

Defining an approach for language education for overseas Koreans in a multilingual era

Nicola Frascini
(University of Western Australia)

1. Ethnicity, language, nation and identity in the 21C world

This paper aims to show how the interconnection of ethnicity, language, nation and identity in the lives of 1.5 and 2nd generation overseas Koreans gives birth to issues of language ownership and questions of cultural belonging. Furthermore, it aims to explain why a consideration of these issues should be taken into account in the field of Korean language and culture education for 1.5 and 2nd generation overseas Korean.

The theoretical framework for this paper is built around the concept of high (or late) modernity (Giddens, 1991), since the sociology and the sociolinguistics of high modernity effectively describe the context of multilingual speakers in the globalized world (Blommaert, 2010). This theoretical framework allows not only for the analysis of language use of multilingual speakers in superdiverse societies (Vertovec, 2007), but it is also a tool for the investigation of the rise of highly standardised national languages, such as the Korean language. I will draw on this theoretical approach, as well as on existing literature, in my analysis of two important pieces of South Korean legislation, the Overseas Koreans Act (OKA, 1999) and the Act on Korean Language (AKL, 2005). These policies are useful in understanding how the motherland positions itself in its relationship with the Korean diaspora. Then, I will proceed to illustrate the opposite perspective, namely perspective of overseas Koreans and their sense of ownership of the Korean language and belonging to the Korean community. In particular, with references to literature written by Koreans abroad and material gathered in previous research, this paper will show that quite often the two perspectives do not coincide, and that the imposition of policies not only does not empower Koreans abroad, but also contribute in creating in them sentiments of non-authenticity and illegitimacy, especially with regard to language (Kramsch; 2012a, b). The last section of this paper considers the results of my analysis and applies it to a critical review of the field of Korean language education for overseas Koreans.

2. High modernity and multilingual speakers

High modernity is the present day world, divided between global influences and personal dispositions (Giddens 1991, p.1). In this paper these two elements of high modernity are often referred to as centrifugal and centripetal forces, the former driving towards globalisation, and the latter towards local (or individual) spaces. A characteristic of this era is that social relations are not bound to specific places, but are actually spread across spaces and time. This is even more true in the new millennium, when internet and technology have multiplied the opportunities for people to be connected and to influence each other in real time, even if they are located at the other ends of the world. Therefore, an interconnected and globalised world affects the relationship between Korea and Koreans abroad. Moreover, Giddens also deems important in this era the effect that centripetal and centrifugal forces have on the building and maintenance of personal identities. Self-identity is a “coherent narrative of the self” (Giddens, 1991; p.3), and people have to create for themselves an identity which makes sense, with the material that (personal and global) history gave them (Appiah, 2005). When people in globalised settings try to make an identity which makes sense they struggle with forces of “difference, exclusion, and marginalisation” (Giddens, 1991; p.6), since these are the

by-products of globalisation in the high modern era. However, as mentioned above, globalisation must be seen with respect to its opposite force, tending to the local. This manifests itself in the strong presence of nation-states. The concept of 'nation-state' is relevant to this paper, since one of the major elements of the nation-state is a national language, most of the time a highly standardised one (Anderson, 2006).

Globalisation understood as interconnected world, and localisation understood as focus on the local contexts of nation-states, are strictly bounded to each other by language, since globalisation destabilises the traditional concept of language (Blommaert, 2013; p.2). Language is one of the most important and valuable resources of a nation-state; however this is true only for a single variety, the one called 'standard', while all others are considered corrupted by either the influences of local dialects, local minority languages or foreign languages. In nation-states, the speakers of a variety that diverges from the standard one have less power and are often even marginalised. For Heller (2010), language in a nation-state is like a technical skill and an object of commodification and who owns the standard variety has the power to decide which values constitute the authentic language and which ones do not. To expand on this, it is possible to state that not only language teaching, but also all efforts to highly codify a standard language are all attempt to control what is deemed as legitimate.

The control of a nation-state over a standard variety is of the outmost relevance for the identity building process of people living in superdiverse contexts. Superdiversity is a concept introduced by Vertovec (2007), which indicates a further characteristic of high modernity, representing a "multidimensional perspective on diversity" (2007, p.1026), where several variables such as cultural background, social class, country of origin, language, age, and many others are multilayered in the same social space, such as big global cities or countries with a considerable immigration. Blommaert and Rampton (2011) stress that linguistic practices of a superdiverse society are in strict contrast with a single, unified, uncorrupted national language, since when variables such as cultural background, ethnicity, age and social class are mixed in the same social space, a single variety is not enough to cover the basic linguistic needs of everyday life. The language repertoire of people living in superdiverse environments must be multilingual, with multilingualism understood as the ability of people to switch easily from one language to another, or from a variety of a language to another (Cenoz, 2013). A standard language, since it values and assumes the existence of a single set of linguistic practices (Blommaert, 2013), is not appropriate to represent the linguistic repertoire needed in multilingual contexts. It must also be noted that multilingualism in superdiverse societies is not necessarily restricted to geographically close languages, nor it is associated with specific social strata.

