

**“THE PRESIDENT IS OUT OF HIS MIND”**  
**MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIZATION ANALYSIS OF KOREAN**  
**MOTHERS’ ASSESSMENTS ON THE SOUTH KOREANA ENGLISH**  
**IMMERSION POLICY PROPOSAL**

**JOSEPHINE LEE**

*University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa*

**INTRODUCTION**

According to Crystal (2003), English is arguably the world’s first “global language,” a language that is used more commonly than any other language and one recognized with a powerful status in every country. English in South Korea of course is no exception. As a country where English is used as a foreign language, South Korea has become one of the largest consumers of English with the English education market being estimated at over 10 billion dollars a year (*Korea Times*, 2008, February 24), with approximately 15,000 youngsters sent for study abroad programs in 2007 to study English (*Korea Times*, 2008, June 18). This English fever of South Koreans has even led to claims in research that Korea is in transformation from a Korean monolingualism to an incipient Korean-English bilingualism (J. S. Lee, 2006). Such a claim is contestable, but it was close to being officially realized in South Korean president’s 2008 policy proposal, when he called for English immersion to be implemented in all public schools.

Although the plan was withdrawn after meeting with intense public opposition, it still persists with significant repercussions in Korea’s society. Not only have individual schools started to incorporate English immersion classes into their curriculum, but the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education announced last February that Seoul’s public elementary, middle and high school English classes will all be taught in English, starting in 2012. It is also true that the state government of Seoul has been supporting a \$30,000 research project since August 2008 on the efficacy of “Content and Language Integrated Learning” (*Korea Times*, 2008, August 24). These moves lead to the belief that it is not entirely impossible for the government to initiate a second attempt of recognizing English immersion classes for the

whole nation.

Given the continuing interests in English immersion, the present study attempts to investigate this social issue from a micro-perspective, focusing on how the actual consumers of Korea's English education are experiencing the effects of the policy proposal. This interview-based study will focus on bringing to life the perspectives of two Korean mothers, Junghee and Hyunjoo. Adopting a *discursive, ethnomethodological* approach, I will apply Membership Categorization Analysis to explore how two Korean mothers from different socioeconomic backgrounds use various categories and devices to construct a particular assessment of the English immersion policy proposal. By doing so, this paper intends to contribute to a deeper understanding on the possible effects of such a policy, and especially its *discriminating* effects on those mothers and children who are invested in an urban private school vis-à-vis mothers and children who belong to a small, rural public school of South Korea. The study will address the following research questions:

1. What categories do the mothers deploy to characterize or evaluate the English immersion policy proposal?
2. What categories do they assign for themselves or their own children in relation to "others" and the surrounding English education community?
3. What sense of social world is invoked and how do they accomplish it in their assessments of the policy proposal?

## THE POLICY PROPOSAL

On January 23, 2008, the presidential transition committee of South Korea unveiled their *English Education Roadmap*, a proposal to reform the current teaching system and drastically improve Koreans' English proficiency. This 4.25-billion-dollar project was to be completed in the next five years, primarily with the motive of increasing national competitiveness, reducing household spending on private education, and promoting educational equality in Korea's society. Originally, Chairwoman Lee Kyung Sook of the presidential transition committee had planned for English content courses to be implemented in public schools—in other words, to teach non-English subjects in English starting from 2010. After several English-immersion classes are piloted in several schools, the program

was meant to be first adopted in elite private and public high schools, and then gradually expanded nationwide. The committee claimed that they would start with math, science, and other subjects in which language differences will have less impact on student comprehension. Within five days of the initial proposal, however, the committee withdrew the plan for English immersion after critics severely challenged its feasibility, citing the massive budget requirement and lack of proficient teachers.

Faced with strong backlash from the public, the committee revised their plan and proposed that only English classes be taught in English. They also postponed the policy's actual implementation to start in 2012 or 2013. Under the plan, the hours allocated for English instruction in elementary schools were to be lengthened to three hours a week, which is an hour increase for 5-6 graders, and a two-hour increase for 3-4 graders. In addition, the committee also proposed to recruit and retrain 23,000 English-specialized teachers. The qualification for these teachers included both Koreans and foreigners who either have a TESOL certificate, have completed at least a masters degree at a English-speaking country, or possess a teaching license. To meet this sudden demand for high-quality teachers, the committee posed another solution: to possibly recruit mothers or university students proficient in English as assistant teachers in classrooms.

The policy developed over time and was becoming more and more specific with detailed structure. Nevertheless, unintended consequences continued to be produced from the evolving policy that further exacerbated public opposition. Following the announcement of the plan, there was a rush of students to private language schools to prepare for the new system. Students living in remote areas would temporarily move to the bigger cities to attend private English institutes for at least a month. Newspapers also constantly displayed disappointing survey results, which often countered the government's motives for pursuing the policy. For instance, in a poll conducted by *The Hankyoreh*, only 8% agreed that the new policy would reduce reliance on private education; meanwhile, 90% answered that private tutoring expenses will instead increase.

Other critiques of the policy centered on the impracticality of the policy. Media claims were that the current proficiency of both teachers and the students is too low for the successful implementation of English-medium classes. The government was presented as if they were forcing English education reform without necessarily considering the current

domestic situation. Another strong argument was that the policy would exacerbate the English Divide<sup>1</sup> (S. M. Lee, 2008). It was feared that the more emphasis was given to English in public schools, the more people would flock to private cram schools, and as a result, the gap between social classes would be further widened. Below are some newspaper headlines<sup>2</sup> that reflect these opinions:

1. 'To teach English even in Korean is difficult. Classes in English are too hard for students.' (*Hankyoreh*, 2008, January 28)
2. Teacher facilities not ready for 'English classes in English.' Pour in money and everything will magically be ready in just 2 years? (*Hankyoreh*, 2008, January 26)
3. Current teachers, 'Only students from economically powerful classes will receive benefits' (*Hankyoreh*, 2008, January 28)
4. Great division between upper and lower class students... Target of new government's English policy 'ambiguous' (*Hankyoreh*, 2008, February 24)

Confronted with these unstable reactions and public anxiety, the government decided to abandon the whole plan after all. Finally on March 20, 2008, President Lee Myung Bak announced that "English immersion education is something we should not carry out and we cannot," but is a matter for the distant future.

For an EFL country like Korea where English is rarely used in everyday lives to actually adopt English immersion into public instruction would be quite unusual and extreme. Even a slight briefing on the timeline of the policy proposal reveals the heated nature of the debate it involved, and eventually, the public was able to resist the policy until it was declared void. However, despite the controversial nature of this social issue that still persists on to the current day, no research has attempted to capture the perspectives of the population that would be most affected by the policy. Discussions have only been presented through media reports and have mostly been centered on the opinions of the *professionals*. The voices of the main stakeholders of English education – students, parents, and teachers – have been left relatively in silence. Therefore, in this study, I will focus on one of these groups – Korean mothers – to explore their detailed accounts of how they perceive the English immersion

---

<sup>1</sup> This term originates from *Digital Divide* to describe the strong relationship between economic wealth and English proficiency.

<sup>2</sup> These titles were translated from the original Korean versions.

policy proposal. In the next section, I will explain the theoretical grounds for taking an ethnomethodological approach and justify its potential contributions to the field of language policy research.

### **AN ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE RESEARCH OF LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING**

A growing field of research centers on issues of language policy and planning (LPP), “a field of inquiry with the social sciences and humanities” (Ricento, 2006, p. 10). While in earlier research, the main agenda was to present a general framework that describes and perhaps guides the process of national language planning (e.g., Fishman, 1979; Haugen, 1983), later approaches became more sensitive to the local socio-political dimensions of language policies, such as examining the policy’s historical roots (e.g., Kaiwar & Mazumdar, 2003), its macro socio-politico-economic power structure (e.g., Schmidt, 2000), its top-down imposition of ideology on the public (e.g., Pennycook, 2006), or even its geographic, spatial organizations (e.g., Breton, 1991). Another major strand of LPP scholarship, “neoclassical and critical approaches” (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), focuses on how language policy is exploited by the state to marginalize minority languages and perpetuate systems of social inequality (e.g., Ricento, 1998; Tollefson, 2002; Wiley, 2002). These critical and postmodern theoretical developments have infused new perspectives and conceptualizations into LPP research, but yet, there is still a need in literature for studies that illuminate the connections between microlevel interaction and macrolevel structures (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Ricento, 2000).

Addressing these criticisms, recent LPP work is gradually realizing the importance of incorporating “the distinct voices and acts of individuals in whose name policies are formulated” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 154). The more holistic, critical approaches to policy, as mentioned above, can reveal the overall macro-structures imposed from top-down, but it falls short in that it provides only part of the picture. The agency of the vast majority, the bottom-up demand to be part of the practice is undermined, and the coinciding or conflicting interests between the nation and the individuals are neglected (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). This claim is yet left to be examined, and there is still little research on how the users of

English in the local context are reacting to their regional ESL or EFL education policies.

According to Sutton and Levinson (2001), language planning involves complex processes in which top-down policies are constantly negotiated throughout institutional and individual levels of interaction. To account for the micro levels of policy interpretation and implementation, there is a need for more studies that bring in the realities of the local community at the grass-roots level: how do local people experience the consequences of the language policy? Canagarajah (2006), in this sense, advocates for the use of ethnography as a methodological approach that would reveal the “unconscious ‘lived culture’” (p. 153) of the community. Similarly, Davis (1999) as well as Hornberger and Johnson (2007) also argue that an ethnographic approach can provide a rich account of the insider’s perspective, interpretations, and perhaps resistance to a language policy.

Although such an approach offers valuable insights in its own right, it is limited to research language policies already *in implementation*, but not policies that *have not yet happened*. Ethnographic practices such as participant observations are not realizable in the investigation of the South Korean English immersion policy because it is only a proposal that has not been put into actual implementation. Other naturalistic, first-hand data-gathering methods that maintain an emic orientation to language practices, in this case, would be to conduct surveys, questionnaires, or interviews that ask how the community perceives as being the possible effects of the policy proposal. Out of the three methods, the current study selects interviews as its main data collection device because it most highlights the advantages of qualitative research in offering a deeper picture than the variable-based correlations of quantitative studies (Silverman, 2006). However, a problem still remains: How should these interviews be analyzed? One way would be to conduct a thematic analysis. As Marvasti (2004) points out, this method offers “convenience...in simplifying and reducing large amounts of data into organized segments” (p. 91), but these advantages are not without a cost. Because the analysis is based upon pre-designed categories, attention is deflected away from the participants’ deployment of categories within their interactions (Atkinson, 1992), which counters the emic interests of this paper. Therefore, in this study, I will attempt instead to utilize an original, unprecedented application of ethnomethodology as an initiative to tackle language policies from the *bottom-up*. Drawing on the early works of Harvey Sacks (1972; 1974), I argue that an ethnomethodological approach to interviews can

provide rich descriptions of how people interpret and engage within the processes of a language policy proposal.

