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad experience before entering college.

**What the Study Involves**
I may ask you to consider one or more types of participation. First, I may ask you to participate in approximately 2 interviews (each interview may last up to 1 hour) with me about your experiences/encounters with literacy practices of South Korean undergraduate students with early study abroad experience prior to entering college. Second, I may be interested in attending some class sessions, taking notes on class activities, and classroom documents (e.g., handouts, assignments) that you are attending. In some cases, I may ask (with permission and consent from the primary participants and other students in the observation environment as well) to audio- or video-tape classroom activities. Finally, I may ask to sit in on and possibly audio- or video-tape social meetings/gatherings that you are attending to observe primary participants’ rhetorical and literacy practices outside of class. If you agree to participate, we will negotiate the specific texts and contexts to study.

**Publication and Identifiability**
The result of this research may be published in journal articles, electronic publications, or books and may be presented in professional conferences, lectures, and workshops on teaching for professors and teaching assistants. I may quote from and describe recorded activities or interactions, any texts you have written that you have made available for the research, and any interview comments you have made. I may play excerpts of audio- or video-tapes in oral presentations of the research or in electronic publications. It is likely that you could be recognized by people who know you if they heard, saw, or read such reports of the research.

To limit your identifiability, I can use a pseudonym for your name in all drafts and final reports of this research. (However, if some of the texts you provide for the research are already published texts, then we would need to use your real name in our research reports to include that
data. You may also wish to assert your authorship of the work, ideas, and texts reported.)

Regardless of whether you are referred to by a pseudonym or not, to safeguard your privacy, we will keep any identifying data (audio-tapes, video-tapes, copies of your writing, interview transcripts) in a private office where others will not have access to them and we will never release raw data to anyone else. All data will be kept in a secure location and kept indefinitely until the research is finished.

**Your Rights, Benefits and Concerns**
You may benefit from the opportunities this research offers to reflect on the rhetorical and literacy development of South Korean undergraduate students with early study abroad experience in general. The primary benefit of this research is to increase our basic understanding of 1) the population at focus (Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad prior to matriculation) 2) the ways their rhetorical and literacy are developing in college and 3) how their surrounding influence and adapt to their rhetorical and literacy circumstances and needs. Such understanding may eventually improve both pedagogical and administrative aspects in educational settings. The most likely risk of participating in this research would come from loss of privacy and potential to be identifiable to others in research reports. However, the safeguards described above in the section, “Publication and Identifiability” minimize these risks.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Whether you choose to participate or not has no bearing on your access to or use of any services that I or others offer in any context. You may withdraw at any time after signing this form should you choose to discontinue participation in this research. The decision to participate, decline, or withdraw from participation will have no effect on your grades at, status at, or future relations with the University of Illinois. There is no remuneration for participating.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Yu-Kyung Kang (224-489-6228; ykang5@illinois.edu) or Paul Prior (217-333-3024; pprior@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, you can contact the UIUC Institutional Review Board (528 E. Green Street, suit 203, 217-333-2670; irb@illinois.edu). If you are out of town and identify yourself as a research participant, you may call collect.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

Please review and check off the options below to ensure that we know how your data may be used. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask them.

- I agree to participate in interviews about the rhetorical and literacy experiences of Korean and Korean-American undergraduate student, with the understanding that my interview comments might appear in reports of this research. Yes [ ] No [ ]
• I agree that any audio- or video-taped recording of activities may be used (quoted or paraphrased) in written publications, electronic publications, and/or oral presentations associated with this research. Yes [ ] No [ ]

• Choose one of the following:
  __________ I would prefer to be referred to by a pseudonym rather than my real name in all reports of this research.
  __________ I would prefer to be referred to by my real name in all reports of this research.

I have read this informed consent form and checked answers to the questions above, I am 18 years or older, and I agree voluntarily to participate in this research.

__________________________  ________________________
(signature)  (date)

__________________________
(print name)
Informed Consent for Observation Participants

Jogi Yuhak and the Promise of Literacy: The Transnational Lives of Korean Undergraduates

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research I, Yu-Kyung Kang of the Department of English, am conducting under the direction of Professor Paul Prior, also of the Department of English. I am interested in exploring the rhetorical and literacy experiences of South Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students at UIUC with study abroad experience before matriculation – my primary participants. I intend to gather information regarding your experience/encounters with these students' literacy experience in order to examine their rhetorical and literacy strategies and practices as the students navigate through college life and beyond. I hope that this research will provide valuable information on the rhetorical and literacy development of South Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad experience before entering college.

What Your Participation Involves
I am interested in audio- or video-taping some class sessions and social meetings/gathering to observe the rhetorical and literacy practices of my primary participants (South Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad experience before entering college). If you are attending the class session and/or social meeting/gathering that is to be observed, I will ask you for your permission to be audio- or video-tape.

Publication and Identifiability
The result of this research may be published in journal articles, electronic publications, or books and may be presented in professional conferences, lectures, and workshops on teaching for professors and teaching assistants. I may quote from and describe recorded activities or interactions, and any interview comments you have made. I may play excerpts of audio- or video-tapes in oral presentations of the research or in electronic publications. It is likely that you could be recognized by people who know you if they heard, saw, or read such reports of the research.

To limit your identifiability, I will use a pseudonym for your name in all drafts and final reports of this research. (However, if some of the texts you provide for the research are already published texts, then we would need to use your real name in our research reports to include that data. You may also wish to be identified to assert your authorship of the work, ideas, and texts reported.)