The problem with a standard language, as pointed out by Blommaert and Rampton (2011), is that such a language is more a discursive construct than an everyday reality. This brings us to the consequences that this has on individual speakers. The concept of native speaker is born out of the concept of a standard language itself, and since a national language is a product of a nation-state, the concept of native speaker itself is the product of an ideology, therefore it is a social and political construct (Lowe and Pinner 2016). The problem that arises at this point is that when multilingual speakers place themselves in the sociolinguistic framework of the nation-state, they found themselves to be illegitimate speakers, non-authentic, since they do not adhere to the set of norm deemed as 'standard'. The efforts of a nation-state to preserve the *status quo* of a national standard language represent the power to decide what is authentic and what is 'fake'. This has extremely important repercussions on migrant communities, and specifically in the context of this paper, on the sociolinguistic life and linguistic self of overseas Koreans: multilingual speakers in superdiverse contexts have difficulties in finding their own subject position (Kramersch, 2012a). In the case of overseas Koreans, the difficulties arise from the fact that 1.5 and 2nd generation Korean must build an identity that makes sense out of the everyday reality of their lives and also out of the narratives of the

motherland; however, these two are often divergent since one requires flexible multilingualism while the other stresses a rigid normative language.

3. The motherland looks at overseas Koreans: policies of inclusion and exclusion

Before looking at how Koreans abroad see themselves as speakers of Korean and position themselves with respect to the motherland, it is necessary to see how the main discourses connected to nation and language in South Korea. This section presents as examples two policies, the Overseas Korean Act (OKA) and the Act on the Korean language (AKL). I will show how these policies, in their attempt to strengthen the concept of the Korean nation-state, actually create either centripetal or centrifugal forces that shape the relationship between overseas Koreans and the Korean community.

The OKA (1999) represents the acknowledgement of the importance of overseas Koreans to the motherland. The act is an attempt to incorporate overseas Koreans into the Korean nation-state; however as Park and Chang (2005) show, the incorporation has not been symmetrical, and also not all overseas Koreans have always been considered in the same way. The act incorporates overseas Koreans into the political and economic structure of the motherland but has been amended after its publication since its critics pointed out that some ethnic groups were not equally represented (Park and Chang, 2005). To address this and other critics the body of the act has been amended several times between 2000 and 2016. The OKA grants to foreign national Koreans rights comparable to those of Koreans in certain fields, positioning them into an intermediate position between Koreans and foreigners. Article 10 states that:

Employment and other economic activities of foreign nationality Korean who has been granted qualification for sojourn as overseas Korean shall be freely permitted to the extent that he/she does not impair social order or economic stability.¹ (OKA, art.10)

In the following articles 11, 12, 13 and 14 overseas Korean that have been granted sojourn are given the same rights as Koreans with respect to real estate transactions, financial transactions, foreign exchange transactions and health insurance, all aspects of everyday life with several restrictions for non-Korean foreigners residing in Korea.

It is interesting to note that the act, as reported in its online Korean version available, is of competence of the “department of policies for foreigners” of the Korean Ministry of Justice. This means that even if the act is an attempt to incorporate foreign national Koreans in the Korean people by giving them some of the rights that Koreans have, on the other hand the common discourse positioning overseas Korean at the margin of the Korean community is visible in the fact that the act is supervised by an office that has authority on policies aimed to foreigners. Jeon (2008) also points out several discrepancies in the OKA, mostly due to the unclear definition of ‘overseas Korean’. The law incorporates in its text two quite different categories of people, overseas Koreans national and foreign national Koreans. While the former retain their Korean nationality, the latter have the nationality of a foreign country. Therefore the main problem of the law is that it causes a clash with international regulations (Jeon 2008:122). Jeon’s critique of the lack of clarity around who a ‘overseas Korean’ is, finds confirmation in a survey conducted by Yun et. al. (2015), where the researchers showed the perceptions that national Koreans have about overseas Koreans. Yun et. al. (2015) survey shows that overseas Koreans from Europe, US, Australia and New Zealand are believed to have more commonalities than overseas Korean from other regions (p.50). An important aspect of this survey is that national Koreans perceive as “less Korean” an overseas Korean who cannot speak Korean, such

¹ English translations of the OKA and the AKL are from the website law.go.kr.

as 2nd or 3rd generation or Korean international adoptees. This aspect is important because it shows us that despite the efforts to incorporate overseas Koreans into the community of the motherland, there is also a strong discourse that connects the belonging to the Korean community with the ability to speak Korean. This brings us to introduce our second piece of legislation, the Act on the Korean language.