There are three reasons for selecting this particular approach. First, ethnomethodology, developed by Garfinkel, views social context as “members’ phenomenon.” This perspective allows the researcher to reach a deeper analysis that goes beyond the conventional content or thematic extraction of interview data where the interviewee responses are seen as direct reflections of exterior realities. As “context is something provided for and oriented to by members” (Hester & Eglin, 2003, p. 93), careful attention is given to what is made relevant from the participants’ interests in the developing interview interaction. Second, a main interest of ethnomethodology is in the investigation of members’ sense-making accomplishments. In the words of Heritage (1984), ethnomethodology is concerned with “the body of common sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by means of which the ordinary members of society make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves” (p. 4). Such a focus is a perfect match with this present study in that it provides for a framework for speculating on how the interviewee accomplishes to make sense of the policy by means of invoking social worlds in which his or her categorial membership would exist in cohesion. Lastly, interview responses are viewed not as reports but rather as accounts (Baker, 2002). This conceptualization enables the researcher to gain access to how members arrange common sense knowledge, versions of social reality, and moral assumptions on how things should be (Silverman, 1993). In sum, the strictly *emic* interest of ethnomethodology provides a ground for rich analysis to bring forth the participant-oriented, participant-relevant perspectives of the policy discussions in hand.

## METHODOLOGY

The main analytical focus of this study is not to assign any categories *a priori* but to observe, by taking an *emic* approach that focuses on the participants’ perspectives on their involvement, which are accomplished within an “empirically observable conversational conduct” (Markee & Kasper, 2004, p. 495). The externally-presented background of the participant and her children will be strictly demonstrated by what they locally produce in

their interview accounts.

Apart from these larger framing considerations, the primary methodology used in this study draws from the field of Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). MCA was started by the sociologist Harvey Sacks in his methodological questionings of ethnographic approaches that center on *observational* practices. His stance on this issue is displayed in the following quote:

Suppose you're an anthropologist or sociologist standing somewhere. You see somebody do some action, and you see it to be some activity. How can you go about formulating who is it that did it, for the purposes of your report? Can you use at least what you might take to be the most conservative formulation – his name? Knowing, of course, that any category you choose would have [these] kinds of systematic problems: how would you go about selecting a given category from the set that would equally well characterize or identify that person at hand? (1992, pp. 467-468)

Because of the problems inherent in the descriptive processes of ethnographic observations, imposing researcher's categories on the participants, Sacks argues that social sciences should take an interest in how the *actual members* are able to produce descriptions of social events. MCA thereby draws attention to how members of a society generate various categories to describe people in their talk and make sense of particular events (Sacks, 1972; Silverman, 1998). According to Hester and Eglin (1997), these categories do not derive from pre-given, decontextualized cultural models that exist outside of the local interaction, but they are situationally occasioned as “indexical expressions and their sense is therefore locally and temporally contingent” (p. 22). The categories they use in talk-in-interaction evoke commonsense knowledge that members of a society have about the society and in terms that are in the *greatest relevance to their lives*. Therefore, emphasis is placed on how membership categories are assembled *in situ* as the participant's resource in reflection of the context and their agenda in the specific situation, in order to perform a certain social action meaningful to the occasion and to the task in hand. As Edwards (1991) specifies, “categories are designed for talking, for addressing differences of perspective, for arguing and persuading and blaming, and whatever other interactional functions are served by the construction of reality in talk” (p. 537). It is within this rhetorical process of category work that participants accomplish interactional activities such as accounting, justifying, accusing,

and so on.

Along this line, it is clear that MCA coincides with the interests of ethnomethodology: describing the methods members use in doing ordinary courses of action and social life. To examine the participant's membership categorization apparatus, Sacks proposed several concepts that make possible a formal analysis of the procedures involved in categorial ordering work. I will not go through an extensive explication of all of the concepts here (see Hester & Eglin, 1997; Schegloff, 2006; Silverman, 1998 for a comprehensive overview), except for a brief mentioning of two core notions that are widely applied throughout MCA literature in their abbreviated forms. One of those concepts is *membership categorization device* (MCD), such as *age*, *ethnicity*, and *gender*, by which categories can be linked to form larger classes or collections. That membership categories can be grouped into collections implies that in the local talk-in-interaction, some membership categories can be commonsensically heard as belonging together while others are not. Another concept that Sacks maintained is that categories are associated with *category bound activities* (CBAs). More specifically, these are activities that are expected to be done by members of a particular category. The category-boundedness of activities allows for negative moral assessments of people when those activities are absent, or if a member performs an activity inappropriate to their categorial identity.

In this study, I will employ these MCA notions to empirically show how through categorization work, that is, aligning and disassociating with membership categories, each interviewee manages a sense in similar or different ways of how they are viewing the English immersion policy. The categorial formulations, selections of operative MCDs, and their linkages to certain CBAs will illuminate the participants' ways of creating a referentially adequate assessment, constructing hearability, and evoking members' versions of social worlds. Attention will also be given to what discursive positions the mothers create for themselves and for their children as they assign *self* and *other* categories in the unfolding interview interaction. In addition to MCA, I analyzed the data with attention to indexical linguistic devices as follows: quantifiers, emphatic stress, phonological lengthening, pronominal systems, honorific morphology, and metaphors/images. Other than these indexical cues, the data was also scrutinized for the functional use of discursive devices such as lexical choice, person references (Stivers, 2007), and represented speech (Buttny, 2007).

The analysis of how these devices connect with membership categories as well as discursive acts allows this study to reveal the nature of policy assessment the participants endogenously construct in the interview.

### THIS STUDY<sup>3</sup>

#### *Data Collection*

The data presented in this study come from a larger set of eleven semi-structured interviews conducted in the period of June to August in 2008: seven with Korean mothers who send their children to a Christian private elementary school, and four with mothers whose children attend a rural public elementary school. The rationale for selecting these two sites was to recruit two groups of participants coming from distinct backgrounds in occupation, social class, educational background, and schooling environments.

To give a brief description of each of these sites, the Christian private school (CCS) is located in a big city in one of Korea's provinces, *Gyeonggi-do*. This school, which currently has around 1,000 students, is known for providing innovative contexts for learning, especially with their high focus on English classes. English is a mandatory subject for the students starting from first grade, and in recent years, the school has started to adopt English immersion classes for subjects such as art and music. The school is known for its high reputation in the community as well as its expensive tuition. The public school (CPS), on the other hand, is located in the same province, but in the deep countryside. Most of the residents in this area work in the fields as farmers. To get to the nearest city takes about an hour and a half drive. The school has approximately 55 students in total and is on the verge of closing down. The only English classes in this school are optional extra-curricular classes offered once a week, and teachers, mostly who have not majored in English education, take turns teaching these classes.

In this paper, the focus will be on only two participants: *Junghee* from the private school group and *Hyunjoo*<sup>4</sup> from the public school group. The data consist of audio-recordings and

---

<sup>3</sup> This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), University of Hawaii at Manoa (CHS#16177)

<sup>4</sup> All names are pseudonyms.

field notes on a two-hour (Junghee) and one-hour (Hyunjoo) long interview, respectively, as the participants responded to a repertoire of questions (see Appendix 1), primarily asked on how they are managing their child's English education under the influence of the English immersion policy proposal. After collecting the data, the recorded data were transcribed in three tiers following the Conversation Analysis (CA) and Korean transcription conventions (see Appendix 2).

### ***Participants***

Junghee is in her late-forties and has one daughter who is in sixth grade. Her daughter has been attending the private school (CCS) since she was in first grade, and she studied abroad in the Philippines for three months when she was in fourth grade in the year of 2006. Junghee majored in Korean literature when she was in college, and her husband is a law school graduate. Both Junghee and her husband are employed at a nearby university and their family income amounts to approximately 4,000,000 won ( $\approx$  \$3,300) per month.

Hyunjoo is in her early thirties, and she has three children that are attending fourth, third, and first grade of the same public school (CPS). Of her three children, she reports that only her first child has received one year of extra-curricular English instruction at her school so far. Both Hyunjoo and her husband were educated up to high school, and she currently works as a part-time office worker. She recorded in the background questionnaire (see Appendix 3) that their monthly family income is around 1,500,000 won ( $\approx$  \$1,250).

## **ANALYSIS**

In the interview account told here by two Korean mothers – *Junghee* and *Hyunjoo* – there exists a co-production of assessment on the English immersion policy proposal. The purpose of this section is to illustrate in the following excerpts how categories are selected and positioned, what category-bound activities, attributes and expectations are attached to these categories, and in what commonsense ways the categories are ordered to produce a kind of social world. An in-depth analysis of the category productions and other discursive resources employed in the interview will demonstrate how the interviewer and interviewee collaborate in constructing coherent versions of the policy assessments. And finally, of

interest is how, within the social configurations they created, the children of each mother are presumed to have *differential* experiences under the policy. First to be discussed are the four excerpts selected from Junghee's interview.

**Junghee: An Urban, Private School Mother**

Immediately prior to the first excerpt, the interviewer had proposed the topic of the policy. First, it was verified that the interviewee had heard about the policy proposal. Then given the interviewee's confirmation, follow-up questions were posed to establish a similar, mutual understanding about the policy between the interviewer and the interviewee. It is within this common ground of knowledge that the interviewer embarks on the first actual interview question: *kuke icye cheum-ey tulu-sye-ss-ul ttay ette-n nukkim-i tu-sye-ss-eyo?* ("How did you feel when you first heard of it?")

**Excerpt 1**

**"He is Out of His Mind"**

01 IR:	<i>ku cengcek-ul cheum tulu-sye-ss-ul ttay:</i> that policy-AC first hear-SH-PST-RL time
02	<i>ette-n nukkim-i tu-sye-ss-eyo?</i> what kind-RL feeling-NM have-SH-PST-POL <b>"How did you feel when you first heard about the policy?"</b>
03 JH:	<i>↑e↓wu:: ceycengsin-i ani-si-n ke-ci [hhh</i> uh sound mind-NM not-SH-RL thing-COMM <b>"↑o:: ↓h he is out of his mind hhh"</b>
04 IR:	[AHAHAHA °cengmal-yo°= really-POL <b>"°I see °"</b>
05 JH:	<i>=kulenikka cungang tanni-n ay-tul-hantey-nun coh-ci::</i> I mean CCS attend-RL child-PL-to-TP good-COMM <b>"I mean, it's good for the children who attend CCS"</b>
06 IR:	<i>ey ey</i> yes yes <b>"uh-huh"</b>

07	JH:	<i>kyayney-nun haksup yonge-tul-i toy-nikka::</i> they-TP academic vocabulary-PL-NM ok-because <b>"beca::use they are good with academic vocabulary"</b>
08	IR:	<i>ey</i> yes <b>"I see"</b>
09	JH:	<i>kuntey kuleh̃ci anhu-n</i> but like that not-RL
010		<i>hyeytayk-ul mos pat-nu-n ey-tul-un</i> benefit-PL cannot receive-IN-RL child-PL-TP <b>"but to those that are not like that, to those children who cannot receive such benefits"</b>
011	IR:	<i>mm</i>
012	JH:	<i>=cukula-nu-n ke-ci::</i> should die-IN-RL thing-COMM <b>"it's saying that they should die"</b>
013	IR:	<i>mm</i>

In Excerpt 1, the sequence is initiated with the interviewer's inquiry on what might have been Junghee's initial reactions towards the policy proposal (lines 1-2). Junghee's reply is produced in two parts: first in terms of setting off her negative stance, and second in terms of accounting for her assessment through the production of different categories of children. She starts out with a turn-initial emotive token  $\uparrow e\downarrow wu::$  in line 3, of which the intonation and final vowel stretch are produced in an exaggerated manner. Through the use of prosodic emphasis, the token is hearable as a frustrated grunt or a deep sigh, indexing an intense state of emotion that registers a "troublesome" event. In other words, the emotion-laden  $\uparrow e\downarrow wu::$ , instantiates an interpretative frame for the listener to expect that a negative remark involving a strong affective stance is forthcoming.

