'Your pronunciation is really good': the construction of linguistic identities in ELF interactions among multilingual speakers

Yujong Park

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

'Your pronunciation is really good': the construction of linguistic identities in ELF interactions among multilingual speakers

Yujong Park

English Language & Literature Department, SungKyunKwan University, Seoul, Korea

ABSTRACT

Studies on the linguistic identity of multilingual speakers engaged in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) interactions have continued to grow in the past 20 years. This paper was aimed at contributing to this line of research by studying interactional data to investigate the construction and negotiation of linguistic identities among multilingual speakers of English. Data was collected from 38 ELF interactions in a university classroom located in South Korea. The analysis shows that the students' linguistic identity in relation to English was made relevant consequent to the interactional exploitation of the two interrelated social constructs of phonology and nationality (i.e. being foreign). The findings suggest that these multilingual students negotiate and build one's linguistic identity by evaluating different ways of speaking English which in turn influence their own linguistic use. The study helps us understand how normative expectations or beliefs are expressed at the level of interaction and underscores the need for ELF awareness and development of related pedagogical tools for empowering these group of students.

1. Introduction

Multilingualism frameworks have become central in recent conceptualisations of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Cogo, 2012; Jenkins, 2015, 2017) as dynamic pluralistic manifestations of linguistic resources have become more prevalent (see Ishikawa, 2015; Ishikawa & Jenkins, 2019 for a discussion on English as a multilingual franca). South Korea provides an excellent context for the study of ELF because many international universities in the country are accepting an increasing number of students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds who use English as a common language of choice to interact with each other. Fewer ELF studies have studied South Korea, which is likely due to the country's historically monolingual society. This situation has been changing in recent years as the number of multilingual speakers from different geo-cultural backgrounds is greatly increasing. In several *kukcey* ('international') universities located in Seoul, foreign students representing a variety of different countries constitute almost one-tenth of the student

population (Nahm, 2018). The number of foreign students in Korean universities has increased from 84,800–142,000 in the past 4 years that exceeds that of neighbouring countries, Japan and China (Nahm, 2018). The current study aims to investigate these multilingual students' linguistic identities to gain a better understanding of the social constructs that participants orient to in the transnational and globalised Korean context.

This study joins a growing number of ELF researchers who investigated participants' own practices in naming and labelling different ways of speaking English as a lingua franca (Hynninen & Solin, 2017; Jenkins, 2007; Morán Panero, 2019). In this line of research, rather than investigating 'varieties' in the methodological design, the extent to which perceptions, stereotypes and social meaning-making practices play a shaping role in the emergence of varieties are explored. For example, after analysing interviews collected from 48 college students from Spain, Mexico and Chile, Morán Panero (2019) found great variability in the way participants constructed semiotic relations and evaluative practices concerning the English language. Despite the widespread iconisation of 'native-like' English as correct, some Spanish students described departures from idealised standards as natural and even desirable. Past research on ELF speakers' identities (Evans & Imai, 2011; Jenkins, 2009; Matsuda, 2003; McKenzie, 2008) tended to rely on survey responses or interview data taken from English learners situated in Japan and China (Evans, 2010; Evans & Imai, 2011; Jenkins, 2007). However, surveys or interviews may not truly represent the reality of the manner in which attitudes and identity work is performed (Garrett, 2010). Utilising conversation analysis (CA), this study examines students' linguistic identity as portrayed in ELF interactions by exploring participants' discursive orientations toward different ways of speaking English. Although a growing number of studies on ELF interaction among multilingual speakers have used CA (Cogo & Dewey, 2006; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hülmbauer, 2009; Hynninen, 2011; Kasper, 2006) to investigate competences or strategies that participants use to achieve mutual/shared understanding, there have been less studies using this framework that attempted to study participants' construction of linguistic identities through participants' own discursive practices. This study may fill this gap in research by examining the manner in which linguistic identities are framed and how the corresponding ideological underpinnings are realised at the level of interaction among multilingual users of English. Transcripts of the interactions revealed moments in which participants exploited standard language and native speaker ideologies for identificational purposes in specific contexts. In what follows, I first provide the landscape of past work on linguistic identity in L2 interactions, followed by a brief overview of conversation analytical research, which provides the methodological background, before reporting on the findings of the study.

2. Literature review

2.1 Research on linguistic identity and ELF interactions

Language use is an important way in which individuals define themselves and others (Giles, 1977). Linguistic identity, therefore, is an essential part of individuals' social identity. Linguistic identity is most commonly realised through an individual's self-definition derived from membership of a linguistic group (Bordia & Bordia, 2015), such as being a 'Korean language speaker' or an 'English language speaker.' In ELF interactions, linguistic

identity becomes particularly salient in the presence of other speakers who come from different language backgrounds. In this context, speakers generally exhibit multilingual identities encompassing the original or natal linguistic identity, along with the foreign linguistic identity (i.e. English). As is the case with other forms of social identities, linguistic identities have prototypical characteristics, which are created by linguistic group members who use the language in a particular way over a period of time (Hogg, 2001). Prototypical characteristics may include pronunciation; vocabulary; paralinguistic features such as rate and pitch of speech; and gestures (Bordia & Bordia, 2015). By enacting prototypical characteristics, individuals are able to maintain legitimate in-group statuses among other members of the linguistic group (Hogg, 2001). Linguistic identity is important in ELF contexts with multilingual speakers because it may influence not only how individuals react to other languages but also their attitude or evaluation of the entire cultural/social group tied to that language (Jenkins, 2007; Norton, 2000).

Recent ELF research has characterised ELF identities as being hybrid, multiple, and negotiated online rather than being fixed constructs (Baker, 2015; Ehrenreich, 2017; Pietikäinen, 2017; Sung, 2015). Moving beyond the essentialist view of fixed identities, the discussion has shifted toward understanding identities as being multifaceted. Because ELF is frequently used in transcultural, transnational third spaces (Bhabha, 1994), it sometimes becomes difficult to determine one's linguistic identity by the national borders of Kachru's (1985) inner, outer, and expanding circle model. Previous researchers have demonstrated that English speakers from all circles co-construct their own situated norms of appropriateness (Matsumoto, 2011; Promodou, 2003). The present study attempts to show that notions of power and ideology related to the English language may influence how linguistic identity is co-constructed by participants in ELF interactions from the South Korean context.