The need for a piece of legislation about the Korean language began to be felt in the late Nineties of the 20C and it had brought to actively produce different drafts and preliminary versions of what was passed as the Act on the Korean Language in 2005 (Park, 2015). AKL represents two main efforts: one is regulating the standard use of the national language, while the other one is stating who has the right to look after the ‘development’ and ‘preservation’ of the language itself. Since its first publication in 2005 it has been amended several times, mostly due to the need of incorporating important developments regarding the spread of the Korean language. An example relevant to this paper is the increase of foreigners studying Korean language in Korea as well as abroad. This motivated a recent amendment regarding the introduction of a national certification for teachers of Korean as a second language and the creation of the King Sejong Institute Foundation.

In the perspective of this paper, this act is important since it formally creates the legal basis of a national standard language, one of the fundamental elements of a nation-state. Also, the AKL introduces the ‘National Language Deliberation Council’, which overlooks at and suggests official adjustment to what must be considered standard language. The following articles from the AKL are presented here to show how language policies in South Korea have created specific discourses around the use of the Korean language that can negatively affect the linguistic identity of overseas Koreans.

The purpose of the AKL, as stated in its article 1, is to:

[...] enhance the quality of the cultural lifestyle of people and contribute to the development of Korean ethnic culture by fostering people’s creative thinking by encouraging the use of the Korean language and establishing the foundation for the development and conservation of the language. (AKL, art.1)

The act aims to enhance Korean people’s cultural life by encouraging the use of the language and establishing foundations for its *development* and *conservation*. In this context, development and conservation refer to fostering the use of the Korean language (also to speakers of Korean as a foreign language) and to preserve the language in its actual form. The preservation of the Korean language as the most important cultural asset for the Korean people is stated also in article 2, which stresses the importance to preserve the language for the use of the future generations.

In articles 1 and 2 it is possible to individuate the two main goals of the policy. The first corresponds to the effort to expand the use of the Korean language. A confirmation of this is in article 19. This article states that the State must support the development of teaching curricula and material, and to train and certify teachers for Korean as a second language education for “foreigners who intend to learn the Korean language and overseas Koreans” (AKL, art.19). The second part of the article establishes the King Sejong Institute Foundation as a specific institution with the role of expanding opportunities for Korean language education overseas. It must be noted that foreigners and overseas Korean are grouped together in the same article, thus confirming the perceptions of the Korean people with regard to overseas Korean with poor Korean language competence that I outlined above.

The second goal points toward the effort to preserve the Korean language in its form. The act establishes the institution of the ‘Korean Language Deliberation Council’, an institution with the role of deliberating “on important matters for the development and preservation of the Korean language” (AKL, art.13). Among other roles, this Council decides upon new language norms before the ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism enacts them. An example of these language norms can be found in the

notification n.12 of 2017 ('Korean language orthography') of the Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism.

The Act on the Korean Language must be understood also within the context of post-war Korea and with subsequent attempts to 'purify' the language. At the end of the Japanese colonial period first attempts of purification were aimed at Japanese words, and the first policies related to the national language were introduced in the Sixties and Seventies. Park (2008) individuates in this period the origin of the linguistic purism movement in South Korea. He also observes that the strong ideological work of linguistic purism is at the origin of the erasure of linguistic diversity in Korea (2008, p.334). At present, it is possible to observe that Korea scholars have different opinions regarding the standardization and purification of the Korean language. On the one hand, supporters of the language purification process such as Ko (2011) do not consider what has been done to purify (or standardize) the use of the language successful enough, claiming that a bottom-up participation of the Korean people in the process would be more effective than the introduction of top-down policies. Nevertheless he states that "even now [...] it is impossible to negate the necessity of a purification of the Korean language" (2011, p.10-11) and that "[...] the purification process cannot be stopped, and moreover must not be stopped" (p.11). Kim (2011), expresses that now the influences of western languages (i.e. English) more than Japanese loanwords is the main goal of the purification efforts, and although being supportive of the purification process he understands that this process is also a political process of inclusion and exclusion. On the other hand, other scholars, such as Cho (2007, 2009) are more critical and pragmatic with respect to the effects of the AKL and the purification process. Cho (2007) notes that Korea is the only country with such a strict control over the language, and this control is not only discriminating other varieties, but is also distant from real everyday language use. He also argues that this excessive control severely limits creativity, freedom and discriminates against minority speakers (Cho, 2009).