It is after this outbreak of an animated grunt, in fact, that Junghee produces the first part of her reply. In response to the interviewer's question about the "policy," she pulls off a negative evaluation of the "president" saying *ceycengsin-i ani-sin ke-ci* ("he is out of his mind"). She does so without any mitigation but as evidenced in the use of sentence-terminal suffix *-ci*, with high assurance and certainty (H. S. Lee, 1999). The pronoun "he" is not mentioned in the Korean version nor is its antecedent, but it is inferable from the context of talking about the policy that she is referring to the president who made the proposal. Another cue that warrants this interpretation is her use of the honorific particle *-si-*. The insertion of this predicate suffix implies that the referent is a social superior, and in this case, it is the

president. In this sense, the combined use of the honorific form *-si-* and the demeaning description “out of his mind” is in contradiction, thereby displaying the speaker’s ironic stance. The recognizability of this sarcasm is achieved by both interlocutors through the outburst of joint laughter (lines 3-4) and confirmed through the interviewer’s acknowledgment token *cengmal-yo* (“I see”).

Several observations can be made about this devaluating comment. First, Junghee uses a single membership category “president” in response to the interviewer’s request for an assessment of the policy. The category “president” here is not a simple person-reference that links to a singular individual, but it is a categorial term used to do “actions other than referring” (Schegloff, 2007): to perform an assessment. As an iconic member of the larger collection “policymakers,” an evaluation of the president is not restricted only to the president himself, but it is hearable as an evaluation of the whole collection, and possibly extending to their collective product – the policy. Therefore, it is not just the president that is “crazy.” The policy itself is also constructed as an “insane” practice. A second observation to be made is in relation with the discursive function of the *ceycengsin-i ani-* (“out of his mind”) utterance. A category-bound expectation of a president would be to make “sane,” judicious decisions for the country. However, to attribute “craziness” to a president is a “deviation-categorization” (Deppermann, 2005), suggesting that he is involved with a violation of an expectation or a norm of the category ‘president.’ The sarcastic nuance of this formulation and the joint laughter of both participants provide for an upshot of the local action of accusing the president, which in combination, work to display Junghee’s disfavoring stance towards the policy proposal.

Having announced a “deviation-categorization,” Junghee engages in further accountability work in the second part of her response, and she does so through the invocation of two contrastive categories: “children that attend CCS” and “children that are not like that, that cannot receive benefits.” She starts with *kulenikka* (“I mean”) in line 5, which projects a forthcoming explication or possible elaboration of what was previously said. Following this discourse marker, she then evokes the first category, *cungang tanni-n ey tul* (“children that attend CCS”). Here, this category is heard as belonging to the collection, “children affected by the policy,” and this group of children, described with respect to ‘MCD-school type,’ is affiliated with an assessment token *coh-ci* (“good”). The predicate

suffix *-ci* used here has an epistemic function in that it indicates the speaker's strong conviction to the proposition (H.S. Lee, 1999). As Jayyusi (1984) argues, although "there are a host of features that, as clusters, can be oriented to and conventionally expected to go together with some categories, ... [w]hat is situatedly provided for or invoked as being category-bound" (p. 35) for the incumbents of the 'school type-CCS' category, is that the new policy will be "good" for them, and this claim, by use of suffix *-ci*, is presented as if it were a robust fact.

In line 7, Junghee further accounts for why the new policy might be good for the 'school type-CCS' category of children, and she does so by evoking another category-bound feature of this group: *haksup yonge-ka toy-* ("good with academic vocabulary"). The category-bound competence *haksup yonge* here is a specific lexical selection in that it is different from saying *mwunpup* ("grammar") or *senghwalyenge* ("conversational English"). *Haksup yonge* here not only indexes an advanced level of English, but it also alludes to a "specific type" of English competence that intertextualizes with the abilities the new policy expects for all students to acquire as they learn non-English subjects in English. Therefore, by saying that the 'school type-CCS' category is already competent with the required abilities of the policy characterizes the group as being ahead in the race, and this description suffices to justify her previous assertion that the policy will be good for these children.

The second category of children is called on across two steps of formulations, *kulehci anhu-n, hyetayk-ul mos pat-nu-n ey-tul* ("children that are not like that, children who cannot receive benefits") in line 9 and 10. Applying Sack's (1974) "hearer's maxim" with respect to the "consistency rule" and "duplicative organization," this category is heard as belonging to the same collection as the previous category – "children affected by the policy" – but lying in a contrastive relationship to the first. One evidence of the category contrast is occasioned by use of the discourse marker *kuntey* ("but") in line 9 and topicalizers *-un* (lines 5, 7, 10). Also, of the two categorial formulations, the first formulation (*kulehci anhu-n*) makes possible the inference that the second category consists of members that are exceptions of the previous group. Whether the negation is directed to the 'school-type CCS' membership or to the category-bound attribute "competence in academic vocabulary" is left ambiguous until a self-repair in line 10 operates to specify the properties of this counteractive category. The reformulation (*hyetayk-ul mos pat-nu-n ey-tul*) here acts to re-categorize the same

members not according to 'MCD-school type,' but by application of the device 'opportunities.' As a result, members of 'school-type CCS' are hearable as having duplicative incumbency in the "children with benefits" category, while those of 'school-type non-CCS' are categorized as "children without benefits." The indexical force of such re-categorization serves to foreground the asymmetry between the two categories. The first category is privileged. Not only do they have the resources for attending CCS – a highly rural, costly private school – but they also get to enjoy a set of benefits CCS endows for them, such as having competencies in academic English and being happy under the new policy. The second category, on the other hand, lacks of both CCS membership and educational benefits. The disprivileged nature of the second category is further accentuated in the word *mos* ("cannot"). In comparison with an alternative negation marker *an* ("do not"), this lexical choice portrays the members of this category as having limited resources or capabilities. Not receiving educational benefits was not a result of their own agency. They just had no other choice.

The contrasting descriptions of the two categories, therefore, are presented as warrants for the clarification and justification of the initial deviation-categorization, "out of his mind" (line 3). The relevance of the president's "craziness" further meets its upshot in line 12, as Junghee ties CBA *cuku-la* ("saying you should die") to the second category, the indexical force of which confirms that the policy is one of a deadly threat. Here, the category-bound expectations of 'president' are occasioned once again in the course of interpreting this utterance. For an incumbent of the category 'president' to tell children "to die" is not only morally accountable, but it is also aptly categorized as being "crazy." Such activity is inappropriate to his social identity (Silverman, 1998), and thus, suffices as a warrant for establishing a negative moral assessment.

In this extract, Junghee calls on a highly dichotomized version of categories to accomplish a negative assessment of the English immersion policy. Under the larger collection of "children affected by the policy," she draws upon two categories that lie in an asymmetrical relationship with 'school-type' and 'opportunities' as its main MCD's. The categories "children that attend CCS" and "children that cannot receive benefits" do not always index the same meaning, but in this interview context, the orderliness of the categories and their predicates, "their 'going together,' is achieved and is found in the local

specifics of categorization” (Hester & Eglin, 1997, p. 46) of assembling an accusing version of the policy. The policy is good for one group of children, while it is “killing” another. The social world she describes is highly segregated; abilities and privileges are divided according to the membership of the children. This theme continues on in the next extract but becomes more complicated as she evokes a lengthy list of categories of children.

**Excerpt 2**

**“Because We Live in the Era of Globalization”**

016	YM:	<i>akka yayki hay-ss-te-n tay-lo (.)</i> previously talk do-PST-RL way-as
017		<i>kule-n (.) ilehkey (0.4)</i> like that-RL like this
018		<i>chensengcek-ulo talanthu-ka cwue-ci-n:: ay-tul-i iss-ko</i> inborn-DR talent-NM give-PAS-RL child-PL-NM exist-and
019		<i>hwuchencek-ulo powan-i toy-n ay-tul-i iss-ko</i> acquired-DR back up-NM become-RL child-PL-NM exist-and
020		<i>↑kuleh-ci anu-n ay-tul manh-ke[tun=</i> like that-NOM not-RL child-PL a lot-DC <b>“as I have said previously (.) there (.) are (0.4) children that have inborn talents, and there are children that have been backed up as they grew up, there are a lot of children who are not like ↑that”</b>
021	IR:	[mm
022	YM:	<i>motel hay-ya-toy-l ay-tul-i iss-ko::</i> model do-should-become-RL child-PL-NM exist-and
023		<i>kunyang ilyongcik-ulo sala-ya toy-l ay-tul-to iss-nuntey</i> just part time job-DR live-should must-PRS child-PL-even exist-but

024	<i>ku::ti ku-- kule-n insayng-ul</i> insist like that-RL life-AC
025	<i>wuli-ka kyulceng-ci-ul pilyo-nun eps-ciman (.)</i> we-NM decide do-AC need-TP no-but <b>“there are children that should become models, and there are even children that should just live on part time jobs. I mean, we have no right to determine their lives, but (.)”</b>
026 IR:	<i>m: :</i>
027 YM:	<i>shh: nay-ka kong<sub>1</sub>pu-lul mos-hay-se</i> I-NM study-AC cannot-do-so
028	<i>molly-ese ka-l pilyo-nun</i> group together-INF go-PRS need-TP
029	<i>eps-ta-n sayngkak-i tul-ketu:n</i> no-DC-RL thought-NM set in-DC <b>“I think that there is no need to go along with the crowd because I am not good at <u>studying</u>”</b>
030 IR:	<i>mm</i>
031 YM:	<i>kulemyen kyoyuk-ul wuli-ka kullopel sitayi-ki ttaymuney</i> then education-AC we-NM global era-be-because due to
032	<i>kulehkey ha-l pilyo-nu-n eps-ta-nu-n sayngkak-i tul-ketun</i> like that do-RL need-IN-RL no-DC-IN-RL thought-NM set in-DC <b>“because we are in the era of globalization, education should not be like that”</b>
033 IR:	<i>mm</i>

In this excerpt, Junghee primarily draws on two rhetorical resources to organize the activity of accounting for her negative stance towards the policy: the first resource is a list of contrastive membership categories and their category-bound activities, and second is a temporal formulation – “era of globalization.” First, she initiates her turn by making reference to prior talk and after slight perturbations in her production, as displayed in the micropauses and fillers (lines 16-17), she constructs a list of categories that define what types of children are out there. The MCD that is in operation of distinguishing the first two categories (lines 18-19) is ‘type of ability,’ whether the ability is *chensengcek* (“innate”) or *hwuchencek* (“acquired”). The contrastive nature of these two categories is not only evident in their semantic relationship but it is also made visible as they are listed in parallel sentence structures – the trait formulated with a directional particle *-ulo*, a relativized modifier before *ay-tul* (“children”), and *iss-ko* (“exist-and”) in final position; they are set off as a contrastive pair.