Identity construction is necessarily bounded to ideology and power (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Bourdieu and Jean-Claude (1977) emphasised the close relationship between speech, identity and power and argued that the value ascribed to speech cannot be understood as being distinct from the person who speaks, and the person who speaks cannot be understood to be separate from larger networks of social relationships (of power). He suggests that relations of power can serve to enable or constrain the range of identities that people can negotiate in their communities which becomes an important issue in ELF interactions comprising speakers from different communities of practices. The politics of identity, power, and citizenship have received much attention in recent years, particularly with regard to the impact of globalisation (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Speakers may be marked as belonging to specific groupings by their use of spoken language, which provides listeners with an index regarding gender, age, ethnicity, geography and education (Lippi-Green, 2012). According to Lippi-Green (2012), the dominant group speaks the so-called unmarked or unaccented standard variety of English, and those who sound similar to the dominant majority reap social, personal and academic rewards. Mastering linguistic skills in English, therefore, becomes a symbolic resource that is heavily endowed with social values – something that is not equally available to all persons. For students from non-English-speaking backgrounds (e.g. from English as a foreign language contexts), schools also provide critical contexts where they must find a voice, through which new identities may be negotiated or indeed resisted to the extent that the student's identity at school contexts hinges on language rather than

place (Miller, 2004). Morán Panero (2016) treated language ideologies as the historical, situation-transcending and collectively shared ideas regarding language that inform the evaluative commentary constructed by individuals in the contexts in which they are situated. She showed that multiple and opposing ideology-mediated conceptualisations of a linguistic phenomenon are sometimes simultaneously available for the same person. For example, interviewees often formulated opposing conceptualisations of the same social construct (e.g. 'native-like' English use), and thereby produced variable evaluations on their own English use (e.g. being or not being 'native-like'). Therefore, the aim is not to establish which one of these seemingly conflictive responses is the real or stable evaluative representation but rather to understand the reason for which a particular evaluation is formulated in a particular context.

ELF research on linguistic identity has distanced itself from the World Englishes paradigm which characterised nonnative speakers as norm-dependent (Kachru, 1985), but rather, it emphasised ELF speakers' language use in its own right. For example, communicative effectiveness in ELF interactions is valued by treating deviations from established varieties such as American English as differences, rather than deficiencies (Seidlhofer, 2011). Recent ELF scholars focus on the processes of metalinguistic construction and evaluation of ELF speakers rather than defining and labelling 'Englishes' a priori. The focus of research has expanded towards the investigation of emerging variability and paying more attention to the 'multilingual repertoires-in-flux' of speakers (Jenkins, 2015; Morán Panero, 2019). However, the manner in which speakers engaged in ELF interactions actually treat each other's practices in English in real-time has been subjected to less examination. This is unfortunate because micro-analytical investigations of ELF interactions may contribute to a more complete understanding of how the linguistic identities of nonnative speakers of English are built and maintained through intersubjective relationships. For example, if being able to speak like an American native speaker is treated with awe and respect within the interaction, learners who are not able to perform at this level might feel as if their linguistic identity is being compromised and feel deficient in comparison with those with greater mastery.

Sociolinguists (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Canagarajah, 2013; Eckert & Rickford, 2001) and conversation analysts (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Goodwin, 2007; West & Zimmerman, 1987) have emphasised the role of interactional data in understanding the process of identity construction in relation to language, that is, how speakers position themselves and others as particular kinds of people through discursive practices. Even if social actors treat identities as pre-existing and fixed, sociolinguistic studies have demonstrated that identity construction is an interactional achievement with consequences for the structure of talk. For example, in a study on identity practices of girl 'nerds' at a California high school, Bucholtz (1999) showed that identities are negotiated through both positive (determined by who is better at being a nerd) and negative identity practices (determined by who counts as a nerd) rather than being a fixed term. The fluidity of identity was also represented by Cogo (2012), who found that workers in a transnational IT company exhibited concern for prescriptive correctness and an orientation for normativity when engaged in high-stakes tasks whereas communicative effectiveness was considered to be more important in daily interactions. Recent conversation analytical studies on ELF interactions have also treated linguistic identities as a contingent matter that becomes relevant only when engaged parties treat linguistic identities as such (Cogo, 2012; Firth, 2009; Jenks,

2012; Kimura, 2017). In a single case study on the interaction between an L1 English speaker and an L2 English speaker, Kimura (2017) found that linguistic identities such as being a nonnative or an L1 speaker of English, were rarely brought to the fore. Pietikäinen (2017) examined identity construction among ELF international couples, comprising partners from different linguacultural backgrounds who used English as their common contact language in their private communication, finding that identity was heavily influenced by the couples' shared experiences in different multilingual contexts and over time.

In the current study, speakers' identity as nonnative English speakers is exemplified in overt yet playful talk about each other's phonology and nationality. Herein, linguistic identity is defined as an individual's self-definition that is derived from membership of a specific language group. In all of the examples, contingent on the interactional uptake, one speaker emerges as being more proficient than the others on the basis of a hierarchical ideological framework that places more value on specific ways of speaking English. Because such talk indexes the identities of the speaker and the interlocutor, it is evident that the creation of social identities in interaction hinges on meaning-making that transcends one-to-one semiotic relationships that map a single linguistic form to a single function. Rather, linguistic identity is dialogically co-constructed and subject to shared ideological interpretation (Ochs, 1993). In the current data, linguistic identity in relation to English is made relevant (surfaces) as resulting from the interactional exploitation of interrelated constructs of phonology and nationality (i.e. being foreign) as will be explicated below.

2.2 Conversation analytic studies of ELF interaction

The present study used CA as its main research methodology to analyse ELF interaction and identity work performed by a sample of nonnative speakers. Research using a conversation analytic framework examines naturally occurring talk to determine what is being accomplished for the speakers involved. The central question asked in CA is 'why that now?' or 'What is getting done by virtue of that bit of conduct, done that way, in just that place?' (Schegloff, 2007). This question is crucial because it is precisely what co-participants are asking themselves as they formulate and interpret actions in interaction, actively holding one another accountable not only for the actions themselves, but also for the designs used to implement them. Much research that has employed CA as a major methodological framework has emphasised that this approach does not preclude researchers from categorising interactional phenomena (e.g. actions, identities, contexts, ideologies or languages) as part of an analysis. However, CA's methodological premise takes issue with categorisations that are assumed by the analyst to have a priori import to the participants, with no attention to the relevance for them, and without entertaining the possibility of other, more micro-level explanations of conduct-in-interaction. Conversation analysts are less interested in an overhearing analyst's 'interpretation' (Schegloff, 1997, p. 502) of that which is happening and the reason for the occurrence. Following the ethnomethodological origins of Garfinkel (1967), the production and recognition of action in talk-in-interaction by the members themselves are what are of true importance (Sacks, 1992). CA began as a study of monolingual interactional practices (primarily employing American English data) but has expanded to include additional languages

and multilingual situations (Hynninen, 2011; Kasper & Wagner, 2014; Pietikäinen, 2017; Shenk, 2007, *inter alias*).