The discourse regarding the standardization of the Korean language and its purification 'process' is highly relevant in the context of overseas Koreans abroad living in superdiverse societies, since their everyday translanguaging practices are being considered illegitimate use of the language.

4. Koreans abroad look back at the motherland: language ownership and belonging

The relationship between Koreans abroad and the Korean language and culture is of the utmost importance to understand the dynamics at play between with the motherland. This section draws from different sources to illustrate this relationship.

The first source is the novel *Native Speaker*, written by Chang-rae Lee and published in 1995. It describes the story of a 1.5 generation Korean-American called Henry, who migrated to New York at a very young age with his family. The plot, based in New York, tells of his connections with the Korean language, as well as with English, through his relationship with his white-American wife Lelia, his father and a Korean-American politician.

The novel begins with the description of a rupture in the relationship between Henry and Lelia. Henry finds a note written by his wife, who is a speech therapist, accusing him of being a "false speaker of language" (Lee 1995:6). It is not stated which language, but through the novel Henry shows that neither ownership of Korean nor of English belongs to him. This accuse of being a false speaker confirms his own feeling of not being an authentic speaker of any language. There are many episodes showing this complex and contradictory relationship between Henry and his mother language, for example when he speaks Korean with Peter, one of the children of the politician.

Peter and I possess a similar command of Korean, though perhaps his grasp is slightly better, his *bah-rham* or accent, or literally, "breeze", is more authentic, still deeply redolent of the old country. Perhaps in

twenty years his Korean words will creep out like mine, the notes uncertain, tentative. When I step into a Korean dry cleaner, or a candy shop, I always feel I'm an audience member asked to stand up and sing with the dive, that I know every pitch and note but can no longer call them forth. (p. 267)²

In this excerpt Henry is stressing his poor pronunciation. He still feels to be a speaker of Korean, but a sort of an illegitimate one, without a proper grasp. By saying that Peter's pronunciation is more authentic than his own, Henry stresses that he himself is a sort of fake speaker, somebody who knew the authentic pronunciation in the past, but cannot pronounce the correct sounds anymore. This feeling of non-authenticity is particularly alive in his interactions with 1st generation Koreans in New York, when he tries to avoid speaking Korean for the fear of looking non-authentic. Here Henry is in a Korean restaurant interacting with the waitress.

She peers over the stainless-steel counter. I bow my head low to her. I want to thank her, too, with a surprise of saying something in our language, but there is nothing in my throat to call up. I am half afraid of disappointing her with some fumble of poorly accented words. (pp. 315-316)

In this passage Henry compares himself to what he considers true Koreans, not 1.5 or second generation, but the 1st generation migrated to the United States, represented by the waitress. He is afraid of speaking Korean in front of her because he doesn't want to disappoint, looking non-authentic. The fear of disappointment comes from what I have mentioned above as the discourse of oneness of the Korean people, namely that Koreans are supposed to speak Korean, while non-Korean are exempted to speak it. This strong discursive connection between people and language, and between looking Korean and speaking Korean, is deeply rooted in the Korean society. The discourse of one ethnicity-one language clearly affects Henry's feeling of ownership of the language and his willingness to speak Korean with the 1st generation. On the one hand, this discourse assimilates Henry in the community of Koreans for his external aspect; however, on the other hand it is pushing him toward a grey area far from the centre of this community due to his failure to speak the language properly.

At the end of the novel Henry quits his job and reconciles with his wife. His job, a spy for a private information agency, represented the metaphor of being false and non-authentic. The passage to a new life, hence the reconciliation with Lelia, marks also the reconciliation between his Korean and American selves, and resolves the dilemma of being a fake speaker of both Korean and English. When Henry starts helping Lelia in her English pronunciation classes to children from newly immigrant families it is possible to see how he overcomes the issue of non-authenticity.