However, as the third category is introduced in line 20, *kuleh-ci anu-n ay-tul* (“children who are not like that”), the negation particle *an-* in the categorial term implies that a new, larger contrast is set off in action. Although semantically contrastive, the previous two

categories do not rely on these “ready-made conceptual resources...[but are deployed] flexibly and inventively” (Edwards, 1997, p. 237) to be heard as belonging to the same “unit” under the duplicatively organized collection “children with abilities” (Sacks, 1972). The third category, on the other hand, is hearable as consisting of those in exception – “children without abilities.” This observation is evidenced in the verbal modifiers of the two categories, where the actions are formulated in their completed stage: *talanthu-ka cwue-ci-n* (“have been given talents”) in line 18 and *powan-i toy-n* (“have been backed up”) in line 19. These children, whether their abilities are given innately or not, are all set. They are characterized as “capable” students. By operation of ‘MCD-ability,’ the third category is qualitatively different in this sense, as it contains those children that have neither innate nor acquired abilities. But because this group is claimed to be *manh*- (“a lot”) in number (line 20), the quantitative size of the category makes appeal to the listener that this group of children deserves attention.

In lines 22-23, Junghee proceeds to locate sub-categories that serve to exemplify what members are representative of the third category. Resorting to ‘MCD-future jobs,’ she calls on the categories of *motel hay-y-toy-l ay-tul* (“children that should be models”) and *ilyoncik-ulo sala-ya toy-l ay-tul* (“children that should live on part-time jobs”). Appeal to some cultural background knowledge is necessary here to grasp the discursive import of these categories. In the Korean society, models and part-time jobs are prototypical of “physical work,” and the category-bound attribute of their members are typically associated with being “under-educated.” By effect of the culturally-specific category resonances (Schegloff, 2007) of “models” and “part-time workers,” what Junghee was referring to as “abilities” in the prior talk is more specified as “academic” abilities. Members of the previous two categories, whether innately given or acquired later, are competent in this area. The third category, on the other hand, is in lack of this trait but pursues alternative career paths that utilize their physical capabilities. Now the contrast is set off between “children with academic abilities” and “children without academic abilities.”

Because Junghee had embedded the descriptions of the sub-categories in strong imperatives (e.g., “*should* become models”) she makes a conversational move in lines 24-25 to mitigate the deterministic force of her prior utterances by producing a meta-comment, “we don’t have the right to determine their lives.” Her sudden shift from the personal to a

collective *wuri* (“we”) also seems to be making use of the pronoun to avoid claiming full responsibility (Lepper, 2000) of what is in risk of being interpreted as an ignorant, discriminating remark: “children without academic abilities” cannot select “educated” jobs, but they are “determined” to take on other “un-educated” jobs.

After this slight digressional insertion, Junghee soon returns to produce her main opinion on the matter that there is no need for children of the third category to “go along with the crowd” (lines 27-29). The first observation to be made in this strip of talk is the sudden shift of footing in line 27. The pronoun *nay* (“I”) here does not refer to herself, but she is animating the voice of a third category member. Through the footing shift, she displays an intensified affective stance of empathizing with the referent as well as her proposition. Second, in line 28, *molly-ese* (“go along with the crowd”) is hearable as being category-bound of a “thoughtless individual,” or “one without direction.” The indexical import of such works to characterize the action of “just studying because everybody else does” as an irrational activity, especially against the backdrop of “the era of globalization” (line 31). Several problems arise when interpreting this particular utterance. What shared inferences of globalization Junghee is orienting to are mutually understood by the interviewer, but the descriptive details are not explicated in this excerpt. To better understand the relevancies of globalization and its relation to the task of accounting for her evaluative stance, therefore, it is necessary at this point to draw on a segment that was taken from an earlier sequence of the interview. The following excerpt, in which Junghee talks about the change in social treatments of “academically-incompetent students,” reveals the situational meaning of globalization from the “perspective of an actor actively operating on the world within which he or she finds him- or herself embedded” (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992, p. 5)

**Excerpt 3**

**“You Can Just Be a Model”**

01	JH:	<i>yocum saho-y-ka tawenhwa toy-se manhi kamsa-ha-ci::</i>
		nowadays society-NM pluralistic become-so a lot thank-do-APP
02		<i>wuli ttay-nun ccwukccwuk ppet-ko</i>
		our time-TP long stretch-and
03		<i>ccwukccwuk ppangppang hay-to</i>
		long with volume be-even
04		<i>najwungey motel ha-myen toy-nu-n ken-tey, (.)</i>
		later model do-if ok-IN-RL thing-but
05		<i>wuli ttay-nun emcheng maca-ss-ketun</i>
		our time-TP enormously get hit-PST-DC
06		<i>°kongpu mos-han-ta-ko°</i>
		study cannot-do-DC-QT
		<b>“I’m <u>very</u> thankful that the society has become pluralistic nowadays. In our times, even though you would be one with long legs, tall and with volume -- you can just be a model (.) -- but in our times, you would get hit a lot because °you are not good at studying °”</b>

The time contrast is significant in this segment as Junghee talks about the different treatment of students that are “not good at studying.” The contrast of temporal categories is seen in co-selection with the category sets of “models” and “academically-poor students.” In line 1, she foregrounds *yocum* (“nowadays”) as the first time frame and asserts with an emphatically stressed intensifier *manhi* (“a lot”) that she greatly appreciates the current societal change towards becoming *tawenhwa* (“pluralistic”). In this society, those that are not good at studying but have the physical traits of long legs, tall height, and body volume are potential candidates for membership in the “model” category (line 4). But as she shifts to the time frame of *wuri ttay* (“in our times”) in line 2, the same individuals are cast into a negatively formulated category, “students that are not good at studying” (line 6) and their category-bound attribute is receiving institutional punishment, “getting hit a lot” (line 5) by teachers at school. Of interest in this extract is how depending on the operation of the “pluralistic” time frame, identical members are casted into different categories: a category of future possibilities or a category of inabilities.

In connection with this previous talk, Junghee’s argument in Excerpt 2 makes more sense. What she was referring to by “globalization” is not about international matters, but concerns the internal change in Korean society of being more aware and appreciative of diversity. In constructing the argument, she makes use of and displays forms of membership

categorization that are tied with this discourse. Under the “globalization” and “pluralism” frame, acknowledgement of diversity is presented as a normative trend, and studying is no longer an obligatory category-bound expectation for members of the third category. In this context, that the English immersion policy expects all students, including children of the third category, to acquire “academic” English skills generates accountability, as it is an action that diverges from the current reality of acknowledging non-academic potentials.

So far, the social world described by Junghee consists of a collection of children with distinct abilities, possibilities, and expectations. The categories listed in contrast structures serves as an argumentative account for her evaluative stance, and the production of these categorizations exhibits a terrain of what comes to be seen as common rationality or social order by the participants (Baker, 2002; Hester & Eglin, 1997) in relation to the context surrounding the policy. Based on what Junghee has constructed as the local rationality of membership categories, their associated descriptions, and commonsense knowledge of societal trends, the current social configuration is represented as one that acknowledges non-academic possibilities of children, and that the policy fails do so is held accountable. It is this deviance from expectations of a “global” or “pluralistic society” that forms the basis of Junghee’s assessment. Up to this point, the social world she evokes does not involve individuals, but groups of children or categories. In the next excerpt, however, the interviewer posits a question that frames Junghee’s responses to focus on a specific individual: her own daughter.

#### Excerpt 4

***“Oh Well, There’s a Word I Don’t Know”***

051 IR:	<i>ku cengchek-i cengmal sihayng-i toyn-ta-ko han-ta-mye::n</i> that policy-NM really implement-NM become-DC-QT say-DC-if <b>“i:f the policy really becomes implemented”</b>
052 YM:	<i>m</i> yes <b>“uh huh”</b>
053 IR:	<i>Sulki-nun ette-l kes kathu-sey-yo?</i> Sulki-TP how-PRS thing like-SH-POL <b>“how do you think Sulki will be like?”</b>
054 YM:	<i>Sul<sup>↑</sup>ki-nun mwe hayngpok-ha-ci</i> Sulki -TP what happy-do-APP <b>“well, Sulki will be happy”</b>

055	IR:	e:: Ye::s "I see"
056	YM:	<i>ciku:m kule-n nunglyek-i ta kwupi tway issu-nikka</i> now like that-RL ability-NM all equip become be-because "because right now, she is all equipped with that kind of ability"
057	IR:	=>ey ey ey< yes yes yes ">uh-huh<"
058	YM:	<i>haksup yonge-latunci kule-n ccok-ulo cinhayng-i toy-to</i> study vocabulary like like that-RL direction-DR progress-NM become-even
059		<i>sutuleysu an pat-key (.)</i> stress not receive-so that
060		<i>cikum keki kwuco-ka::</i> now there structure-NM "even if classes start to use academic vocabulary or things in that direction, the structure is made so that the students will not be stressed (.)"
061	IR:	=>ey ey ey< yes yes yes "uh-huh"
062	YM:	<i>kukey e_ly-e-ssu-l ttay pwute kyeyso</i> that thing young-INF-PST-PRS time from continue to
063		<i>ku haksup yonge-lul ss-e wa-ss-ki ttaymey (.)</i> that study English-AC use-INF come-PST due to
064		<i>kuke-l mwe (.) kwahak swuep-ul yenge-lo han-ta-ko</i> that-PRS what science class-AC English-DR do-DC-
065		<i>sutuleysu an patul kes kath-a</i> stress not receive-PRS thing like-INT
066		>↑eyi molu-nu-n tane nawa-ss-ney< oh well don't know-IN-RL vocabulary come-PST-INT
067		<i>ilehkey ha-l kes kath-a</i> like this say-PRS thing like-INT "I mean, she has continuously used academic English vocabulary since she was young (.) Because of that, I think she will not become stressed just because science class is conducted in English. I think she will just say '>↑oh well, there's a word I don't know<'"

In this extract, the interviewer proposes a hypothetical situation of "what it will be like for your own child if the policy is implemented." To this question, Junghee produces a list of attributes that are hearable as being category-bound of a "successful student." Junghee's immediate response involves a strong assertion saying that her child, *Sulki*, will be *hayngpok* ("happy") in line 54. The Korean term *hayngpok* here, actually, is more than just "happy." There is no equivalent English translation for this word but it can be said to be close to the meaning of "blissful." In other words, Junghee is characterizing her child as one that is blessed, fortunate, and one that has nothing else to wish for. The indexical force of this word

is even accentuated as it is preceded by the token *mwe* and followed by the predicate suffix *-ci*. As the *mwe* token is often used when one talks about the obvious, and the *-ci* suffix is set to mark the speaker's strong conviction (H. S. Lee, 1999), that her child will be *hayngpok* under the policy is discursively constructed as an indubitable fact. This first line of Junghee's response, projected with such assertive power, is what frames the ensuing interview interaction: accounting for "why" her child might feel so pleased, fortunate, and blessed.