A number of studies on ELF interaction have employed CA to analyse how participants cooperatively accomplished shared goals (Firth, 1996; Jenks, 2012; Kaur, 2009, 2016; Kimura, 2017; Matsumoto, 2011; Mauranen, 2006; Pietikäinen, 2017, 2018). CA can serve as an important tool for analysing ELF interactions as it allows the researcher to scrutinise speakers' robust interactional competence in achieving interactional goals without necessarily having to rely on exogenous categories that are essentially the analyst's interpretation. Hynninen (2011) applied the CA approach to examine the functions of mediation in the context of ELF classroom discourse collected from a university seminar, and found that mediation was used as a cooperation strategy, whereby teachers helped students participate in discussion and evaluated students' contributions. ELF's concern with ways in which multilingual speakers achieve understanding through English can also be explored using CA to uncover the manner that speakers achieve intersubjectivity in interaction (Kaur, 2016). For example, Pietikäinen (2017) showed how ELF couples develop their own meaning-making strategies and linguistic practices including translanguage practices. Kimura (2017) reported that speakers' identity may not be attended to in ELF interactions as realised through interactional procedures such as 'let it pass' (Firth, 1996) although the pursuit of institutional goals can manifest itself as orientation to linguistic norms. Hülmbauer (2009) found that 'incorrect' items used in ELF interaction did not cause communicative turbulence, but rather helped participants make sense of the interaction. The aforementioned studies suggest that participants constantly negotiate with regard to the kind of linguistic conduct that is acceptable in specific contexts. The present study will try to continue the methodological discussion regarding potential contributions of CA to the existing body of ELF scholarship by examining how participants display their linguistic identity regarding ELF in their interactions in the Korean context. The results may offer an appropriate, alternative methodology to the mainstream product-oriented approach that tends to explain people's behaviours on the basis of etic categories (Jenks, 2012; Raymond, 2018).

The remainder of the article is then dedicated to the detailed examination of segments of naturally occurring talk through which I aim to illustrate how nonnative speakers' linguistic identity in relation to English is shaped resultant to the interactional exploitation of interrelated constructs of phonology and nationality, and how the English language is ideologically constructed. It will be argued that applying CA theory and method to moments of participant-oriented-to identity work can provide researchers with insights into the manner in which interactants navigate and negotiate their respective linguistic identities at the ground level of turn-by-turn talk, while simultaneously reaffirming and potentially reestablishing a hierarchical relationship between the types of English being used. That is, through the details of social interaction, linguistic identity is investigated not as a predetermined construct but rather at the moment of its production.

3. Data and methodology

Group interactions collected from students attending K University in Seoul, South Korea, were used for the current study. The interactional data was drawn from a corpus of audio-taped university classroom group discussions collected by the researcher in 2017 and

2018. The entire corpus comprised of 38 interactions of 8–10 min each, which amounted to a collection of approximately 5.6 h of interaction. Group discussions were held in English between students of varying nationalities who were taking a class on English Linguistics in the university's English Language and Literature department. The researcher (who was a bilingual in English and Korea) was also the instructor of the target classes. This double role may have influenced the analysis and interpretation of the current data as the instructor had some prior knowledge of the participating students which were not explicitly mentioned in the collected interaction (e.g. personalities, English proficiency, nationality, etc.). However, these moments were rare and when this type of opportunity arose, the analysis focused on interactional evidence following CA methods (i.e. what was revealed in the data by the participants themselves) rather than employing interpretative evidence.

The target university advertises itself as being a global, transnational university that was ranked among the top 10 institutions in the 2019 Asian University rankings. To maintain its global status, the university delivers most lectures in English and students also tend to use English during their classroom discussions to accommodate those from different lingua-cultural backgrounds (i.e. non-Korean students). Participants' nationalities were identified through a survey administered on the first day of class that asked students to identify their country of origin, study major, and self-perceived English proficiency (native, near-native, intermediate, low), along with their goals for taking the class. Based on the survey, most of the students considered themselves as intermediate speakers of English (43%) and the two major language groups were Korean (51%) and Chinese (37%). For example, one (out of the four) classrooms from which data were collected comprised 25 Korean students, 18 Chinese students, one Japanese student, two Russian students, one Australian student and two exchange students from Hong Kong and Indonesia, respectively. According to recent conceptualisations of ELF, natural interactions between speakers of different first languages, including native speakers of English, would be valid for ELF research (Pietikäinen, 2017). With regard to this, the collected interactions could be considered to be ELF conversations that occurred predominantly between nonnative speakers of English; mostly from the expanding circle countries including Korea and China (Kachru, 1985).

The students were asked to engage in free talk outside of the classroom as a class project for approximately 8–10 min and audiotape their interactions. These interactions were collected in an unmotivated fashion, meaning that they were not designed to be used for any specific purpose other than for research on the discourse between nonnative English speakers. The students' command of English varied; some had more trouble than others in expressing themselves in English. However, everyone participated in the interactions and spoke in English even in cases where students shared a first language. All students agreed to submit their data to the researcher and signed informed consent forms. The names used in the paper are all pseudonyms to protect participants' identities.

In order to discuss the relevance of English varieties in constructing learners' linguistic identities in the context of the participating students who regarded themselves as nonnative speakers of English, the current study focuses on the discourse of this specific population. Most of the Koreans who participated did not have the economic, social, or cultural resources accessible to Korean Americans or other types of returnees (i.e. *jogi yuhak* 'early study abroad'), nor were they considered global elites (Block, 2012) in that they did not have the privilege to own the English language by experiencing an English-speaking culture or society at a younger age. However, some of the participating Koreans had

experienced living or visiting an English-speaking country for a short amount of time (i.e. as an exchange student or ESL student), and others had mixed linguacultural backgrounds (for example, one student from Russia remarked that her father was Korean and her mother was Russian). The sample included four native speakers of English (NSE); however, their group interactions were excluded from the analysis as past studies have reported that the NSE students tend to lead discussions and assume more linguistic authority (Hynninen, 2011) which might influence the interactions. The recordings were first transcribed using the common CA system summarised in Appendix 1 (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Ten Have, 2007). The transcripts were then examined to identify overt or 'on-record' ways in which, at the level of the production of action, co-participants could be observed holding one another accountable for their English performance by referring to the way one speaks or indexing a specific cultural group, and gleaning the sheer import of that accountability for the interactants such that it could be prioritised over other interactional business. All identified sequences underwent a second transcription process following Pietikäinen's (2017) guidelines for transcribing ELF data employing CA methodology. For example, phonetic transcription is provided for relevant parts of the data which represent accent-related, nonstandard features of English (e.g. flat turn final intonation, and the lack of rhoticity in /r/). It has become standard in conversation analytical work to provide several fragments of a conversation to convey the sense that the illustrated findings are not idiosyncratic to those particular episodes of interaction (Clift, 2001). The data fragments used herein have been limited to five interactions that illustrate participants' verbal orientation to pronunciation and nationality. A total of ten interactional sequences were identified containing explicit evaluations of participants' English language use in terms of these two main points from which these five were chosen. The five extracts were selected because they were both representative of the phenomena and required less contextual explanation in understanding the interaction. In CA, the integrity of (multiple) single case analyses is grounded in the assumption of 'order-at-all-points' (Robinson, 2007, p. 67). The number of cases is not important but rather the data-internal or emic understandings are assumed to reflect orderly processes which are used to make claims about structures of interaction (Goodwin, 1984; Schegloff, 1987). In examining large amounts of data, Schegloff (1987) emphasises that one should study multiples or aggregates of single instances. Here, quantitative analysis is not an alternative to single case analysis, but rather is built on its back.

