An Examination of Translingual Practices on a Mobile Application: Implications for Pronunciation Instruction and Raising Learners' Translingual Awareness

Yoo Young Ahn

Abstract

This article reports Korean speakers' experiences with naturally occurring translingual transliterations in a noneducational online contact zone to support improvement of English pronunciation. Use of the Korean and English alphabets in pronunciation transliterations and application users' meaning-making are analyzed using Canagarajah's (2013) macrotranslingual strategies for negotiation. Findings show that the nonstandard transliterations could easily deliver pronunciations to a broad audience and stimulate the participation of users, who draw on diverse resources to strategically negotiate their footings to make meaning, often referring to their linguistic knowledge or experiences in certain countries. Patterns around transliteration and negotiation suggest two major implications for classroom pronunciation instruction: using students' existing resources to address crucial features of intelligibility such as vowel quality and suprasegmental features in transliterations, in addition to segmentals, and eliciting students' active involvement in meaning construction. Furthermore, English teachers might challenge their students' acceptance of prevalent monolingual standards in pronunciation and establish their translingual sensitivity to cultural/linguistic diversity.

Key words: translingual practices; translingual transliterations; translingual awareness in EFL; English pronunciation instruction; teaching suprasegmentals

Introduction

During recent decades, the focus of language education has broadened to include developing learners' sensitivity to other cultures and languages in addition to their linguistic competence. In contrast to the monolingual and structural approaches prevalent in language classrooms around the world (Kirkpatrick, 2007; Müller, 2013), the new learning paradigm encourages students' natural use of di-

Contact: Yoo Young Ahn, Indiana University, USA.
Email: yooyahn@iu.edu

verse semiotic resources for communication in their language learning in school (Canagarajah, 2013; MLA Ad Hoc Committee, 2007). As Kramsch (2012) elaborates, the goal of language learning is "to train educated multilingual speakers who do not strive to become like monolingual speakers but rather who can draw profit from shuttling from one to the other of their languages" (p. 17).

To augment multilingual language learners' instinctual practices of juggling various resources for communication, Creese and Blackledge (2010) call for more research on developing "teachable pedagogic resources" (p. 113). Classroom research on translingual practices is very limited, however, and has been conducted mostly in bilingual classrooms (Hornberger, 2003) and in higher education writing classes (Canagarajah, 2011, 2013) in the US or in Europe (Blommaert et al., 2012). One of the less discussed though challenging areas, teaching pronunciation has been largely omitted from studies addressing today's goal of developing learners' holistic translingual and transcultural competencies (Müller, 2013). Furthermore, the introduction of intelligibility in the field of pronunciation questioned ESL, EFL, and foreign language classrooms that have changed little from the ideal of attaining native-like proficiency for decades (Levis, 2005; Munro & Derwing, 1995; Murphy, 2014). Therefore, the concept of translingual competencies aligns with recent movements to set more realistic goals in pronunciation teaching, and enhancing L2 learners' intelligibility through meaningful communicative activities (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing & Munro, 1997, 2005; Munro & Derwing, 1995). At the same time, the role of suprasegmentals in intelligibility has recently received more instructional attention than the teaching of segmentals, although not taught as expected in class (Baker, 2011; Jenkins, 2005, 2007). Regarding the gap between the perceived need of teaching suprasegmentals and teachers' practices, researchers reported that teachers often received phonology-focused training (Breitkreutz et al., 2001; Derwing, 2010; Saito & van Poeteren, 2012), lacked confidence, or considered teaching diverse accents not practical (Jenkins, 2007).

In discussing the need for integrating translingualism and intelligibility into the teaching of pronunciation in EFL contexts, this article first examines how naturally occurring translingual practices of using both target and first languages in sentence-level transliteration can facilitate learning both segmentals and suprasegmentals from observed active meaning-making in a noneducational online environment. The article then discusses possible translingual practices for teaching pronunciation in classroom settings, in which the major local language is a resource shared by both teachers and students. Strategies are offered for teachers to reflect on active shuttling between resources and other knowledge assets to make meaning and to communicate, and to initiate students' translingual awareness of their own perceptions of diversities in pronunciation.

Background

Before discussing translingual practices, I describe *Pikicast*, an entertainment application where the translingual practices for English learning occurs[1] naturally and the Korean language is a primary language. Knowledge of the Korean writing and sound systems assists in understanding how transliteration appeals to a Korean audience, delivering richer linguistic information than traditional notation using Korean or the pronunciation symbols that many learners may find unfamiliar.