The first account is given in line 56. Packed within a *-nikka* clause, Junghee provides an empirical justification for her previous proposition by saying that her child is "all equipped with that kind of ability." Attention can be directed here to her use of an extreme case formulation *ta* ("all") (Edwards, 2000; Pomerantz, 1986). Although there is no way for the interviewer to know whether her child literally has "all" the abilities, such formulation invites a hearing to recognize her child as being competent and fully ready for the possible challenges that the policy might bring. In addition, the specific time formulation *cikum* ("right now") also functions to highlight the current English proficiency of her child. The policy is to be in the future, but her child already has "all" the abilities "right now." In this context, it is justifiable that Junghee attributes an attribute of *sutuleysu an pat* ("not receive stress") to her child in line 59, even if she is placed under the hypothetical scenario of classes being instructed in "academic vocabulary or things in that direction" (line 58). What is intriguing about her formulation in line 58 is that she attaches *-latunci kule-n ccok-ulo* ("or things in that direction"). By making her claim more open-ended, she is hearable as performing an upgrade of her child's potential capabilities. The stress-free nature of her child is not limited to only class environments that require knowledge on academic vocabulary, but is applicable to "any kind" of English instruction that is in that direction.

In addition to the current ability of her child, the second account for her child's happiness is attributed to the *kwuco* ("structure") of the school in line 60, thereby making relevant her child's membership of being a CCS student. This claim is elaborated as she foregrounds, in line 62, the activity of her child "having continuously used academic vocabulary since she was young." Here, Junghee recycles the previous category descriptions she made in Excerpt 1 – children that attend CCS are competent in academic vocabulary – and adds on further information as to the duration and manner of what could be a category-bound activity of CCS students: having started to use academic vocabulary since an "early age" (*ely-e-ssu-l*

*ttay pwute*), and having used it “continuously” (*kyeysok*). The insertion of the time formulation and the adverbial detail serves to enhance the privileged nature of this category of children. While the policy might be imposing devastating measures for “other” children, students of CCS have already been engaging in those types of academic English instruction for a long time.

Up to this point, membership in CCS and their category-bound activity are oriented to by Junghee not only to account for her child’s advanced level of English but also for the stress-free attribute of her child. That her child will not receive stress under the policy is re-stated in line 65, but this time, she manages to pull off this assumption in line 64 through a hypothetical scenario of her child being placed in a specific kind of English immersion class – a science class conducted in English. Worthy of attention is the use of *mwe* in front of *kwahak swuep* (“science class”). The *mwe* token here works to discursively construct science class in English as an easy practice for her child. Another way Junghee portrays such instruction as undemanding for her child is through a quoted performance of her child in line 66. The animated token  $\uparrow eyi$  does similar work as *mwe* (line 64) in that it initially frames the represented speech to be heard as coming from someone that is engaging with a trivial task. Predicting how her child might react to unknown words she encounters in class, Junghee performs the quote “oh well, there’s a word I don’t know,” which sets the impression that new vocabulary is likely to be brushed off, and her child will just move on as if it was not a big deal. Such a performance acts to characterize her child as being familiar with the practice of English immersion classes, and thus, unlikely to receive stress. The policy will not impose new expectations to her child. All she has to do is continue on what she has been doing until now.

### ***Hyunjoo: A “Rural, Public School” Mother***

The following four excerpts are selected from the interview with Hyunjoo. Her response is seen in convergence with Junghee’s in that she embarks with a negative comment, which is then followed by a social scene of “unequal” categories. The analysis will illustrate how her argument also takes on an extensive discursive terrain by means of evoking a set of categorization devices.

**Excerpt 5**

**“When I Hear That Story, My Heart Hurts Very Much”**

01	IR:	<i>kuke icyey cheum-ey tulu-sye-ss-ul ttay</i> that now first-at hear-SH-PST-RL time
02		<i>ette-n nukkim-i tu-sye-ss-eyo?</i> what-RL feeling-NM have-SH-PST-POL <b>“How did you feel when you first about it?”</b>
03	HJ:	<i>ce-nun cheum-ey ttak tul-ess-ul ttay-yo,</i> I(H)-TP first-at just hear-PST-PRS time-POL
04		<i>ike-nun wuyel-- wuyelpan (.) wutungsayngpan</i> this-TP good-bad class smart student class
05		<i>kali-nu-n kes-kwa ttokath-ta-[lako]</i> divide-IN-RL thing with same-DC-QT <b>“Just when I first heard (about the policy), it’s the same as splitting students into good and bad classes according to their test scores (.) sorting out smart students into the same class”</b>
06	IR:	<i>[e::=</i> <i>ye::s</i> <b>“uh-huh”</b>
07	HJ:	<i>=ce-nun sayngkak-i tul-ess-eyo</i> I(H)-TP thought-NM set in-PST-POL <b>“I had such a thought”</b>
08	IR:	<i>e ney::</i> <i>oh ye::ah</i> <b>“I see”</b>
09	HJ:	<i>waenyahamyen, (.) ai-tul-i cengmal cheum-pwute</i> because child-PL-NM really start-from
010		<i>yenge-lul tut-ko cala-n ai-tul-i ani-n isang-un,</i> English-AC listen-and grow up-RL child-PL-NM not-RL unless-TP <b>“because, (.) unless they are children (.) children who grew up listening to English since the beginning”</b>
011	IR:	<i>ney ney</i> yes yes <b>“um-hm”</b>
012	HJ:	<i>oncenhi yenge swuep-ul han-ta-ha-myun-un, (.)</i> entirely English class-AC do-DC-say-if-TP
013		<i>cengmal kuke alatut-nu-n myech myeng ai-tul-man,</i> really that understand-IN-RL few person child-PL-only
014		<i>kongpwu-lul halsu iss-nu-n ke-ko</i> study-AC do-able to become-IN-RL thing-and
015		<i>nameci-tul-un cengmal (.) PANGchi-ka toy-nu-n ke-canha-yo</i> the rest-PL-TP really neglect-NM become-IN-RL thing-you see-POL <b>“If classes are <u>entirely</u> in English, (.) only those children that can understand will be able to <u>study</u>, and the rest will really (.) be left in <u>neglect</u>, you know”</b>
016	IR:	<i>ney ney</i> yes yes <b>“uh-huh”</b>

017 HJ:	<i>ce-nun ku yayki-lul tulu-myense</i> I(H)-TP that story-AC listen-while
018	<i>ne:::mu maum-i ap[unke-eyyo</i> very heart-AC hurt-POL <b>“When I hear that story, my heart hurts very much”</b>
019 IR:	<i>[e::</i> <i>a:h</i> <b>“I see”</b>

Hyunjoo initially responds to the interviewer’s question by foregrounding a very specific time – just precisely when she first heard the story (line 3). After she narrows down the temporal context, she produces through a self-repair a proposition that equalizes the current English immersion policy with the educational practices of *wuyelpan* and *wutungsayngpan* (line 4). Her response is then readily aligned by the interviewer through an overlap *e::* (“uh-huh”) in line 6 and an acknowledgement token *e ney::* (“I see”) provided in line 8. That neither Hyunjoo defines what these educational practices are nor does the interviewer ask for clarification makes relevant that both interlocutors are orienting to the information as shared knowledge, thus projecting co-membership in this context.

Although *wuyelpan* and *wutungsayngpan* is made self-explicative by both parties, they deserve some explanation here for the sake of the upcoming analysis, in order to understand the talk that follows. What these practices are can be easily understood if one deciphers the literal meaning of each terminology. The term *wuyelpan* is a combination of three Chinese characters: *wu* (優), which means ‘excelling’ or ‘superior’; *yel* (劣), meaning ‘inferior’ or ‘lagging behind’; and *pan* (班), which means ‘class.’ In other words, *wuyelpan* refers to the system of sorting out students into either the ‘superior’ class or the ‘inferior’ class, and the cutting line between the two groups is usually based on their test scores. *Wutungsayngpan*, which literally means ‘class for outstanding students,’ is another way of framing the same practice. What is important to note here is that these two practices contextualize with them negative connotations – as it might have been already inferable from the literal definitions – because they are often associated with the idea of privileging the “have’s” over the “have-not’s” (Lee, 1998), and as evil agents of sustaining educational inequality. Two things are made relevant from the invocation of these terms. First, Hyunjoo is mobilizing shared knowledge to create a preface for her account. On the premise that both interactants are

aware of *wuyelpan*'s negative contextual associations, such assertion indexes her disfavoring stance towards the policy. Second, inherent in these terms is a dichotomized version of viewing students that belong to the collection of "children affected by the policy": there are the "excelling" students and the "lagging behind" students. Within the word *wuyelpan*, a "contrast pair" (Francis & Hart, 1997) is set up with operation of the device 'achievement status,' thereby implicating a prospective category contrast to be elaborated and expanded upon through further categorization and predicate work in the ensuing talk.

Unsurprisingly, as Hyunjoo attempts to elaborate on her earlier description of equalizing the English immersion policy *wuyelpan* or *wutunsayngpan* as coordinated categories in the device "bad educational policies," her account becomes replete with different categories of students. In line 9, she produces a transition word *waenyahamyen* ("because), and after a slight pause, she evokes a generalized social scene involving the first student category, *cheum-pwute yenge-lul tut-ko cala-n ai-tul* ("children who grew up listening to English since the beginning"). Then in line 12, she recycles the hypothetical scenario previously posited in the interviewer's question ("if classes are entirely in English"), which is followed by another category, *kuke alatut-nu-n myech myeng ai-tul* ("the few children that can understand it [classes entirely in English]"). The "hearer's rule," and more specifically the "consistency rule," (Sacks, 1972) provides an understanding of these two categories as co-categorizations of the same collection, "excelling students," that was initially set up in the preface of Junghee's response. In the categorial formulations of the two categories, the predicated activities or attributes of the collection "excelling students" is unpacked in terms of "how" their abilities were acquired (i.e., early English education) and "what" particular competencies they possess (i.e., understanding classes taught entirely in English).

Other than being embedded within the descriptions of the category terms, to "be able to study" in English-medium classes is introduced in line 14 as a category-bound feature of the collection. This expected ability is discursively constructed by use of the delimiter particles - *isang* ("unless") in line 10 and -*man* ("only") in line 13, as an attribute that is restricted to this particular group of children. Furthermore, especially intriguing is in line 9, her use of the temporal formulation *cheum-pute* ("since the beginning"). Instead of saying "since kindergarten" "since preschool" or "since 3 years old," the expression makes an extreme stretch in the time frame – "the beginning" – which is possibly a "motivational" predicate

description (Wowk, 1984) that acts to set the particular group of children as being an “exceptional” case. The modifier *myech* (“few”) can also be viewed in a similar light. By proposing the narrow scale of this category, Hyunjoo constructs these children, who have studied English from an early age and can function well in English-medium classes, as a rare minority out of Korea’s student population.

In contrast to this “exceptional” group, a counteractive category is produced in line 15, which Hyunjoo calls on as the *nameci-tul* (“the rest”). The generation of this disjunctive pair is foregrounded by the topical marker *-un* (Kim, 1993) and the indexical force of the lexical choice “rest” is hearable to be characterizing this group as the larger majority. Hearing this category in relation to and contrastive with the previous categories, “the rest” is inferable as making reference to the other side of the *wuyelpan* category bifurcation – “lagging-behind students.” Immediately following the category production, the word *PANGchi* (“neglect”) is used to describe this group, and through the use of the sentence final particle *-canha*, it is asserted as a fact that is non-challengeably shared by the listener (Kawanishi, 1994; Kim & Suh, 2004). As this category-bound attribute lies in definite contrast with the other academically well-functioning group of students, to place children in “neglect” is not only a strong claim that could be held as a publically accountable action (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2009), but it also portrays the situation as being unfair.