Lelia doesn't attempt any other speech work. The kids are just foreign language speakers, anyway, and she thinks it's better with their high number and kind to give them some laughs and then read a tall tale in her gentlest, queerest voice. It doesn't matter what they understand. She wants them to know that there is nothing to fear, she wants to offer up a pale white woman horsing with the language to show them it's fine to mess it all up. (p. 348)

The perception that Henry has of himself as a false speaker of two languages clearly evolved. He does not consider himself anymore a half speaker of two languages, or a native speaker of no language. "[...] it is fine to mess it all up" indicates that Henry's self has developed to include both his Korean and English into one single identity. The reconciliation of his Korean and American selves shows that

² It is the understanding of the researcher that in this excerpt the author confuses the two Korean words *bal-eum* (pronunciation, accent) and *ba-ram* (wind, breeze).

he realized he is made up of both: Henry's language is not Korean *or* American, it is Korean *and* American.

Native speaker is a novel showing that strong discourses about the Korean people, the Korean language and the oneness of the Korean nation affect negatively the life and the linguistic identity of 1.5 or 2nd generation Koreans abroad. These discourses also affect the sense of belonging of overseas Korean, especially young 1.5 and 2nd generation, to the Korean people, as it possible to see from the following excerpts from blog posts written by six young Korean-Australians students as an assignment for a language course in an Australian university.

The sense of belonging is clearly visible from students' consideration of how the concept of oneness of the Korean people manifests itself and what this represent for them, such as in the following Sumi's post.

I think that Korea is one of the countries with the strongest patriotism. When everybody was demonstrating by holding a candle, or was wearing a red t-shirt during the World Cup, or was cheering the athletes during the Olympics, then I really had the impression that "Korea is one"; however, it seems to me that a culture that stresses the oneness of its people might also disregard and discriminate against other people. (Sumi)

This expresses Sumi's perceptions of the one ethnicity-one nation discourse. She acknowledges that the love for the country in Korea is strong, and that in Korea she can observe that, especially during sport events or mass protests, that the Korean people often move as a single entity. However, from her perspective, she questions that this strong love for one's country is also translated perhaps into the discrimination of other people. It is possible to see from this statement that Sumi's perspective is from the outside of the Korean community, expressing concerns that Koreans may discriminate against people, like her, who don't feel like belonging entirely to the community. She stresses further this same position in another post, where students participating in the blog activity were writing about the terms "Korean language" and "national language".

So at the Korean weekend school they call it "Korean classes" and not "national language classes"! Immigrants and multicultural families are increasing in Korea, but I think that there is some confusion about those people that are between Koreans and foreigners.³ (Sumi)

Sumi is surprised to know from the other Korean-Australian students that at the weekend schools for children of overseas Koreans they use the term 'Korean language' instead of 'national language'. 'Korean language' is a term used in Korea to refer to the Korean language mostly from an external perspective, therefore it is a term used also to indicate the Korean language education for foreigners, and the Korean language education for overseas Koreans. On the other hand, the term 'national language' is commonly used by Koreans to refer to their own language, and this term is used also in the field of Korean language education for Koreans. Sumi is not only surprised that the term used for foreigners is also applied to overseas Koreans, but also that notwithstanding the increased foreign population in South Korea, represented mainly by immigrants and children from so called multicultural families, in Korea it is still hard to position those people within the national narrative.

Sumi not only individuates and finds uncomfortable this clear separation between Koreans and non-Korean, but she also posts her reflection about which discourse causes overseas Korean to feel alienated.

³ In the original of this excerpt Sumi refers to national language as *gugeo* and to Korean language as *hangugeo*.

If we had been free from this nationalism and the statism, then Koreans abroad like Ihyang Kim wouldn't have felt alienated. In my opinion even words like "Korean language" and "Korean history" draw a line between Koreans abroad and Koreans.⁴ (Sumi)

Sumi elaborates here on the consequences of being caught in the discourse of the oneness of the Korean people. She refers to Ihyang Kim, a young 2nd generation Korean-Japanese who appears in a video related to Koreans abroad that the students watched and commented. Sumi is of the opinion that the alienation that Ihyang felt was due to Korea's strong nationalism. She goes further by arguing that actually even some terms like "Korean language" and "Korean history" play the role of separating overseas Koreans and Koreans in Korea. The alienation that people like Inhyang feel is due to the discourse of the oneness of the Korean people, which does not allow for grey areas, such as those where overseas Korean live.

Sumi is not the only one that thinks that the discourse of oneness of the Korean people discriminates who does not entirely belong to this group.