---

[1] It is important to note that Pikicast was not developed to teach English, but to provide varied entertaining content to its users.

Pikicast and the Editor

The mobile version of Pikicast Inc. is an entertainment application with which, according to the Apple application store, "Just by swiping a finger, you will be presented with the world's most exciting stories and experiences ranging from texts and images to animated memes and videos." Unlike other social media platforms such as Facebook or Twitter, only authorized editors present content to their 15 million users. Editors either create original content or select content from existing databases on various topics such as counseling, news, food, movies, and more (Yoo, 2015). Depending on popularity, editors often start or stop their series. Talk-Talk-Hae-Young [똑똑해영][2] was one of those editors who published 73 original posts about English learning from August 18, 2015 and discontinued after the last posting on January 15, 2017. Thus, this editor's posts about English were one possible content that Pikicast provides. As an online space, all information remains anonymous in Pikicast, including the actual identity of the editors, their backgrounds in English language or English teaching, reasons for initiating posts for English learning, and how they choose certain topics and phrases. In fact, Talk-Talk-Hae-Young may represent a group of editors, but the editor in this article is referred to in the singular, so there is no way of determining whether this is the case.

Korean, Hangeul, and Their Impact on English Learning

Three aspects of Korean that affect English pronunciation are related to the editor Talk-Talk-Hae-Young's (henceforth the editor) translingual practices. First, because Korean prosody is based on tonal patterns in phrases while English places stress on syllables (Guion, 2005; Sohn, 1992), Korean learners of English must pay particular attention to intonation to produce intelligible speech. Second, there are a number of English sounds for which exact equivalents do not exist in Korean or are not distinguished from one another (e.g., /b/ & /p/, /f/ & /v/, /r/ & /l/, /z/ & /j/, /iy/ & /I/, /ɛ/ & /æ/, /ɑ/ & /ɔ/, /ʊ/ & /uw/), and these pairs may be transliterated interchangeably depending on speakers' decision about the similarity in sounds (National Institute of Korean Language, http://kornorms.korean.go.kr). Moreover, the written form of syllabic blocks in Korean, which consists of an initial consonant, a medial vowel, and a final consonant, is distinctively different from alphabets, in which letters are written vertically in a line (Koehler, 2010). For example, there are two types of Korean vowels that could be written next to (vertical) or below (horizontal) the initial consonants. When a final consonant follows, it is positioned below the combination of consonant and vowel, not on the right side. According to the rule, the word hangeul consists of two syllables in Korean: 한글, not 하ㄴ그ㄹ. Third, this rule for syllabic structure—that every syllable has a vowel— often generates extra syllable(s) when foreign words are pronounced or transliterated in Korean. For example, a one-syllable English word *strike* becomes a five-syllable word *su-tu-la-i-ku* (Sohn, 1999, p. 14), putting stress evenly on the reduced sounds. This rule could make intelligible production of familiar loanwords with L1 prosody more challenging than pronouncing new words. More importantly, the wrong stress on weak vowels and shift of lexical stress or rhythm in English speech negatively affect speakers' intelligibility (Cutler & Clifton, 1984; Field, 2005), which could result in communication breakdowns.

---

[2] The editor's username could mean "(I'm) smart" or "Let's talk" in Korean.

Translingualism

Translingualism explains how diverse language modes function in natural communicative settings, both spoken and written, and how freedom to draw on multiple modes encourages language users to negotiate and construct meaning within their particular contexts (Canagarajah, 2013). Thus, communicative texts and talk naturally feature the diverse resources of members who engage in "mobile, fluid, and hybrid" ways to communicate (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 15). This practice challenges beliefs about language learning rooted in monolingual, modernist, and structural orientations. Within traditional frameworks, newcomers to a language community are never legitimized as having mastery of the language and mind of the community, no matter how much they aspire to be like native speakers. From this perspective, students' first language(s) are not resources but impediments as sources of interference. As an alternative, translingualism draws upon the perspective of *postmodern globalization* (Hall, 1991) to support integration of various available resources—not limited to linguistic ones—to achieve the goal of communication, blurring perceived linguistic boundaries. Within the translingual framework, communication entails naturally occurring mutual exchanges and collaborative negotiation among individuals, who use various semiotic resources to make meaning (Li, 2018). Their choices of resources could vary depending on each user's understanding of communication norms from previous experiences in various contexts with different interlocutors.