The lexical passive verb *toy-* works even further to strip the agency off the children, possibly exerting a function to position them as mere victims, who were placed into neglect not voluntarily, but regardless of their will. The passivity of this term also implies that there is a hidden agent behind this action, and operated by the local conversational business of “evaluating the policy,” the representatives and decision-makers of the policy proposal are implicitly brought into account. By ascribing the predicate “neglect” to these public figures, Hyunjoo achieves an accusing “version” (Cuff, 1993) of the policy proposal. The activity of deserting a certain group of children is a “breach” (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2009) of the normative CBAs or moral obligations that the category “policymakers” hold, which becomes a resource for characterizing the government policy and action in an unfavorable manner (Housley, 2002). The amplification and emphatic stress placed on the word *PANGchi* suggests the intensified state of Hyunjoo’s emotion to the extent that she expressively stages in line 17, that the perceived situation makes her “heart hurts very much.”

An observation of this part of the interview interaction reveals how Hyunjoo designs her response to accomplish a negative assessment of the English immersion policy. The period of receiving English education becomes the main dividing line through which the categories are framed and narrated. The asymmetrical categories she evokes also resonate with the rather negative evaluative imports of *wuyelpan* as well as its inherent categorial package of “excelling” and “lagging behind” students. By effect, Hyunjoo is able to pull off a social world with inequality in educational opportunities or experiences in English that students have before coming to school (Lin, 2001), and the policy is seen as a potential agent of sustaining the structure. Through the technologies of appropriating shared knowledge, categorizations, and emotional states, Hyunjoo skillfully establishes an interpretative frame to express her disfavoring stance towards the English immersion policy: it will lay discriminating and “heart-breaking” results.

In the next excerpt, the interviewer asks another question that elicits further opinions about the policy. If in the first segment was framed as more of a general account, this time Hyunjoo brings forth a more personalized approach as she talks about the immediate consequences the policy might have on her own child.

Excerpt 6

*“How Much Stress Would They Get”*

070	IR:	<i>manyak-ey cengmal-lo:: motu-n hakyoyey</i>
		if-at really-for all-RL school-at
071		<i>kukey sihayng-i toyn-ta hanta-mye::n</i>
		that implement-NM become-DC say-DC-if
072		<i>icey emenim-uy ai-tul-un ette-l kes kathu-sey-yo?</i>
		now mother-HT-GN child-PL-TP how-PRS thing like-SH-POL
		<b>“if in reality, that becomes implemented into all schools, how do you think your children will be like?”</b>

073	HJ:	<i>manhi himtul-keyss-cyo ce kathu-n kyengwu-to:</i> a lot hard-will be-APP I(H) like-RL case-too
074		<i>ce-ka cikum pelsse kule-n sayngkak-ul ce-y ipcang-eyse</i> I(H)-NOM now already like that-RL thought-AC I-GN position-from “It’ll be hard. Even in my ca:se already thinking of those things from my side”
075	IR:	<i>ney</i> yes “yes”
076	HJ:	<i>sayngkak-ul han-ta-myen ce-to nemu himtulthey-nikka-yo</i> think-AC do-DC-if I(H)-too very hard-will be-circumstance-POL
077		<i>mwullon (.) mwullon himtul-keyss-cyo</i> of course of course hard-will be-APP
078		<i>kuliko sikan-i cina-myen</i> and time-NM pass-if
079		<i>ai-tul-i il i-nyen an-ey cekung-ul ha-keyss-cyo</i> child-PL-NM one two-year within-at adjust-AC do-will be-APP “if I think of those it’ll be very hard for me, too. Of course (.) of course it’ll be hard. And if time passes, in about a year or two, the children would adjust”
080	IR:	<i>ey ey ey</i> yes yes yes “yes yes yes”
081	HJ:	<i>haciman ku il i-nyen an-ey cekungham-ey iss-ese</i> but that one two-year within-at adjust-at exist-at
082		<i>i ai-tul-i ku tongan twichye-ci-n ke-nun</i> this child-PL-NM that during lag behind-PAS-RL thing-TP
083		<i>ttalaka-l su-ka eps-eyo</i> keep up-PRS able to-NM not-POL “ <b>But</b> as they are adjusting, what they have already been lagging behind in those one or two years, they cannot <b>keep up</b> with that.”
084	IR:	<i>mm</i> mm “um-hm”
085	HJ:	<i>kuliko i ai-tul-i il i-nyen tongan</i> and this child-PL-NM one two-year during-at
086		<i>elmana manhi sutuleysu-lul pat-keyss-eyo</i> how much a lot stress-AC receive-will-POL “ <b>And during those one or two years, how much stress would they get</b> ”
087	IR:	<i>m ku-chyo</i> hm right-APP “hm right”

In Excerpt 6, the interviewer posits the hypothetical scenario once again by upgrading it into an extreme case – if the policy really becomes implemented into “all schools” (line 70). Then in line 72 the interview question is pursued in a way that it calls for the relevancy of *eme-nim-uy ai-tul* (“mother’s [your] children”). Here, the interviewer uses the personal

reference term *eme-nim* (“mother”) to refer to Hyunjoo, and by doing so, turns on the “standardized relational pair” (Sacks, 1972) of “mother” and “child.” Hyunjoo is positioned by the question to talk from the categorial incumbency of being a mother on how her own children might experience the policy on the premise that it becomes the reality. Also, the interviewer’s question is framed in way that it implicates for Hyunjoo to cast her children into a category.

The consequentiality of this question is made evident as in line 73, her immediate response remarks that “it will be hard.” She continues to explain in line 76, that it will not only be hard for her children, but also for herself: *ce-to nemu himtultey-nikka-yo* (“it will also be very hard for me, too”). The standardized relational pair is made relevant here and it is appropriated to highlight the negative impacts of the policy: it will have tough consequences for “both” the mother and the children. One observation to be made about the sequence of this response is that “it will be difficult” is proposed three times from line 70 to 76, and they are highly loaded with affective stances. The first production of *himitul-keyss-cyo* (“will be difficult”) in line 73 is preceded by an emphatic intensifier *manhi* (“a lot”), and the adverbial *pelsse* (“already”) in line 74 works together to display a reinforced state of her worries. The modal marker *-keyss-* in line 73 is also significant in that it is used as an “affect key” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989; Suh & Kim, 1993), which indexes sympathy to the speaker or the situation. In line 76, the second production of *himitultey-nikka-yo* (“will be difficult”) is again coupled with the use of an intensifier *nemu* (“very”), and the grammatical particle *-nikka-* is also used in a similar function as *-keyss-* to mark the speaker’s intensified affect (S-O Sohn, 1993). Lastly, the third production *himitul-keyss-cyo* (“will be difficult”) in line 77 is when Hyunjoo’s affective stance reaches its climax. Here, the emotional intensity is upgraded through the word of *mullon* (“of course”), which by effect, normalizes her and her children’s perceived hardships as the “obvious.” The encasing of this word in repetition, with a slight pause in between, further works to place emphasis on this proposition.

After this sequence of affectively-loaded utterances, Hyunjoo moves on to elaborate on what she thinks are the expected difficulties for her children. She starts out by setting a future time frame in line 78 (“if time goes by”) and suggests “1 or 2 years” as a period of “adjustment” for her children. The lexicon choice *cekung* (“adjust”) implies that the policy, if implemented, will involve a change of schooling situations for her children, and she views

that at the end, they will have worked to fit in. However, in line 81, she projects a counteractive stance of what she had just said before, signaled by a contrastive discourse marker *haciman* (“but”) and topical marker *-nun* (line 82). She proposes that as her children try to adjust, they would still be lagging behind, and from such a process, they will be negatively affected by the experience of “stress” (lines 82-86).

Several observations can be made in this particular account. First, the words *twichyeci-n* (“lag behind”) in line 82 and *ttalaka-l* (“catch up”) in line 83 metaphorically indexes a image of a “race,” and one in which her children are left behind no matter what. Other than that her children are positioned as being behind in the race, what this statement further implies is that there are also a group of students that will always be ahead, who can be inferable as referring to the category Hyunjoo evoked in Excerpt 5: the “children who received early English education.” Furthermore, this proposition is cased in the simple present tense (line 83), thus presented as if it were an undisputable fact. Another category-bound attribute Hyunjoo attaches to her children is that they will receive a lot of stress (line 86). She formulates this description in a rhetorical question signaled by *elmana* (“how”), and combined with use of the affective modal marker *-keyss-*, she once again sets up an affective frame that explicitly enacts to elicit sympathy from the listener. Her attempt is endorsed in the interviewer’s following turn by a receipt marker *m ku-cyo* (“yeah, right”).

In Excerpt 6, Hyunjoo has laid out a detailed account that characterizes the English immersion policy as an action that will impose difficulties for her children. Under the influence of the policy in action, the particulars she produces in this sequence – “will be hard, lag behind, cannot catch up, receive stress” – are features she sees as being associative with her children. These attributes, as a result, are informative in terms of recognizing the categorization of her children (Sacks, 1992). The features she attaches to them are hearable as being category-bound to “the rest” or the “lagging behind” class of *wuyelpan* from Excerpt 5, who she described as students placed in “neglect.” In this context, why her orientation to invoking sympathy was the most pervasive mark of the interactional sequence in Excerpt 6 is made understandable. Her children are also bound to be “neglected” under the English immersion policy, and to talk about it, obviously involves an intense affective stance. Such emotional intensity persists into the subsequent interaction, and in fact, it is even heightened as it is framed within a quoted performance of her child.

Excerpt 7

“What am I? And What are They?”

088 HJ:	<i>na-nun na-nun mwe-ya (.) cyayney-nun mwe-ko (.)</i> I(H)-TP I(H)-TP what-Q they-TP what-and
089	<i>na-nun an toy-nuntey? &gt;ile-ta po-myen tto&lt;</i> I(H)-TP not can-IN circumstance like this-while do-if and
090	<i>na-y hyengpyen-un mwe-n-tey?</i> I-GN financial situation-TP what-IN circumstance
091	<i>na-y pwumo-nun mwe-n-tey?</i> I-GN parent-TP what-IN circumstance <b>“ ‘I-What am I? (.) And what are they? (.) Why can’t I do it?’ &gt;While thinking like this, it will also lead to&lt; ‘What about my financial situation? What are parents doing?’ ”</b>
092 IR:	<i>m : :</i> hm <b>“hm”</b>
093 HJ:	<i>na-y cwupyen-un mwe-ya?</i> I-GN surrounding-TP what-Q
094	<i>way wuli emma-nun yeki-se sa-nu-n ke-ya?</i> why our mom-TP here-at live-IN-RL thing-Q <b>“ ‘What about my surrounding? Why is my mom living here?’ ”</b>
095 IR:	<i>m</i> um <b>“um”</b>
096 HJ:	<i>tosi-lo naka-se sal-ci?</i> city-DR go out-at live-NOM <b>“ ‘why not live out in the city?’ ”</b>
097 IR:	<i>mm</i> hm <b>“hm”</b>

Excerpt 7 was produced in immediate connection with the previous segment. What is apparent from the very first line is the sudden shift of footing. In the form of represented speech (Buttny, 2007), Hyunjoon starts to animate a quoted performance of her child. The change of footing is made evident by the register shift. Prior to this excerpt, her sentences ended with the polite sentence final particle *-yo*, but here, these particles are absent but replaced with intimate-level final particles like *-ya* (e.g., lines 88, 93, 94) or non-polite suffixes like *-tey* (e.g., lines 89, 91). The non-polite pronoun *na* (e.g., lines 88, 89, 90, 91) is also indicative that she is not speaking in the interviewer-interviewee frame, but is voicing a different interactive situation. Also, particularly interesting is the sudden appearance of the nouns *na-y pwumo* (“my parents”) in line 91 and *wuli emma* (“our mom”) in line 94. Clearly, these referring terms are what Stivers (2007) terms as “alternative recognitionals.” The

marked use of the reference form *wuli emma* is selected from the perspective of her children, which indexes a form of speech, wherein they are talking to an imagined audience. Here, the main business of concern is not referring, but performing a more personal and emotional association with the topic in hand.