I am proud of patriotism; however, for me it is difficult to see the big picture if you are restrained in the frame of belonging to one people. And also, me too I didn't understand those aspect of the patriarchal culture still alive in my parents. (Sueun)

Like Sumi, Sueun touches the topic of the uniqueness of the Korean people and their love for the motherland. However, she puts this into a more intimate and domestic perspective. Sueun often complained that her parents would try to reproduce the Korean cultural environment at home. However, their forced sense of belonging to the Korean people even if it was difficult for her to understand and accept. In particular, she criticises being restricted within the same cultural frame created by the sense of belonging to one people and one country. With saying this she stresses her sense of non-belonging entirely to a single community. She makes clear her "external perspective" by criticising the reproduction of some elements typical of the Korean culture, such as the paternalistic home atmosphere. Korean-Australian students see the reproduction of the Korean culture as an effort to incorporate them into the Korean community; however, they are quite critical of these efforts since they feel that they are not entirely Korean. This is visible in one of Hyeonju's posts.

During the weekend I used to read more Korean books than doing school homework, and my father considered more important to comments the book writing in Korean. He also made me study Chinese characters. I know that studying Korean was important; however I was born in Australia, not like my parents who migrated from Korea, and learning English and learning the Australian culture was more pressing to me to live my own life as a Korean-Australian. It has been a big burden for me that my parents stressed Korean so much, which was not essential, and disregarded all that. (Hyeonju)

Hyeonju is one of the most critics about the reproduction of the Korean culture in the home environment among the students writing on the blog. She recollects that when she was younger, despite the fact of being born in Australia, her parents forced her to devote a considerable amount of efforts in learning the Korean language. She stresses that, since she was not born in Korea but in Australia, learning English and learning about the Australian culture would have been more relevant for her life. She does not deny the need of learning Korean, neither she refused to learn the language of her parents. However she stresses that her parents' educational priorities were quite different from

⁴ In the original of this excerpt Sumi refers to Korean language as *gugeo* (literally national language) and to Korean history as *guksa* (literally national history).

her vision of the world. In this excerpt Hyeonju too positions herself from an external perspective with respect to the core of the Korean people, represented by her parents.

From the blog excerpts it is also possible to see that young Korean-Australians do not look negatively at their Korean side and at their relationship with the motherland and its culture. Their perspective in fact is a critical one. Sueun states that she is happy that both Korea and Australia shaped her identity, recognizing with this the richness of living in and between two cultures and two languages.

This section shows that discourses alive in Korea that connects external aspect, language, and belonging to a community ultimately have negative effects on the sense of belonging of overseas Koreans and their linguistic identity. In many instances overseas Koreans overcome the discourse that categorises them as fake speaker of a language by stating their multilingual identity. Many, such as Henry, are not half speakers of two languages, but simply fully multilingual. They also criticise the discourse that attempt to incorporating them either into the broader Korean community or into the category of foreigners, since they can stand at the same time into an emic and ethic perspective, they are in a position that allow them to look at the big picture, as Sueun said. In particular the Korean-Australian students want to be recognized by what they really are: not failed Koreans but real Korean-Australians.

4. High modernity and language education for overseas Koreans

In this final section I will discuss the need to reconsider Korean language education for 1.5 and 2nd generation overseas Korean in the light on the analysis conducted above.

Since language is essential not only as a mean of communication, but also as a mean of identity formation, it is necessary for a pedagogy of Korean language for overseas Korean to address issues related to the identity of the self, as the Korean essentialist discourse about one language-one ethnicity-one nation is in strict contrast with the context of the lives of overseas Korean. Korean language pedagogy for overseas contexts has to address multiple issues where language, nation, ethnicity, identity and belonging cross each other. Overseas Koreans, especially young 1.5 and 2nd generation, don't feel a sense of belonging to only one country, and do not think that only one language can express all what they want and need to say. As seen in the previous excerpts, *The Native Speaker* protagonist Henry found his own dimension when he realized that he did not have to think that only Korean, or only English, is his true language since both Korean and English, together and at the same time, are his true language repertoire. In a similar way, young 1.5 and 2nd generation Korean-Australia realized that they do not need to decide to be Korean or Australian, since they actually are both. All these elements should be taken into account in the pedagogy of Korean for overseas Korean learners.

Another element emerging from the analysis is the need to reconsider what the 'standard' in teaching Korean to overseas Korean. 'Standard' must be considered in this context with two meanings: understood as comparison for assessment, but also as highly centrally regulated language. The hypothetical Korean native speaker cannot be considered the standard as it does not represent an attainable goal. The native speaker as a standard is also undesirable for another reason: a monolingual native speaker's language practices do not compare to overseas Koreans everyday multilingual life. A monolingual native speaker, such as the speaker living in the Korean society described by Park (2008), has neither the fluidity nor the knowledge to switch between codes and languages. Therefore multilingual overseas Koreans need to be compared to multilingual standards. Of course a certain amount of standardised form of language is needed for teaching purposes; however, as seen above, we always must be aware that a standard language, and especially one which is considered to be pure from foreign contaminations, is quite distant from multilingual and multicultural realities. Teaching to

overseas Korean has to consider also which variety, which forms are used in which range of social, political, cultural and linguistic contexts. This is the reason why instead of teaching only the standard form of the language, deemed to be correct, a pedagogy of Korean for overseas Koreans has to include a variety of codes to give the students the responsibility to make their own linguistic choices (Kramersch, 2014). This is important in empowering overseas Korean students, which at present are considered lesser speaker of a language, despoiled of any authority even over their own mother language, such as Henry.