The current study attempted to collect interactional data that are free from social desirability biases ('where people voice the attitudes they think they ought to have') and acquiescence biases ('where people may give the responses they feel the researchers are looking for') identified with other types of research data such as anonymous questionnaires and interviews (Garrett, 2010). The investigated discourse phenomena were unprompted and thus, they may represent spontaneous, momentary displays participants' unconscious/conscious attitudes towards the English language. However, because the data was video/tape-recorded and collected as part of the course project, the interaction may include occasional talk surrounding these two topics (cf. Ten Have, 2007). Most of the participants were majoring in Linguistics within the English language and literature department, and more than half of these students were double majoring in Economics and Business. Two students came from the French Language and Literature department to double major in Linguistics within this department. Research has shown that students

studying linguistics may have a stronger concern for Anglophone standards than students working in other fields due to associated pressures (Cury & Lillis, 2004), which might have influenced the way these students formed their linguistic identity.

In the following analysis, I illustrate the manner that the linguistic identities of these nonnative speakers are co-constructed through turns-at-talk in their ELF interactions, the ways in which those turns are designed, and the ramifications that this has for the production of hierarchies of ideology. Expanding the scope of prior work on identity construction, it will be argued that such discursive orientations to Anglophone or standard models of English (i.e. interactional exploitation of interrelated constructs of phonology and nationality) perform interpersonal and identity-based work by allowing interactants to 'index who they take themselves and the other to be, and who they take it they are to one another' (Kitzinger & Mandelbaum, 2013, p. 178). The analytical categories 'phonology' and 'nationality' were selected out of multiple other possible ways of performing identity in the data (e.g. ethnicity, gender, the way one dresses, one's hair color) as these were the only categories that were explicitly talked about in the collected interactions.

4. Analysis and discussion

Nonnative speakers engaged in ELF interactions are faced with a complex dilemma in constructing their linguistic identity. As evinced in past research, they are bilingual or multilingual in their mother tongue (Korean, Chinese, Hakka, and Russian, to name a few) and English, but they have complex views on their linguistic identity related to the English language (Jenkins, 2007). Participants in this study include Korean-born or Chinese-born Koreans as well as true foreigners in the Korean context who do not regard themselves as Koreans (e.g. Chinese or Japanese who were born in their respective countries). Such inter- and intra-cultural diversity produces internal ideological hierarchies regarding who appears to be more or less proficient in the English language at the level of interaction. Similar to the NNS teachers in Jenkins (2007), students desired a native-like English identity as signalled by a native-like accent and negatively evaluated a nonnative accent.

In the following analysis, I demonstrate that as nonnative speakers of English, the interactants are orienting to, or comparing themselves with an English native speaker ideal even though they have no trouble in effectively communicating in English. This dichotomy between NNS and NS was highly present in an implicit way by using comparative statements (e.g. You don't sound like a … , Your pronunciation is really good). Although there were no instance of students explicitly using the labels 'native' and 'nonnative speaker', their beliefs regarding an ideologically preferable way of speaking was especially present in evaluative remarks on characteristics that are derived from the phonology and nationality of their mutual interactants. Importantly, speakers do not need to actively believe in the truth value of those ideologies; rather, they simply need to be aware of their pervasiveness to effectively exploit those ideologies for identity construction. Below, I analyse five excerpts from the dataset in which ideological themes in identity construction appear. There are three or four participants in each excerpt, and each excerpt includes nonnative speakers from different countries, including Korea and China. Detailed information about the participants is provided prior to each excerpt when relevant.

4.1. 'Your pronunciation is really good': *phonology as an ideological framework for constructing linguistic identity*

In four instances, students evaluated each other's English in the first moments of conversations by orienting to one another's phonology (e.g. prosody, pronunciation or intonation). Although prescriptive grammatical correctness was never brought up to the fore of the interactions, the phonology of specific speakers (i.e. how they speak) was almost always commented on via overt praises or evaluative remarks. The following excerpt provides a case in point. Here, four students (E, M and W, are Korean, and S is Chinese) are introducing themselves to one another by talking about their ages and educational backgrounds. E is the only graduate student present in the interaction and she makes a joke about her age as being a secret (line 39). After simultaneous laughter, in line 41, W displays his admiration and enviousness of E's pronunciation by producing an overt evaluation, ('your pronunciation is really good') which is not topically connected to the prior discourse on E's age. As the analytical focus is on participants' phonology, a phonetic transcription is provided for words that were pronounced in a non-targeted manner (e.g. /sɛlmoːn/).

Excerpt 1. 2017_group 4.

```
27 E:         Age? A lot more than you guys hh[hahh
28                               [hhahhah
29 W:          oh no(h[hhh]
30 E:         [Ok(hhh)ay.
31 S:         Education is the:n (.) you become to: teacher? >English tea[cher?
32 E:                                                    [Oh no::=
33            =actually I don't wanna become a teacher, >I'm just trying to< get my degree?
34 S/W:       O:hh[hh
35 E:         [The masters degree? That's why I'm studying.
36 ??:         .hhhh wow.
37 E:         hhehh yeah.
38 (1.0)      /((additional laughter and a sighing sound from E))
39 E:         okay I can tell you my age but. (.) Not in h(hh)ere.
40 ??:         hhahhhahha the recorder is on.
41 W: ->       mmm wow. I envy you. [Your pronuncia-=
42                               [hhahhh ahhh hhahh
43 W: ->       =your pronunciation is really good.
44 E:          Thank [you. Hhahha
45 S/W:             [hhehhe
46 M:          Okay. Hhhehh
47 E:          So.
48            (0.2)
49 W:          So. (.) What are you guys going to do today
50 M:          Umm today. I'm going to (.) meet my high school friends. (.)
51            And have dinner?
52 S:          M[mm
53 E:          [Where are you gonna eat?
54 M:          Umm I am going to my friends school[?
55 E:                                        [mhm?=
56 M:          =And eat ss- {[ssɛlmoːn]}?
57            (0.8)
58 E: ->       {[sæmən]}?
59 M:          a::hhh hhaha {[ssæmən]},
60 M:          Yes.
61 E:          Ahhh
62 S:          N[ice
63 M:          [hhhhh
64 W:          Ahhh rich.
65 ??          hhahheh[hehh ((simultaneous laughter))
66 E: ->             [All you can eat {[sæmən]}?
```

```
67              (0.2)
66 M:            Yeah?
67 E:     All you can eat {[ sæmən]}? So (.) no: limit?
68 M:            Myeas.
69 S:     Mhh hhhh
70 E:     That's good. H[hhheh
71 ??                    [((simultaneous laughter))
```