Whether this audience is their friends, their teacher, their parents, or even themselves is left unclear, but it is in this context of fictional dialogue that Hyunjoo manages to deliver a more personalized and affectively-loaded portrayal on the difficulties the English immersion policy might cause for her children. In line 88, a category contrast is made between *na* (“I”) and *cyayney* (“them”), and it is performed through a fictional scene where her children are asking a somewhat philosophical, rhetorical question: “What am I? And what are they?” It is to be noticed here that through the use of “pro-terms” (Watson, 1987), the division between different sets of categorial membership is made relevant. Hyunjoo evokes the dichotomized categories of “children who received early English education” and “the rest,” in which her child, through pronoun *na*, is identified with the latter group. The pronoun *cyayney*, on the other hand, distances her child from having incumbency with the “excelling students.” They are constructed as the “other.”

The questioning dialogue continues on for the rest of the segment, which performs a similar function of what Edwards (2005) calls the “speaker-indexical nature of complaints” or casting blame. Within this rhetorical device, Hyunjoo brings up one by one what she believes are the ultimate factors that lead to her children being placed into the category of “the rest.” In line 89, the inability of her children to well-function in English classes is mentioned first. This, she posits as a leading cause of them to blame their *hyengpyen* (“financial situation”) in line 90, *pwumo* (“parents”) in line 91, and *cwupyen* (“surrounding”) in line 93. All these words can be heard as different ways of formulating the underprivileged nature of her socioeconomic class. Furthermore, as she attributes her child’s presumed difficulties to her social background of having little income, her inadequacy in social capital, and her residence in an isolated region, the lexical means involved in her account implicitly calls on the “other” category, counteractively constructing the “excelling students” as having incumbency in a more privileged class than her and her children.

In lines 94 and 96, *cwupyen* consequentially leads to a locational contrast between *yeki* (“here”) and *tosi* (the city”), where the city is constructed as the better place to live. These

location categories are more than geographical terms in that they are formulated to accomplish a rhetorical purpose (Lepper, 2000; Schegloff, 1972). First, the indexical properties of *yeki* establishes recognizability of what category Hyunjoo's child shares membership with, while *tosi* is referred to as the "other," or more specifically, as the "better other." Second, as the application of the dichotomized categories are extended from personal memberships to locational categorizations, the asymmetrical division between "excelling students" and "the rest" are discursively reinforced in her account.

In this extract, Hyunjoo brings to life her children as characters of her represented speech. She animates what might be their inner-struggles resulting from the policy, and the performance becomes a resource for the casting of her children into the category of "the rest." By means of invoking her membership in a low socioeconomic class, her limited social or cultural capital as a parent, and her residency in a distant residential location as possible causes of her children's inability in English-medium classes, they are thereby ascribed with a relatively disprivileged position in comparison with "them" or those children that live in "the city." Highlighting the inequality of available resources between her children and "the others," Hyunjoo achieves here, through the double-voicing of her children, to assemble a "blaming" or "complaining" assessment towards the English immersion policy.

Of interest in the last excerpt is how Hyunjoo pulls off an account of making some suggestions to the policy-makers. In line 52, future possibilities of the policy implementation is foregrounded once again. While in previous excerpts, this hypothesis was talked about through the nominalization of "the policy," in this segment, a member of the category of policy makers, *taythonglyeng* ("president") is called on as the major agent. The policy, in this sense, is framed as "his plan" (line 54).

**Excerpt 8**

**“The President is Not Serving the Nations People”**

052	HJ:	<i>ce-nun manyak-ey cengmal taythonglyeng-kkeyse</i> I(H)-TP if-at really president-NM(H) <b>“I think if the president really”</b>
053	IR:	<i>m</i> <i>um</i> <b>“um”</b>
054	HJ:	<i>aphulo kule-n:: (.) kyeyhoyk-i iss-usi-ta-myen,</i> in the future like that-RL plan-NM have-SH-DC-if
055		<i>&gt;cengmal cikum-pwuthe kulemyen&lt; wenemin kyosa-lu:l</i> really now-from then native speaker teacher-AC
056		<i>&gt;cengmal&lt; hakkyo-ka sosu-ilcilato</i> really school-NM small number-even though
057		<i>kulentey-pwute munhwacek hwaltong-ul</i> that place-from cultural activity-AC
058		<i>&gt;kulenikka&lt; ha-ci mos-ha-nu-n kos pwuthe ce-nun</i> so do-NOM cannot-do-IN-RL place from I(H)-TP
059		<i>ciwen-ul hay-cweya han-ta-ko sayngkak-i tul-eyo</i> support-AC do-must do-DC-QT thought-NM set in-POL
060		<i>kulay kulayya-ciman motu-n kes-i ta</i> then by that-only then every-RL thing-NM all
061		<i>kongthong-i toy-l su iss-nu-n kesi-ci,</i> same-NM become-PRS able to be-IN-RL thing-be-NOM
062		<i>tosi-eyse-man hwalpalha-key</i> city-at-only active-AD
063		<i>motu-n kes-i ta kongthong-ulo toye iss-ko,</i> every-RL thing-NM all same-DR have-INF be-and
064		<i>tosi-na talu-n kos-eyse-nu-n oytteleci-key</i> city-or other-RL place-at-IN-RL alone-AD
065		<i>kuke-nun taythonglyeng-i cengma::l motu-n kukmin-ul</i> that-TP president-NM really all-RL citizen-AC
066		<i>sayngkakha-ko semki-nu-n key ani-lako</i> think-and serve-IN-RL thing not-QT
067		<i>sayngkak-i tulketun-yo</i> thought-NM set in-POL <b>“in the future, has that plan, &gt;the::n (.) really from now&lt; even though the schools are small in number, I think there, &gt;I mean&lt; places where they can’t do cultural activities, should be provided with native speaking teachers. Only then will everything be <u>the same</u>. If only the city <u>actively</u> has everything as the same, and the other places are left in <u>isolation</u>, the president</b>

Then in lines 55-59, she proposes a suggestion for the president to provide *wenemin kyosa* (“native speaking teachers”) with two priorities in mind. First, she puts forward a time zone *cikum-pwuthe* (“from now”), characterizing the action to take place as an imminent need. Then the second priority is location. The local reference term *kulente-pwute* (“from that place”) in line 57 is reformulated through the discourse connective *kulenikka* (line 58) to

a more specific space: “places that cannot do cultural activities.” *Munhwacek hwal tong* (“cultural activity”), in this sense, should be understood as not an ethnically or nationally traditional activity, but as common modern activities like going to the movies, watching a theater performance, karaokeing, cheering a sports game, and so on. Therefore, what Hyunjoo is indexing by “places that cannot do cultural activities” are those sites like the countryside that lack these cultural facilities. Schools in these places are mentioned as being *sosu* (“a small number”) in line 56, and the impracticality of providing support to these schools can be heard to be slightly touched upon by use of the concessive suffix *-ilcilate* (H-M Sohn, 1999). Regardless of the number of these schools, however, Hyunjoo states this action as a “must” (line 59), and the countryside is a prioritized location to be on top of the president’s list.

Starting from line 60, Hyunjoo continues to elaborate on her account for setting forward such a proposition. The main argument is made in lines 60-61 that when support is given to rural schools, everything becomes *kongthong* (“the same”). Coupled with the use of the delimiter suffix *-ciman* (line 60), this condition of governmental assistance is accentuated as “the” solution to establishing equality. What she perceives as an unequal situation, on the other hand, is described in lines 62-63, and in this context, locational membership categorizations of “the city” and “other than the city” become relevant. In lines 62-63, *tosi* (“the city”) is attributed with the description that everything is made *kongtong* (“the same”) there. But the delimiter suffix *-man* (line 62) highlights that this feature is restricted only to the city. In contrast, *tosi-na talu-n kos* (“other than the city”) in line 63 is ascribed with *oyttele-cikey* (“be isolated”), which interestingly, resonates with the previously constructed image for the children category “the rest” as being in “neglect.”

Hyunjoo further argues in lines 65-66 that if the president supports for the unequal nature across these locational categories, he is not serving the people of Korea. Here, she can be seen as describing her stance in the device of evoking moral obligations of the category “president.” In particular, especially since the word *semki-nu-n* intertextually alludes to his 2007 presidential campaign slogan – *kukmin-ul semki-nu-n taythonglyeng-i toy-keyss-upnita* (“I will be a president that serves the nation’s people”), she is making relevant a specific role conception related to this president. Hyunjoo appeals to this obligational role as a criterion of justice, and her critique results from what is invariably associated with her perceptions of a

normative social order: to make everything “equal.” To go against this moral standard and promote an action that sustains inequality between the city and the rest is an accusable action of incumbents of the category “president.” Framing the act into a moral issue, Hyunjoo is able to skillfully accomplish an assertion that rural schools should be a top priority for more educational support from the government, which should be realized in the English immersion policy.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have examined how two Korean mothers, through categorization work and specific narrative strategies, discursively produce their stances towards the English immersion policy proposal. The analysis of this study reveals that there are both commonalities and differences found between their interview responses. To start out by summarizing their similarities, both participants project a disfavoring stance towards the policy, and they set forward accusing remarks to the president for “not serving the people” and making “insane” decisions. In doing so, they recognize that different categories of children have different abilities. Hyunjoo focuses on the stratified English proficiency to frame the policy as a discriminating practice, while Junghee adds on an additional dimension to the argument. Junghee encases the ‘ability’ categories in the larger device of “globalization” as a way of casting her negative evaluation. Acknowledgement of “non-academic abilities” is the normative social trend, but that the policy fails to address the diversity of children abilities is held accountable.

Another striking similarity that appears in their accounts is their pervasive use of categories that serve as explications and confirmations of the stereotypical image of inequality in education. Under the influences of the policy, they both see a dichotomized division in the students – “well-functioning students” and “students in neglect” or “students that will be stressed” – and they attribute the separation to the unequal educational opportunities of early English instruction. In addition, also constructed was the differential nature between the “the city and the isolated rest” as well as “CCS and non-CCS students.” These particulars have the power of evoking a social world in which activities and privileges are clearly divided according to social and locational membership. For both participants,

inequality is an achievement and a resource for creating interactional coherence and projecting their negative assessment towards the policy proposal.