Regardless of whether you are referred to by a pseudonym or not, to safeguard your privacy, we will keep any identifying data (audio-tapes, video-tapes, copies of your writing, interview transcripts) in a private office where others will not have access to them and we will never release raw data to anyone else.
Your Rights, Benefits and Concerns
You may benefit from the opportunities this research offers to reflect on the rhetorical and literacy development of South Korean undergraduate students with early study abroad experience in general. The primary benefit of this research is to increase our basic understanding of 1) population at focus (Korean and Korean-American undergraduate students with study abroad prior to matriculation) 2) the ways their rhetorical and literacy are developing in college and 3) how their surroundings influence and adapt to their rhetorical and literacy circumstances and needs. Such understanding may eventually improve both pedagogical and administrative aspects in educational settings. The most likely risk of participating in this research would come from loss of privacy and potential to be identifiable to others in research reports. However, the safeguards described above in the section, “Publication and Identifiability” minimize these risks.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Whether you choose to participate or not has no bearing on your access to or use of any services that I or others offer in any context. You may withdraw at any time after signing this form should you choose to discontinue participation in this research.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Yu-Kyung Kang (224-489-6228; ykang5@illinois.edu) or Paul Prior (217-333-3024; pprior@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, you can contact the UIUC Institutional Review Board (528 E. Green Street, suit 203, 217-333-2670; irb@illinois.edu). If you are out of town and identify yourself as a research participant, you may call collect.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep

Please review and check off the options below to ensure that we know how your data may be used. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask them.

- I agree to be audio- or video-taped and that any audio- or video-taped recording of activities may be used (quoted or paraphrased) in written publications, electronic publications, and/or oral presentations associated with this research. Yes [ ] No [ ]

I have read this informed consent form and checked answers to the questions above, I am 18 years or older, and I agree voluntarily to participate in this research.

(signature) (date)

(print name)
# APPENDIX B

## SECONDARY PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Participants</th>
<th>University Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mardia Bishop</td>
<td>Course Director of Communications, Department of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi Cailles</td>
<td>Assistant Director for Residential Life - Hall Supervision &amp; Staffing (Urbana Halls Operations &amp; Staff Recruitment/Selection contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Carney</td>
<td>Interim Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anissa Dalle</td>
<td>Faculty, Intensive English Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Gallant</td>
<td>Lecturer Communication 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinhyuk</td>
<td>International Korean Student/Transfer Student from community college in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Mette</td>
<td>Professor/Executive Associate Director School of Art and Design, FAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Misa</td>
<td>Director, International Student and Scholar Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mortensen</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Olinger</td>
<td>Instructor of first-year writing course, Teaching Assistant and doctoral student in the Department of English, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnYeong Park</td>
<td>Research Assistant for International Student Career Development and Outreach, Career Center doctoral student in Human Resources Education program, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Sadler</td>
<td>Director of the MATESL Program, Advisor for the minors in TESL; Director of ESL Programs; Associate Professor of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Schiller</td>
<td>Assistant Director, International Student and Scholar Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sondra Schreiber</td>
<td>Assistant Director, International Student and Scholar Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahki Sen</td>
<td>Clinical Counselor, Chair of International Student Outreach, Counseling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Springs</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Assistant Director, Employer Connections and Job Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Tami</td>
<td>Director of International Student Integration, International Programs and Studies. Dr. Tami was an Associate Director at the beginning of my fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Tucker</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs in the College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Weber</td>
<td>Senior Lecture of English, First-year writing course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong</td>
<td>International Korean Student/Transfer Student from community college in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Yontz</td>
<td>Teaching Associate of Finance, College of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Navigating Academic Writing:
Writing Groups for KOREAN Undergraduate Students

Would you like to talk about US academic writing in your own language?
Do you sometimes wonder what your writing assignments mean?
Do you struggle to talk with your professors and classmates about writing?
Would you like to practice US conventions of using sources?

Then you would want to join Navigating Academic Writing, FREE writing groups hosted by the Writers Workshop. These groups are specifically for writers whose first language is Korean and will meet in a 4-week session. Topics will be tailored to your needs but may include organizing ideas, understanding different kinds of writing tasks, understanding instructors’ responses, and using sources. The sessions will be led by an experienced Writers Workshop consultant who understands struggles with writing in English.

In order to participate, you must attend the informational meeting on February 2 (Thursday) at 3:00pm to sign up and you must attend all four sessions. Students who have participated in Navigating Academic Writing in the past are not eligible.

Informational Meeting:
Thursday, February 2, 2012

Writing group sessions:
    Thursday, Feb 9
    Thursday, Feb 16
    Thursday, Feb 23
    Thursday, March 1
3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
Room 251 Undergraduate Library

Email ykang5@illinois with the subject “Writing-Group-Korean” by February 1 to attend the informational meeting.
APPENDIX D

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

NAVIGATING ACADEMIC WRITING
KOREAN UNDERGRADUATE WRITING GROUP / Spring 2012

Name: _____________________________________

Email: _________________________________ Phone: ____________________________

Major: __________________________ Year in School: ________________ Age:______

Writer’s Workshop ID Number (if you have one): ____________________________

Our group will meet on Thursdays from 3:00-4:30pm on February 9, 16, 23 and March 1.
Attendance is required at all 4 sessions.

What courses are you currently taking that require writing (please list)?

How long have you been speaking English (When did you come to the States or another country where English is the first language to attend school)?

How long have you been writing and/or reading in English?

Have you received any specific writing instruction in English? What type (ESL classes, IEI, coursework elsewhere, etc.)?

What kind of writing projects are you currently working on? Please describe in detail. (For example, course assignments)

What concerns do you have regarding writing in English and/or academic writing?

What areas do you most want to improve in your writing?

What writing subjects do you want our Undergraduate Writing Group to address? (For example: American academic writing conventions, citation and source use, paragraph organization, common English grammar areas that challenge Korean writers, etc.)

157