The evaluative remark 'Your pronunciation is really good' (line 43) which is preceded by W's expression of jealousy ('I envy you') explicitly orients to the ideological hierarchy of English in terms of the speaker's phonology. E instantly accepts W's compliment by expressing gratitude ('Thank you') and then, laughter ensues, with all participants laughing (lines 42–25). The collaborative laughter immediately following W's overt evaluative remark acts to ratify E as a superior speaker of English than W or the other speakers in the group (Goodwin, 2007). Prior to the evaluation, S had been the most verbal student in the interaction, having asked questions and providing multiple acknowledgment tokens. However, after W's acknowledgment of E's English performance, E takes on a more active role by embodying the role of a language monitor (if there is such a term) by problematising nonstandard English pronunciations (line 58 '/sæmən/') and trying to clarify any misunderstanding present in the interaction such as downgrading the cost of eating salmon (line 67 'All you can eat /sæmən/?'). E's repair of M's pronunciation of the trouble source (line 56 /ssɛlmo::n/) shows that speakers are orienting to the pronunciation of words in ELF interactions even in cases where such pronunciation does not necessarily pose a problem of misunderstanding. Here, then, we can see the procedural consequentiality of evaluating one's own and other speakers' pronunciation to the moment-by-moment negotiation of identity, with the evaluation affecting how students go about formulating their turns-at-talk for each other and across sequences of action. Participants frame their understandings of speaking better English (i.e. sounding like a native speaker) and map those understandings onto people and activities that are significant to them; here, we can see such ideologies being put to work in turn-by-turn talk as one participant linguistically categorises another's speech as being of better quality ('your pronunciation is really good').

An asymmetric power structure is also demonstrable in the delegation of roles wherein a person with good pronunciation becomes a source of envy. A longstanding and entrenched ideology that a phonology that is closer to the inner-circle variety is superior to nonnative speakers' phonology of English has been played out in acts of disempowerment and discrimination at both the institutional and local levels. Students who were endowed with the most social power were decidedly more native speaker-like than those with lower statuses (Garrett, 2010). In the current dataset, including the excerpt above, the persistent ideology of 'sounding like a native speaker' is aligned with certain associated power imbalances that are manifest at interactional levels, insofar as it is the most fluent speaker who dictates who is to say what. As Luk and Lin (2006) argued in respect of Hong Kong English, the local hegemony of English is being sustained by local forces.

The following extract provides an additional example, whereby participants explicitly orient to their way of speaking English as being a notable and admirable feature of themselves. There are four students in this interaction and they have been talking about their educational and cultural background. S1 came from Hong Kong (but has a Korean mother and father) and S4 (who is Chinese) is commenting on her (S1's) English as being different

from other people from Hong Kong (line 71 'Where did you get your English cause I know that Hong Kong people not [really]').

Excerpt 2. 2018_group10 Y.

```
66 S1:        It's like how Koreans (.) speak English. Writing I can do and listening but
67            speaking I'm not fluent in Chinese. I stutter cause I'm like translating
68              in [English.
69 S4:             [mm::
70 S1:            (so yeah)
71 S4: ->          Where did you get your English cause i know that Hong Kong people not [really
72 S1:                                                                                    [oh cause
73            I also went to an international school [my whole life
74 S4:        [ah yeah]
75 S1:           yeah
76            (2.0)
77 S1:          and our school was a British sch[ool
78 S4:                                           [oh:
```

Before S4 finishes his question, S1 explains that she had attended an international school where (British) English is used. Even though there is no explicit mention of S1's spoken English, the participants treat S1 as sounding like a native speaker of English. By comparing Hong Kong English with S1's British English, S1's local identity as a student from Hong Kong is being challenged and questioned (Park, 2013). Sequences such as this illustrate one overt, or on-record, way in which, at the level of the production of action, co-participants can be seen to actively hold one another accountable for pronunciation, as well as for the sheer import of that accountability for the interactants such that it can be prioritised over other interactional business (i.e. telling a joke).

4.2. 'It wasn't like BABABA': characterising linguistic identity through phonology

The negotiation of one's linguistic identity through talk regarding English phonology can become relevant even when discussing a non-present third party. In the following conversation, three Korean friends are discussing S1's recent trip to India as an ISAC student member. S1 has just mentioned how amazing the international leader's presentation was at the global ISAC meeting. As S3 teases her and tells her to go marry him, S2 asks a series of questions regarding the leader's nationality, age and finally his pronunciation (line 18).

Excerpt 3. 2017_1_group5.

```
01 S3:        Ohhh [go marry him.=
02 S2:              [Really really hhahha ( )
03 S3:        =[How old is he.
04 S1:        =[Literally fell in love.
05 S1:        I don't know. Twenty five maybe?
06            [Twenty six?
07 S2:        [Is he from-
08 S1:        Egypt.
09 S2:        Ah Egypt?
10 S3:        Egy[pt.
11 S2:           [Hhhe he-
12            (.)
13 S2:         he- [does his appearance- like=
14 S1:             [( )
15            =Arabic.
```

```
16 S2:           Yes.
17              (0.2)
18 S1:          Arabic? Kind of? I can show him. I can show you his picture.=
18 S2: ->          =How is his pronunciation.
19 S1:          Great.
20 S2:          Great?
21 S1:->         Yeah. It wasn't like >BABABA<=
22 S2/S3:        =hahhhahh [HAHHHHA
23 S1:          [I mean I mean I mean
24 S3:          What's bababa hhehhhe
25 S2:          [hhehhehh
26 S3:          [Ca(hhh)n you explain that to me. Hahhahh
27 S2:          ARABIC English hhhahh
28 S3:          You(hh)re [so(hhh) racist(hhhh).
29 S1:                     [Indian accent
30              He wasn't have it.
31              (.)
32 S1:          He didn't have it.
33 S3:          bababa hhahha
34 S2:          hhahh so. Was the hotel really expensive?
35 S1:          I don't know cause I just paid the delegate fee?
36 S2:          a:::h.
```

When S2 asks 'How is his pronunciation.' S1 initially replies 'Great.' When S2 repeats her answer with rising intonation ('Great?') in the third turn, S1 provides additional information (Park, 2013) regarding the man through a characterisation of his English phonology ('It wasn't like >BABABA<'). This evaluative turn leads to a heightened degree of laughter by the co-participants and is later described as being 'so(hhh) racist(hhh)' (line 18). The prosody of '>BABABA<' with a staccato pitch is used frequently to ridicule the accents of English speakers situated in outer-circle countries. When S3 makes fun of S1's response by asking 'What's bababa', S2 incorrectly describes it as 'ARABIC English', which undergoes repair by S1 ('Indian accent'). That S1 would try to compliment the Egyptian student's pronunciation by characterising him as not having an Indian accent may be considered to be racist (line 28, 'You(hh)re [so(hhh) racist(hhhh).']) on the part of the speaker; however, the term 'BABABA' exemplifies the participants' perceptions on EFL varieties and the association of a favourable linguistic identity that is forged onto English phonology. Just as in the former examples, the answer to the question regarding an individual's pronunciation is consequential as it affects the positionality of the participants. S1 ideologically positions Indian English as being less desirable and evaluates the leader's performance by stating that he has an ideal accent (although this is not overtly mentioned in the interaction). The laughter that emerges during and after this characterisation disguises S1's problematic turn with the veneer of performing a playful action and possibly jocular act (Jefferson, 1984); however, it also ratifies the pronunciation of one's English as being more or less preferable. This interaction shows that hierarchical power relations influence the way many EFL speakers both categorise/affiliate themselves and ascribe identities to each other (Jenkins, 2009, p. 194).