Having constructed a world of educational inequity, the interviewees were asked to characterize their own children on how they might experience the policy, and this is when the two mothers drastically diverge in their responses. Hyunjoo, first of all, positions her children as possible victims of the policy, and through the interactional resources of represented speech and affectively-loaded utterances, she presents it as an unfair, heartbreaking, and sympathy-eliciting situation. Just as Baek (2000) as well as Lee and Cha (1996) state in their studies, her reasonings include the fact that the students in big cities can afford better English language education than those in rural areas and that the discrepancy is highly correlated with the socioeconomic status of their parents. These claims, in fact, are made immediately visible in Junghee's interview as she presents her awareness of the policy's negative impact on a certain group of children, but calls on her own child as an exception. Her child is constructed as a beneficiary of CCS, one that has been continuously engaged with early English education, one that is already equipped with the necessary English skills, and one that is thereby "happy," "stress-free," and "easily-engaging" with the new policy.

A comparison of these diverging responses evidently feeds back to the "social world of educational inequity" that the participants created in the interviews. As in the words of Tollefson (2000):

for those who already speak English, the economic value of the language translates directly into greater opportunities in education, business, and employment. For those who must learn English, however, particularly those who do not have access to high-quality English language education, the spread of English presents a formidable obstacle to education, employment, and other activities requiring English proficiency (p. 9).

That inequality in English education opportunities is an overriding theme throughout their interview accounts and that it consists of the main reason for disfavoring the English immersion policy have crucial messages for those involved in national education administration, curriculum development, and language policy planning. Because this study relies on the participants' *perceptions* elicited through interviews, I cannot claim any correlations between the new policy and its role in the reproduction of social stratification.

However, that the participants present it as if it is an unchallengeable fact does intimate the possibilities the implementation of English immersion in public schools might have in promoting educational disintegration among students from different socioeconomic backgrounds (Dronkers, 1993). This study, therefore, sheds light on how the social issue of English Divide is realized in talks or evaluations of the policy proposal, and it sets up the necessity for further studies to discover concrete evidence in “grounded-local realities” (Ramanathan, 2005) on how the South Korean English education policies are embedded within and are part of political power structures that “legitimize serious social stratifications and ways in which institutions and humans take note of inequalities” (p. 90).

Interview accounts from two participants, of course, may be inadequate for policy decisions to be based on, and it is not the purpose of this study to make any generalizations. However, the value of this study lies in the fact that it does not under-represent the participant’s voice into numbers or edited segments taken out of context, but it allows us to see in fuller discourse, the interviewee’s business of applying categories and relevancies that are most important for interpreting the policy in connection with her and her children’s life. As a result, a deeper understanding can be reached about the concerns of these particular participants that are interactionally situated in these interviews as a mother whose children are attending school in a remote countryside and a mother whose child goes to a private school. The present study provides one piece of the puzzle, and it is anticipated that a collection of similar studies, each focusing on different educational contexts and participant backgrounds, will bring forth a rich ground for bottom-up concerns to be voiced into policy decisions.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, P. (1992). The ethnography of medical setting: reading, writing and rhetoric. *Qualitative Health Research*, 2(4), 451-474.
- Baek, C. (2000). *A study of regional differences in elementary school English education*. Unpublished master's thesis, Sunshil University, Seoul, Korea.
- Baker, C. D. (2002). Ethnomethodological analyses of interviews. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.) *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 777-795). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Breton, R.-L. (1991). *Geolinguistics: Language dynamics and ethnolinguistic geography*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- Buttny, R., & Cohen, J.R. (2007). Drawing on the words of others at public hearings: Zoning, Wal-Mart, and the threat to the aquifer. *Language in Society*, 36(5), 735-756.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 153-169). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Cuff, E. C. (1993). *Problems of versions in everyday situations*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis/University Press of America.
- Davies, K. A. (1999). Dynamics of indigenous language maintenance. In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 67-97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deppermann, A. (2005). Conversational interpretation of lexical items and conversational contrasting. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction* (pp. 289-317). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dronkers, J. (1993). The causes of growth of English education in the Netherlands: Class or internationalization? *European Journal of Education*, 28(3), 295-307.
- Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (Eds.) (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Edwards, D. (1991). Categories are for talking: On the cognitive and discursive bases of categorization. *Theory & Psychology*, 1(4), 515-542.
- Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and cognition*. London: Sage.

- Edwards, D. (2005). Moaning, whinging and laughing: The subjective side of complaints. *Discourse Studies* 7(1), 5-29.
- Fishman, J. S. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English World-Wide*, 1(1), 11-24.
- Francis, D., & Hart, C. (1997). Narrative intelligibility and membership categorization in a television commercial. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 1-24). Lanham: International Institute for Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis/University Press of America.
- Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997). Membership categorization analysis: An introduction. In S. Hester & P. Eglin (Eds.), *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis* (pp. 1-24). Lanham: International Institute for Ethnomethodology & Conversation Analysis/University Press of America.
- Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (2003). *The Montreal massacre: A story of membership categorization analysis*. Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Housley, W. (2002). Moral discrepancy and "fudging the issue" in a radio news interview. *Sociology*, 36(1), 5-23.
- Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2009). Membership categorization, culture and norms in action. *Discourse & Society*, 20(3), 345-362.
- Jayyusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. London: Routledge.
- Kaiwar, V., & Mazumdar, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Antinomies of modernity: Essays on race, Orient, and nation*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Kasper, G., & Markee, N. (2004). Classroom talks: An Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 491-500.
- Kawanishi, Y. (1994). An analysis of non-challengeable modals: Korean -canha(yo) and Japanese

- janai. In N. Akatsuka (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics v.4* (pp. 95-112).
- Kim, K-H. (1993). Topicality in Korean conversation: A conversation analytic perspective. In P. M. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics v.2* (pp. 33-54).
- Kim, K-H., & Suh, K-H. (2004). An analysis of Korean sentence-ending suffixes in caregiver-child interaction. *Language Research*, 40(4), 923-950.
- Korea Times. (2008, February 24). Private language schools hail new English education scheme. *Korea Times*. Retrieved March 22, 2008, from <http://www.koreantimes.com>.
- Korea Times. (2008, June 18). Overseas Elementary Students Double. *Korea Times*. Retrieved August 15, 2008, from <http://www.koreantimes.com>.
- Korea Times. (2008, August 24). Seoul starts English immersion study. *Korea Times*. Retrieved November 14, 2009, from <http://www.koreantimes.com>.
- Lee, H. S. (1999). A discourse-pragmatic analysis of the committal -ci in Korean: A synthetic approach to the form-meaning relation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 243-275.
- Lee, J. S. (2006). Linguistic constructions of modernity: English mixing in Korean television commercials. *Language in Society*, 35, 59-91.
- Lee, S. M. (2008, January 30). Ingkulisi dipaitu [English Divide]. *Chosun Ilbo*. Retrieved March 22 from [http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html\\_dir/2008/01/300/2008013001572.html](http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2008/01/300/2008013001572.html).
- Lee, Y., & Cha, Y. (1996). The effects of English learning environments on the English communicative competence of primary school students. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 12, 277-295.
- Lepper, G. (2000). *Categories in text and talk: A practical introduction to categorization analysis*. London: Sage.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2001). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 271-286). London: Routledge.
- Marvasti, A. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology*. London: Sage.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 90-115). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimatizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9, 219-229.

- Ramanathan, V. (2005). Rethinking language planning and policy from the ground up: Refashioning institutional realities and human lives. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 6(2), 89-101.
- Ricento, T. (1998). Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities. In T. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *National language policy in the United States*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ricento, T. (2006). Theoretical perspectives in language policy: An overview. In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 3-23). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427.
- Sacks, H. (1972). On the analyzability of stories by children. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 325-45). New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sacks, H. (1974). On the analyzability of stories by children. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology* (pp. 216-232). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, Vols. 1-2. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462-482.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 433-461.
- Schmidt, R., Sr. (2000). *Language policy and identity in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (1998). *Harvey Sacks: Social science and conversation analysis*. New York: Oxford University.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). London: Sage.
- Stivers, T. (2007). Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives* (pp. 73-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

- Sohn, H-M. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Sohn, S-O. S. (1993). Cognition, affect, and topicality of the causal particle -nikka in Korean. In P. M. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics v.2* (pp. 82-97).
- Suh, K-H., & Kim, K-H. (1993). The Korean modal marker keys as a marker of affect: An interactional perspective. In P. M. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics v.2* (pp. 98-114).
- Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 7-22). Clevedon: Cromwell.
- Tollefson, J. W. (Ed.). (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Watson, D. R. (1987). Interdisciplinary considerations in the analysis of pro-terms. In G. Button & M. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wiley, T. G. (2002). Assessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 39-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wowk, M. T. (1984). Blame allocation, sex and gender in a murder interrogation. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 7, 75-82.

## APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. 현재 자녀가 어떻게 영어를 배우고 있나요?  
(“How is your child currently learning English?”)
2. 자녀가 영어에 대해 어떻게 생각하나요? 좋아하나요, 싫어하나요?  
(“How does your child think about English? Does he/she like learning English?”)
3. 주위의 다른 어머니들께서는 어떻게 자녀의 영어교육을 하고 계신가요?  
(“What do hear of how other mother’s are teaching their children English?”)
4. 그런 얘기들을 들을 때, 어머니께서 하고 계신 영어교육에 대해 어떤 생각이 드시나요?  
(“What do you come to think about the English education you are doing when you hear about other mothers?”)
5. 자녀의 영어교육을 함에 있어서 어떠한 어려움들이 있나요?  
(“What concerns to you have about your child’s English education?”)
6. 자녀의 영어교육을 위해 어떤 도움이 있었으면 하시나요?  
(“What kind of help would you like to have in assistance of your child’s English education?”)
7. 이명박 대통령의 영어몰입교육에 대해 들어보셨나요? 처음에 그 소식을 들으셨을 때, 어떤 생각이 드셨나요?  
(“Have you heard of Lee Myung Bak’s English immersion policy proposal? What did you think when you first heard the news?”)
8. 영어몰입교육 정책이 실제로 시행이 된다 한다면, 어머니의 자녀는 어떨 것 같으신가요?  
(“If the English immersion policy becomes implemented, how do you think your children will be like?”)

9. 어머니께서는 영어를 배우신 경험이 있으신가요? 있으시다면, 그 경험이 자녀의 영어교육에 영향을 미치나요? 어떤 영향을 미치나요?

(“How have you learned English? Does your own experience have an influence on managing your child’s English education? If so, how?”)

10. 자녀에게 왜 영어를 가르치시나요?

(“What is the reason you are teaching your child English?”)

## APPENDIX 2: INTERLINER GLOSS

AC	Accusative particle	NOM	Nominalizer suffix
AD	Adverbial suffix; adverbializer	PAS	Passive suffix
APP	Apperceptive sentence-type suffix	PL	Plural suffix or particle
DC	Declarative sentence-type suffix	POL	Polite speech level, suffix, or particle
DR	Directional particle	PRS	Prospective modal suffix
H	honorific word	PST	Past tense and perfect aspect suffix
HT	Honorific title	Q	Question marker
IM	Imperative sentence-type suffix	QT	Quotative particle
IN	Indicative mood suffix	RL	Relativizer (or adnominal modifier)
INF	Infinitive suffix	RT	Retrospective mood suffix
INT	Intimate speech level or suffix	SH	Subject honorific suffix
NM	Nominative case particle	TR	Transferentive suffix