A multilingual perspective on language teaching should be reflected also in the teaching of culture, many times referred to with the term 'heritage'. This term has been adopted in the field of Korean language education to describe the pedagogy aimed to overseas Koreans (Kang, 2013). The use of the term 'heritage' to describe the Korean language and culture deprives overseas Koreans of the ownership of their own language and cultural background (Fraschini, 2017b). 'Heritage' is, as the term itself says, something inherited from the past, transmitted unchanged from past generations to the younger one. This prevents overseas Korean to engage creatively in the use of their language and culture. Young Korean-Australian students, has seen above, rejected some elements of their cultural background because they refused to be transmitted something they are supposed to receive passively, and that contrast with their multilingual and multicultural lives.

This brings us to the need to reconsider also the material used in the classroom of Korean language for overseas Koreans. It is known that many weekend schools for children of overseas Koreans adopt textbooks and material used in Korea primary schools. Other schools instead adopt textbooks for overseas Koreans provided by the Overseas Korean Foundation and produced in Korea. Both these approaches have flaws, since the former does not consider the language standard and the multilingual lives of the students, while the latter assume a 'one-size-fits-all' approach that does not take into account each single pedagogical context. Not only material, but also curricula should be developed with the same logic, since curricula should be tailored on the teaching context and on specific students. However, in many call for a standard curriculum for weekend Korean language schools for overseas Koreans, such as Jeong and Kim (2009). Cho (2014), even if he criticizes existing suggestions of a standard language and culture curriculum for overseas Korean by saying that all lack a teaching approach focused strictly on overseas Koreans' need, he does not overtly advocate against the development of a 'standard' curriculum itself. A 'standard curriculum' for overseas Koreans would only be imposed on the students from the motherland and would hardly empower overseas Korean students.

In the discussion of how a globalised world influences the pedagogy of Korean language for overseas Korean, it is important to review the position of one the main actors of this pedagogy: the language teacher. Research on Korean non-native language teachers (Fraschini, 2012; Bae and Ar 2012) has demonstrated that in the teaching of a foreign language, native teachers and non-native teachers are both effective on their own terms. In the same way, training of 1.5 and 2nd generation Korean as teacher of Korean for overseas Korean is meaningful because can offer to overseas Korean students a perspective on the Korean language which reflects their own perspective. The teacher of Korean for overseas Korean needs knowledge of what is supposed to be the standard variety, since this is undoubtedly more easily teachable as said above, but also of other varieties more available in the multilingual sociolinguistic context of their students. Also, such a teacher needs to be able to feel empathy with their students.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I adopted a framework focused on the concept of high modernity to the analysis of two Korean pieces of legislation, in order to show how the essentialist discourse of one language-one

nation-one ethnicity influences the sense of language ownership and cultural belonging in 1.5 and 2nd generation overseas Koreans. In particular, I demonstrated how the discourses emanating from the motherland are in contrast with how 1.5 and 2nd generation Korean position themselves with respect to their mother language and cultural background. The result of this analysis and comparison of different points of view is taken then into account in the review of some elements related to Korean language and culture education for overseas Korean.

This paper assumes that the school and educational environment are powerful means of reproduction of existing discourses and relations of power. This paper accounts for some consideration on how Korean language pedagogy could be more empowering from the perspective of 1.5 and 2nd generation students. However, also the family environment must be accounted for in discussing reproduction of discourses and educational approaches in the case of overseas Korean learners. Therefore future research should address also how issues of language ownership and belonging arise within the family context of young overseas Koreans.