In sum, the evaluation of the leader's pronunciation as being 'great' is characterised as not being 'like>BABABA<'. The participants' hierarchical ordering of English varieties is in line with prior studies that have characterised Indian, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and other 'accents' as particularly incomprehensible and troublesome in the English teaching and learning establishment (Blommaert, 2010; Pennycook, 1999). Here, we can observe the ways in which participants equate good English with a native speaker 'ideal' in the interaction

and the manner that their turns-at-talk reflect their attitude toward a nonnative like pronunciation (e.g. Konglish, Chinglish) through labelling practices (Morán Panero, 2019).

4.3. 'Everybody except me is a foreigner': foreignness as a framework for constructing linguistic identity

The next example involving three students (K and S are Koreans and L is Chinese), focuses on K's comment on her failure as a student by comparing herself with her 'foreign' classmates. The meaning of being 'foreign' is not clarified in the interaction; however, it appears to target only those foreign students who are native speakers of English and therefore have no difficulty understanding the English lectures and excludes Korean or foreign students who do not come from English-speaking countries (i.e. Chinese-born Chinese students). Therefore, K's characterisation does not reflect the true situation, as most of the foreign students in the class are also nonnative speakers and experience challenges following the English lectures, as evidenced in other interactional data (not included here). The ideological underpinning seems to be that K is selecting a subgroup of foreign students (e.g. native speakers of English) to portray the obstacles she is encountering in the English-only classroom as a nonnative speaker of English. This example is embedded within a broader conversation about K's plan to take time off from school and what she will be doing during the break.

Excerpt 4. 2018_2_group3.

```
01 K:          I want to take time off.
02 L:          Why.=
03 S:          =ME TOO::
04 L:          hhahh[ha
05 K:              [The class [lec-=
06 S:                         [Always.
07 K:          =lecture is too harsh for me:.
08 S:          M(hhh)e too. Hhh
09 L:          [Eng-
10 K:          [Every-
11 L:          English lecture?
12 K: ->        Yes. Everybody except me is foreigner. Hhh
13 l                [think.
14 S:          [My my English is SO:: poor but why: why am I even in here.
15 L:          Wuyun how wa- how's your presentation going.=
16 S:          =poor.
17             ((laughter))
18 L:          Wh(hhhh)y. hhehh
19 S:          I do(hh)n't know what I'm doing hhehh.
20 K:          Is that individual or group presentation.
```

After K indexes her linguistic identity as a nonnative speaker by contrasting herself with her classmates' nationalities ('everybody except me is foreigner'). S chimes in and declares that her own English is also 'SO:: poor' (line 14) before questioning her own existence in the class ('why am I even here'). Both K and S playfully yet dramatically position themselves as being deficient because of not being 'foreigners' as a means of bonding through their status as 'Koreans' and nonnative speaker of English (throughout the entire interaction). The three speakers communicate effectively in English and have little problem in using English to convey their opinions; however, throughout the entire interaction, each downplays their own English ability by comparing themselves with 'others' (i.e. foreigners who

use perfect English) even though only two students in the classroom would consider themselves to be native speakers of English (i.e. one student from Hong Kong and one from Australia). This type of move can be an identity tactic (Shenk, 2007), whereby presenting the inauthentic self as a nonnative speaker of English, the individual indexes the authentic self (Coupland, 2008). Such tactics operate as an inverted display of cultural knowledge by demonstrating that the speaker knows that she has committed both a linguistic and a social error. This type of double-voicing (see Bakhtin, 1981) frequently occurs after an act that might be interpreted as 'ridiculous' or 'stupid' or, more specifically, as representative of social (or linguistic) ineptitude or inadequacy (see Goffman, 1983). In the following group interaction, four students (L, H, J and K) are talking about 'utopia' or what makes an ideal society. L who came from Indonesia, expresses his opinion on how Korean students tend to be involved in competition to a higher degree than students from other countries (lines 5–6, 15).

Excerpt 5. 2017_1_group6 (L: male/ HJK: female).

01 K: Oh mo(hhh)re cooperation hhehh that's
02   [Advertisement hhh or something?
03 J: [yeah hhahha
04 H: Okay uhhhm
05 L:-> I think it's a very Korean thing to say less co- less competition or no competition
06   because like competition is a very big thing in Korea. Especially in Korea right
07 K/J: mh[m
08 L: [like everywhere you go there's gonna be competition?
09 ?:   mhm.
10 L: like in the workplace in schools like everywhere, like just to be a bit
11   a little bit better than your friend a little bit better than your coworkers?
12   So I think that's a very good thing which you said like no competition,
13 K: mm.
14 L: because it doesn't exist (.) in many other con- like it EXISTS?
15 ->   But not to the degree that it is in Korea.=
16 H: =Yeah and I think that it also has a very bad influence on your self-confidence?
17 K: mmm Right.

Following L's comment about Korea being a highly competitive society, H admits that it has a very bad influence on one's self-confidence. This type of thinking might explain the reason why students in excerpt 4 compare themselves with native speakers of English and feel inferior and inadequate as a result.

Expanding on the sociolinguistic concept of legitimate and alternative language markets (Bourdieu & Jean-Claude, 1977; Woolard, 1985) by locating these phenomena in interaction, this analysis indicates that high value is placed not only on English as a linguistic system in the abstract but also, and more so, on English produced in the context of an ideology of the native speaker in particular. The examples above give us a glimpse of the capital that the English language holds for these participants. Although the participants are proficient in English and can be considered to be legitimate speakers of that language, they constantly experience anxiety and deficiency at not being able to perform on par with native speakers of English.

5. Conclusion

The current study describes how nonnative English-speaking students build linguistic identity through turns-at-talk in ELF interactions and illuminates how their attitudinal

and discursive orientations to the English language perform critical identity-based work through interactional exploitation of the interrelated constructs of phonology and nationality. At first glance, these discursive orientations appear to be odd and even contradictory as most of these students are fluent in that (1) they can carry out a conversation in English with little problem and (2) they themselves include foreigners (living in Korea) from non-English-speaking countries. Nonetheless, the fact that ideological prerequisites of phonology and nationality are brought up in the interactions reveals that the learners may place value first in sounding like a native speaker (even though the term itself is not mentioned in the interactions) and then, they may place value on being a foreigner born in a country that has English as (one of) its first language(s). In the collected ELF interactions, participants' linguistic identities are socially constructed through the negotiation of expert/novice roles, orientation to one's degree of foreignness and the authenticity of one's pronunciation.