Accordingly, many European and US scholars now perceive the development of translingual and transcultural competence as a primary goal of language education and foster use of diverse resources in language teaching (e.g., Douglas Fir Group, 2016; Kramsch, 2012; MLA Ad Hoc Committee, 2007). To communicate with culturally and linguistically diverse interlocutors in global contexts, language learners need to practice how to co-construct acceptable meanings and negotiate language norms depending on context, acknowledging that there is no universal standard for speaking and writing (Canagarajah, 2013; Horner et al., 2011; Kramsch, 2014). This new approach is becoming increasingly accepted in composition and literacy classrooms (Canagarajah, 2011; Horner et al., 2011; Lee, 2016) as part of students' trajectory toward mastery of the discourse norms of their fields while retaining the flexibility of shuttling between languages in literacy practices inside and outside classrooms (Garcia, 2009; Hornberger & Link, 2012). However, there is still a need to examine strategies that translinguals adopt for communication to suggest pedagogic resources for teachers (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) to make the classroom "a potent site where students may develop a critical attitude toward existing norms" (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 12). It implies possibilities of adopting translingual frameworks beyond writing classes—for example in pronunciation teaching—drawing learners' attention to evaluating their own resources to develop communication strategies, while questioning accepted norms of English in their contexts, particularly standard English accents.

Teaching Pronunciation and Translingualism

One area that has been less influenced by translingualism is pronunciation instruction, although use of various semiotic resources in speaking instantiations demonstrates translingual practices. For example, the well-known foreign language teaching guideline from ACTFL (2006), accepted worldwide as a reference, provides only limited information on how to teach pronunciation to multilingual learners, regardless of their explicit emphasis on speaking, multilingualism, and intercultural competence (Müller, 2013). With little guidance, pedagogic approaches to teaching pronunciation tend to vary by programs or by teachers. In some cases, pronunciation is not included in the curriculum because of the difficulty of teaching it, or it is taught quickly when it appears in the teaching materials, not in respective pronunciation classrooms (Foote et al., 2011; MacDonald, 2002). More recently, Baker (2011) pointed out teachers' lack of confidence with teaching pronunciation.

Analyses of English language textbooks also have shown that many pronunciation activities are decontextualized drills, focusing on practicing isolated sounds often without explanation of prosodic features (Breitkreutz et al., 2001; Derwing et al., 2012). Teachers who valued lingua franca accents did not teach it in the classroom, as it seemed impractical (Jenkins, 2005, 2007), or they did not feel confident (Baker, 2011). Little training for pronunciation pedagogy was mentioned as another reason why teachers are reluctant to teach pronunciation in North American contexts (e.g., Breitkreutz et al., 2001; Derwing, 2010; Saito & van Poeteren, 2012). Not much information is available about pronunciation instruction in the Korean context (teachers' beliefs, teaching materials, and teaching practices), but researchers have reported a prevalent expectation about English teachers' nativelike proficiency to teach English communicatively (e.g., Butler, 2004). Teachers' lack of confidence in their oral proficiency was often blamed for not teaching English communicatively. The assumption about nativelikeness has resulted in adding more language-related courses and study abroad programs through teacher (re)training in South Korea. These findings indicate the need to situate pronunciation within translingual competence, and to investigate ways of teaching effective communication strategies.

An emphasis on diversity in translingualism is also related to a current discussion about intelligibility as an alternative to standard pronunciation norms (e.g., Derwing & Munro, 2005). While investigating factors affecting intelligibility, researchers have begun to pay attention to suprasegmental as well as segmental features (Anderson-Hsieh et al., 1992; Cutler & Clifton, 1984), particularly lexical stress and vowel quality (Field, 2005). For sentence level prosody, Hahn (2004) showed how nuclear stress on content words influenced the extent to which native-English-speaking listeners understood L2 speech. Given the significance of prosodic features in communication, Chun (1988, 2002) stated that intonation should be taught from the earliest stage of foreign language instruction using authentic materials to enhance students' competence in discourse or lexical stress (Field, 2005). More recently, Müller (2013) recommended holistic competence in pronunciation as a means for communication, calling for educators' understanding of the shift in instructional goals and suggesting raising students' awareness in their assumptions about pronunciation, especially in contexts where students have limited exposure to the target language.