References

- Act on the Korean Language* of 2005 (Republic of Korea). Available at <http://www.law.go.kr>
- Anderson B. (2006). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.
- Appiah K.W. (2005). *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bae K.M. and Ar J.M. (2012). "A Study on Non-native Teachers of Korean as a Foreign Language: Focused on Filipino KFL teachers". *Journal of Korean Language Education* 23(3). pp. 343-364.
- Blommaert J. (2010). *The sociolinguistic of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert J. (2013). "Citizenship, language and Superdiversity: towards complexity". *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 12(3). 193-196.
- Blommaert J. and Rampton B. (2011). "Language and Superdiversity". *Diversities* 13(2). 1-21.
- Bucholtz M. (2003). "Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3). 398-416.
- Cenoz J. (2013). "Defining multilingualism". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33. 3-18.
- Cho T.R. (2007). "Problems of policies on language standardization and their possible solutions". Proceedings of the 25th national conference of the Hanmal Yeongu Hakhoi [Society for the research on the Korean language]. 189-195.
- Cho T.R. (2009). "Signification and limitation of legal regulations on language policy". *Hanmal Yeongu* [Korean language research] 24. 241-265.
- Cho T.R. (2014). "Analysis of Korean Language Curricula for Overseas Koreans from the Aspects of Heritage Language Education: Focused on the general theory". *Ijungeoneohak* [Bilingual Studies] 85. 381-407.
- Coupland N. (2010). "The authentic speaker and the speech community". In Llamas C. and Watts D. (eds), *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 99-112.
- Fraschini N. (2012). *Identity of non-native Korean teachers*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Korea University.
- Fraschini, N. (2017a). "I thought that I don't qualify to call Korean my 'national language': identity and authenticity in Korean-Australian heritage language learners". *Journal of Korean Language Education* 28. pp. 45-80.
- Fraschini, N. (2017b). "Late modern considerations on language education for Koreans abroad". In Shin S.C. and Lee I.Y. (eds), *Korean Language as Socio-Educational Resources: A refereed proceeding of the Australian Symposium on Korean Language Learning and Teaching 2017*. pp. 22-31.

- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Heller M. (2010). "The commodification of language". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39. 101-114.
- Jeon J.H. (2008). "The issues and alternatives of Korea's policy towards overseas compatriots in the globalization era: focusing on the Overseas Korean Act and dual nationality". *Korea and International Politics* 24(2). 99-134.
- Jeong J.H. and Kim T.H. (2009). "A study of the curriculum of overseas Korean language school". *Sae Gugeo Gyeoyuk* [New Korean Language Education] 82. 415-438.
- Kang S.H. (2013). "Korean education as a heritage language: on its prospects and future task". *Perspectives on Language Truth* [eono sasilgwa gwanjeom] 31. pp. 79-105.
- Kim H.S. (2011). "A critical alternative to the purification of the Korean language". *Sae Gugeo Saenghwal* [New Korean language life] 21(2). 123-136.
- Ko S.H. (2011). "History and future perspectives of the purification of the Korean language". *Sae Gugeo Saenghwal* [New Korean language life] 21(2). 5-18.
- Kramersch C. (2012a). "Imposture: a late modern notion in poststructuralist SLA research". *Applied Linguistics* 33 (5). pp. 483-502.
- Kramersch C. (2012b). "Authenticity and Legitimacy in Multilingual SLA". *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 1 (1). pp. 107-128.
- Kramersch C. (2014). "Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: introduction". *The Modern Language Journal* 98(1). 296-331.
- Lee C.R. (1995). *Native Speaker*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Lo Bianco J. (2014). "Domesticating the foreign: globalization's effects on the place/s of languages". *The Modern Language Journal* 98(1). 312-325.
- Lowe R.J. and Pinner R. (2016). "Finding the connections between native-speakerism and authenticity". *Applied Linguistics Review* 7(1). 27-52.
- Park C.W. (2015). "Looking back at the 10 years of the *Act on Korean Language*". *Sae Gugeo Saenghwal* [New Korean language life] 25(3). 3-35.
- Park J. (2008). "Two processes of reproducing monolingualism in South Korea". *Sociolinguistic Studies* 2(3). 331-346.
- Park J. S. and Chang P.Y. (2005). "Contention in the construction of a global Korean community: the case of the Overseas Korean Act". *The Journal of Korean Studies* 10(1). 1-27.
- Overseas Korean Act* of 1999 (Republic of Korea). Available at: <http://www.law.go.kr>
- Yun I.J., Kwon I.N., Kim T.G., Bae J.S. and Song Y.H. (2015). "South Korean nationals' perceptions of overseas Koreans: the effects of national consciousness, multicultural acceptance and contact experience". *Studies on the Issues of Reunification* 27(1). 31-68.
- Vertovec (2007). "Super-diversity and its implications". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6). 1024-1054.
- Wiley T.G. (2007). "Heritages and community languages in the national language debate". *The Modern Language Journal* 91(2). 252-255.