The findings confirmed the results of prior studies that ELF speakers may orient to a standard language and native speaker ideologies for identificational proposes in their interactions (Jenkins, 2007; Sweeney & Hua, 2010). The pronunciation and nationality of the speaker seem to matter to these students even though they have no difficulty in communicating with each other in ELF contexts. Matsumoto (2011) described ELF interactions as comprising a third space that is 'neither the one ['native speakers'] nor the other ['non-native' vis-à-vis 'native'] but something else where ELF speakers have an equal claim to membership, and exist in their own universe in comparison to NSs (p. 99). The current study shows that ELF speakers may nonetheless hold evaluative positions regarding each other's English as reflected in phonology and birthplace and that this may be displayed in their interactions. Even in this third space, ELF speakers exalt the English variety that represents more power and ownership of the language. Therefore, these findings support the argument that these notions (i.e. norms and standards) are an important analytical category and that identity is inseparable from relations of power, language ideologies and political arrangements (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). At least to this group of university students located in Korea, the ideological status of sounding like a native speaker of English is significant to the immediacies of social and interactional life as well as to the well-established values that ELF communities hold about group membership and differences. The current analysis also suggests that linguistic identities do not reside in the speaker but rather are discursively achieved through separate social constructs.

The two ideological prerequisites for an individual's linguistic identity examined here, phonology and birthplace are reflexes of a longstanding hegemonic structure, which is the reason for which they carry such force. Under other circumstances they might be rejected as stereotypical, hostile, and even colonial. However, the potential antagonism is play-framed (i.e. participants laugh about the term or evaluation) in the interactions, and thus, it carries a meta-message of safety, accord, and reevaluation. These ideologies are mobilised and resignified by speakers (Butler, 1997), and in so doing, they serve to reinforce the friendship group and become socially established. The examination of such real-time enactments of varied, fluid, and even disputed linguistic identities, in contrast to rigid theories claiming that identity categories are culturally or developmentally fixed, requires access to the dialogic negotiations that occur in the dynamics of face-to-face conversation.

Bourdieu and Jean-Claude (1977) described (nonnative) speakers as struggling with the 'power to impose reception' or gaining the right to speak as a legitimate speaker. In an analysis of ELF speakers' communication experiences in a dormitory community, Matsumoto (2011) showed that successful ELF interactions may take on and do away with any ideological sense of inferiority or deficiency that nonnative speakers may internalise (p. 109). In Pavlenko and Backledge's study (2004) on Diana, the ideology of language with regard to learning Italian extended beyond the power of ethnic ties, but served as a valuable resource that would open up future employment markets, as she negotiated her identity as Italian Canadian. The current study confirms the ideology of English in the Korean context, where English is a powerful asset for students in the job and educational market.

The current study finds that although these ELF speakers are multilingual, the main language they use for communication is English. Pietikäinen's (2017) examination of multilingual couple's communication patterns also showed this trend of using English as a common language of choice. Jenkins (2009, p. 204) argued that a learners' freedom to express their own local and ELF identities in their English would positively influence learners' attitudes by enhancing their confidence as English speakers. Likewise, Ishikawa (2015) proposed that ELF awareness had a clear potential to gender more positive attitudes toward their English among Japanese university students. In Korea, English textbooks and the English national curriculum prioritises American English and native speakers over other varieties of English and nonnative English. If ELF becomes more commonplace in students' everyday lives and pressures to learn American English are removed, then these learners may be able to more confidently project their local identities in their interactions. Future research on ELF in expanding circle countries will be able to contribute to educational reform and changes in attitude with regard to ELF being promoted and valued.

One limitation of this study is the representativeness of the findings and its population. First, that which people say they believe does not necessarily represent 'the entire range of their underlying beliefs about language' (Park, 2009, p. 21). As Bucholtz and Hall (2005, p. 605) stated, identity is inherently relational; therefore, it will always be partial, produced through contextually situated and ideologically informed configurations of self and other. Discursive and constructionist scholars have repeatedly warned against making generalisations regarding the evaluative dispositions that our participants may have, whether at the time of data collection or in future evaluative situations (Ishikawa & Morán Panero, 2016). Although the CA method enables us to observe how power, identity and ideology are constructed in natural, unprompted ELF interactions (as opposed to elicited investigations), it is not possible to the extent to which these representations are 'true'; we can only infer that they are being employed by observing relevant behaviours (i.e. talk). In order to obtain more validity, it is necessary to undertake longitudinal and ethnographic studies to understand the ways in which language users' beliefs and evaluations may be used, constructed, and modified from one interaction to interaction another (Hynninen, 2016; Ishikawa & Morán Panero, 2016). Second, it should be noted that although these students viewed themselves as nonnative English speakers, they are proficient in that they can carry out fluent and effective interactions with their peers in English and may not represent others of the age group who have lower proficiency. Those who have experienced ELF communication first hand may have more favourable orientations toward ELF (Jenkins,

2009), whereas students with lower English proficiency are more likely to avoid participating in such interactions in the first place. As students in the English Language and Literature department, a majority of the participating students might have felt the pressure to align more closely with the native speaker norm as the sociocultural expectation is that English department students would be proficient users of English. Investigations of ELF interactions among nonnative students with lower proficiency may be valuable in this regard.

Despite these shortcomings, the study suggests that it is important to present students in the Korean multilingual college context with a wide range of variations in English usage, including ELF interactions, to familiarise them with English as a multilingual franca (EMF) and raise awareness of the global roles of English that are not limited to specific varieties. This may provide students with additional tools to successfully reposition themselves as speakers and challenge status quo understandings of 'native-like' English as inherently 'perfect' or 'correct' (Morán Panero, 2019). The goal should be building a positive multilingual identity that indexes ELF as representing competence, authenticity and hardworking learner ethics and open up a new space of using English in their own right as being multilingual English users (Ishikawa & Jenkins, 2019; Morán Panero, 2019, p. 324). This goal might be a long term one; however, it is critical to strive towards its accomplishment if Korea is to become a truly multilingual country. This study may contribute to current and future research by showing the value of ELF research employing an emic, procedural approach.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). *Identities in talk*. Sage.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Baker, W. (2015). *Culture and identity through English as a Lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). Dissemination: Time, narrative and the margins of the modern nation. In H. H. Bhabha (Ed.), *The location of culture* (pp. 139–170). Routledge.

Block, D. (2012). Commentary: Transnational South Korea as a site for a sociolinguistic of globalization and the distinction of global elites. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *16*(2), 277–282. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2012.00528.x

Blommaert, J. M. E. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Bordia, S., & Bordia, P. (2015). Employees' willingness to adopt a foreign functional language in multilingual organizations: The role of linguistic identity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *46*(4), 415–428. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.65

Bourdieu, P., & Jean-Claude, P. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Sage.

Bucholtz, M. (1999). "Why Be Normal?": language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society*, *28*(2), 203–223. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404599002043

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 585–614. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407

Butler, J. (1997). Introduction: On linguistic vulnerability. In J. Butler (Ed.), *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative* (pp. 1–41). Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh University Press.

Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of "actually". *Language*, *77*(2), 245–291. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2001.0074

Cogo, A. (2012). ELF and super-diversity: A case study of ELF multilingual practices from a business context. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *1*(2), 287–313. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0020

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic moves to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *5*(2), 59–94. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.12

Coupland, N. (2008). The delicate construction of identity in face-to-face accommodation: A response to Trudgill. *Language in Society*, *37*((02|2)), 267–270. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404508080329

Cury, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, *4*(4), 663–688. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588284

Eckert, P., & Rickford, J. R. (2001). *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press.

Ehrenreich, S. (2017). English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua franca* (pp. 37–50). Routledge.

Evans, B. E. (2010). Chinese perceptions of inner circle varieties of English. *World Englishes*, *29*(2), 270–280. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2010.01642.x

Evans, B. E., & Imai, T. (2011). 'If we say English, that means America': Japanese students' perceptions of varieties of English. *Language Awareness*, *20*(4), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.592590

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On conversation analysis and "lingua franca" English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8

Firth, A. (2009). Doing not being a foreign language learner: English as a lingua franca in the workplace and (some) implications for SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*(1), 127–156. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2009.006

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H. (1977). *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095141

Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 225–246). Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C. (2007). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse and Society*, *18*(1), 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507069457

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*(3), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503_1

Hülmbauer, C. (2009). We don't take the right way. We just take the way that we think you will understand: The shifting relationship between correctness and effexiveness. In E. L. F. A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 323–347). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hynninen, N. (2011). The practice of 'mediation' in English as a Lingua franca interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 965–977. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.034

Hynninen, N. (2016). *Language regulation in English as a lingua franca: Focus on spoken academic discourse*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Hynninen, N., & Solin, A. (2017). Language norms in ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 267–278). Routledge.

Ishikawa, T. (2015). A study of Japanese university students' attitudes towards their English. University of Southampton, Faculty of Humanities, Doctoral Thesis

Ishikawa, T., & Jenkins, J. (2019). What is ELF? Introductory questions and answers for ELT professionals. *Center for English as a Lingua Franca Journal*, *5*, 1–10.

Ishikawa, T., & Morán Panero, S. (2016). Exploring language attitudes in ELF research: Contrasting approaches in conversation. *Englishes in Practice*, *3*(4), 74–109. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2016-0004

Jefferson, G. (1984). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 346–369). Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a Lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 200–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, *2*(3), 49–85. https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Jenkins, J. (2017). The future of English as a Lingua franca? In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 594–605). Routledge.

Jenks, C. (2012). Doing being reprehensive: Some interactional features of English as a Lingua franca in a chat room. *Applied Linguistics*, *334*(4), 386–405. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams014

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. (2006). Beyond repair: Conversation analysis as an approach to SLA. *AILI Review*, *19*(1), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.07kas

Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2014). Conversation analysis in applied linguistic. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *34*, 171–212. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000014

Kaur, J. (2009). Preempting problems of understanding in English as a Lingua franca. In A. Mauranen, & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 107–125). Cambridge Scholars.

Kaur, J. (2016). Conversation analysis and ELF. In M.-L. Pitzl, & R. Osimk-Teasdale (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectives and Prospects* (pp. 161–168). De Gruyter Mouton.

Kimura, D. (2017). L1 English speaker participation in ELF interaction: A single case analysis of dyadic institutional talk. *JELF*, *6*(2), 265–286. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2017-0013

Kitzinger, C., & Mandelbaum, J. (2013). Word selection and social identities in talk-in- interaction. *Communication Monographs*, *80*(2), 176–198. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2013.776171

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language ideology and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

Luk, J. C., & Lin, A. (2006). Uncovering the sociopolitical situatedness of accents in the World Englishes paradigm. In R. Hughes (Ed.), *Spoken English, TESOL and applied Linguistics* (pp. 3–22). Palgrave Macmillan.

Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 483–496. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00314.x

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communication and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(1), 97–114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01172.x

Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *177*, 123–150. https://doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2006.008

McKenzie, R. M. (2008). Social factors and non-native attitudes towards varieties of spoken English: A Japanese case study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 63–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2008.00179.x

Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. In A. Pavlenko, & A. Backledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 290–315). Multilingual Matters.

Morán Panero, S. (2016). Orienting to the spread of English as a Lingua Franca: Voices from the Spanish-speaking world. Doctoral dissertation. University of Southhampton

Morán Panero, S. (2019). "It's more fashionable to speak it badly": indexicality and metaseiotic awareness among users of English from the Spanish-speaking world. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 8(2), 297–332. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2019-2021

Nahm, J. (2018). Weykukin yuhaksang 4syenkan 67% kupcung. ("Foreign students increase 67% in the past four years"). *Chungang news*. 2018. 10. 24 https://news.joins.com/article/23059047

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman/Pearson Education.

Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(3), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2603_3

Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Park, Y.-J. (2013). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 61, 145–167. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt006

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329–348. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587668

Pietikäinen, K. S. (2017). English as a Lingua Franca in intercultural relationships: Interaction, identity, and multilingual practices of ELF couples. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki

Pietikäinen, K. S. (2018). Silence that speaks: The local inferences of withholding a response in intercultural couples' conflicts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 129, 76–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.03.017

Promodou, L. (2003). In search of the successful user of English. *Modern English Teacher*, 12, 5–14.

Raymond, C. (2018). On the relevance and accountability of dialect: Conversation analysis and dialect contact. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 22(2), 161–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12277

Robinson, J. (2007). The role of numbers and statistics within conversation analysis. *Communication Methods and Measure*, 1(1), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312450709336663

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 50(2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786745

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes*, 23(3), 499–545. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638539709545001

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

Shenk, P. S. (2007). 'I'm Mexican, remember?' constructing ethnic identities via authenticating discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(2), 194–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00318.x

Sung, C. C. M. (2015). Exploring second language speakers' linguistic identities in ELF communication: A Hong Kong study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 309–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1347138

Sweeney, E., & Hua, Z. (2010). Accommodating toward your audience. Do native speakers of English know how to accommodate their communication strategies toward nonnative speakers of English? *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4), 477–504. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943610377308

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Sage publications.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243287001002002

Woolard, K. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolin-
guistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist*, *12*(4), 738–748. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1985.
12.4.02a00090

Appendix. Transcription symbols (adapted from Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Schegloff, 2007)

[ ]	overlap boundaries of talk
=	contiguous utterances
(0.2)	length of silence in tenths of seconds
(.)	micropause
./?/,	falling/rising/continuing intonation
::	sound stretch
-	cut-off or self-interruption
°..°	portions quieter than surrounding ta
WORD	increased amplitude or stress
> <	rushed speech
hh	hearable aspiration
.hh	hearable in-breath
(word)	transcriber's uncertainty on the utterance/to clarify the item
((word))	transcriber's commentary, description of events