Methods

Responding to the need for integrating translingual practices into pronunciation teaching, this study first reports why the editor Talk-Talk-Hae-Young's transliterating practices were translingual, utilizing Korean, English, and other visual cues as resources. The following section examines thematic patterns in the practices to represent linguistic features more accessibly to a novice audience, focusing on mistakes that the editor made. Application users' responses to the editor's practices in the comments were analyzed as well, to understand both how segmental and suprasegmental information was delivered and users' strategies for negotiating meanings of given English phrases. These findings suggest implications for enhancing translingual pronunciation teaching with areas where teachers could pay attention for teaching and raising students' awareness of translingual/transcultural competence in monolingual contexts.

Data: The Editor's Posts and Users' Responses

In light of the literature, the editor's posts for English learning were micro contact zones within the application of which both the editor and application users were members. The number of users could not be specified, as only users who left their comments were included. The scope of the data in Pikicast was limited to Talk-Talk-Hae-Young's 73 posts published between 2015 and 2017. The 28 posts about vocabulary and weekly reviews were excluded, as they did not introduce any new transliterations. Out of 45, the 9 most recent posts were also exempted, as the editor changed the format and only provided phrases without transliterations. Therefore 36 posts with five idiomatic phrases each (for a total of 180 phrases) were counted as eligible intact data for this study. Data were first collected in 2016 and were revisited in 2017 after the editor stopped posting.

Data consisted of translingual practices by two parties: the editor who introduced the idiomatic English phrases with transliterations, and the users who responded to the posts through comments. With a focus on translingual practices, the two criteria for selecting the editor's phrases were the following: (a) the transliterations used various resources, more than one language and other visual cues, and (b) the phrases triggered active interaction among users, defined as more than 10 comments for each. Prioritized transliterations included those in which the editor had managed to put English into Korean syllable blocks that no standard word processing software (e.g., MS Word and Hangeul) allows. Comments that received more than 30 "likes" by other users were prioritized to understand users' reactions. Unlike the editor, users were unable to add foreign letters in Korean syllabic blocks, or to use any other visual features (e.g., underline or bold) in their comments. According to these criteria, below I report 13 phrases by the editor and 27 comments from users. All posts and comments can be located on the Pikicast website (www.pikicast.com) or its mobile version.

Analytic Framework and Data Analysis

Translingualism as a theory provided the analytic guidelines to examine the editor's and users' strategies that were used for communication. The open-coded translingual practices were analyzed for recurring patterns, using English primarily for segmental features (particularly for consonants), exaggerating and repeating transliterations that affected users' readability, or a lack of consistent criteria for transliteration, until no new ones appeared (Braun & Clarke, 2012). Linguistic information in transliterations was examined. This procedure examined the use of Korean and English, their functions, and linguistic mistakes in the editor's posts. Including users' responses to the editor's transliterations and mistakes not only supported the efficacy of the translingual practices for novice learners, but also informed some aspects that teachers need to take into consideration to prevent learners' confusion. Lastly, analyzing users' abilities and inabilities to point out linguistic errors not only provided pedagogical insights (e.g., avoiding errors and setting agreed-upon criteria) but also showed users' lack of translingual attitudes toward diversity in speech.

Interpreting functions of the data supported understanding of the findings. The four categories for meaning-making are *envoicing, interaction*, *recontextualization,* and *entextualization*, which respectively represent personal, contextual, social, and textual acts of translingual interaction (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 79). The first strategy, envoicing, is the act of speaking or writing in particular ways (language register, word choices, semantic distinctions, etc.). Writing their posts and comments, translinguals consciously or unconsciously disclose their strategic decisions about what resources to use, and when and how to use them effectively. Negotiation and meaning co-construction often occurred among users through comments, as the editor did not interact with users. Without assigned standardized positions, such as knowledge provider and knowledge recipients, users were constantly framing or recontextualizing their footings to make their claims, sometimes against the given

information from the editor. The lack of established norms in an anonymous online space also made users' interaction unconventional, as contextual cues were restricted to texts without the gestures or facial expressions of interlocutors. Many of the users' comments also actively recontextualized to clarify, negotiate, or rebut provided information about a foreign language and culture. Recontextualization was related to entextualization, a metastrategy monitoring "the spatiotemporal production processes of text and talk for voice and intelligibility" (p. 84) that users disclosed in their comments, referring to their own norms for communication. However, users' intentions in using entextualization strategies and decision-making processes had to be inferred from their word choices or ways of talking, due to the anonymity and instantaneity of interactions in the online space.

Findings

Thematic analysis found that the editor tended to (a) use English characters for consonants and pay less attention to vowels, (b) misrepresent pronunciation of particular consonants and vowels when s/he tried to imitate the sounds accurately, (c) occasionally, but not consistently, deliver prosodic features, and (d) not respond to the comments. The editor's practices elicited users' comments in four aspects: (a) responses to the translingual transliterations, both positive and negative; (b) responses to wrong information, such as misrepresentations of pronunciation in transliteration, context, or expression; (c) requests for further linguistic information, for example, prosodic information; and (d) sharing of personal experiences related to the given phrases and contexts.

The Editor's Translingual Practices

Table 1. An Overview of Selected Phrases with Transliterations

Selected phrases	Transliterations in Korean[3]	Transliterated back to English[4]
None of your excuses.	넌 윰뷰얼 익스큐싯스	nʌn ob-byu-eol ik-su-kyu-sis-su
Of all days to be late!	옾f얼 데이s 투비 래잍!	ʌp-f-eol de-i-s to-bi læ-it
Even you can't blow it!	이ⱴ 유 캐앤ㅌ 블로 잇!	i-vun yu kænt bul-lo it
Well, honey. I've seen worse.	웨엘, 호ㅓ어니. 압 v씬 워얼s	We-ɛl, hɔ-ʌ-ʌ-ni. ɑb-v-ssin wo-ɔl-s
Shouldn't we do something?	슈든 위 두우 썸ㅃ엥?	ʃu-dun wɥ du sʌm-th-iŋ
Thanks for everything.	th앵 ss 톨에 V R ㅣ th잉	θ æ- æŋ-s fɔl ɛ-vu-ri-th-iŋ
Is the restroom vacant?	이 s 더 뤠스트룸 ㅞ이컨ㅌ	i-s dɔ rwe-su-tu-rum vwe-i-keon-t
Could I get a receipt?	쿠다아이 게더 리쉽ㅌ?	ku-da-a-i gɛ-dʌ ri-ʃip-t
Please accept my apology.	플리이ㅈ 억쎕ㅍㅌ 마 a퓔로쥐	pul-li-i-z ʌk-ssep-p-t mʌ a-pʌl-lɔ-ʒi

---

[3] English letters were inserted into Korean syllabic blocks using a character editor.

[4] This table consulted NIKL's table comparing Korean and IPA symbols [국제 음성 기호와 한글 대조표] for transliterating Korean into English. Korean diphthongs that are not included in the table were transliterated following rules for writing Korean in the Roman alphabet [국어의 로마자 표기법]. Dashes were used to show Korean syllabic blocks in transliterations. English letters used in the editor's transliterations were bolded, and suprasegmentals (e.g., assimilations, linking, and reduced sounds) were underlined.

Features of Transliterations

First of all, the data established that application users shared one primary language, Korean. Although Pikicast was open to anyone who had access to the Internet, most of the content in the application was produced in Korean, and the editor Talk-Talk-Hae-Young's posts relied heavily on Korean to introduce the context and explain the phrases (visit HERE to see editor's posts). In the posts, the editor made limited use of English other than the target English phrases, adding only a few English letters in pronunciation transliterations. The subordination of English to Korean in a Korean application limited the audience to Korean speakers, but made the content broadly available within that group, including those with little knowledge of English. A noticeable *envoicing* strategy observed from the editor's posts was inserting a few English characters into Korean syllabic blocks in transliterations. Furthermore, from the level of sophistication in manipulating the language in posts, users could speculate that the editor was a Korean speaker rather than a speaker for whom Korean was an additional language. Later users' comments showing how users started questioning the authenticity of information supported this observation.

Crucial features that made transliterations translingual included breaking rules of grammar and transliteration of foreign words by the NIKL. Prioritizing the imitation of authentic sounds, the editor inserted English consonants that were nondistinguishable or nonexistent in Korean—*f, s, v, th*, and *r*—in Korean syllabic blocks. Typically, English consonants and stressed vowels were emphasized with an extra syllable as in *well* (웨엘), worse (워얼s), and *thanks* (th앵_ss). In contrast, the editor dropped reduced sounds such as final *t* in *can't, vacant, receipt, shouldn't* in transliteration, representing stressed and reduced sounds. These practices were not only appreciated by users for creativity, but also complimented for providing more authentic pronunciations, "native-like" in users' words, than general transliterations using unfamiliar symbols (see users' comments for *The grape touched the ground* in Table 2).

Inconsistency and Mistakes in Transliterations: A Need for Criteria

However, without consistency in transliteration criteria, the same translingual strategies undermined some users' trust in the information that the editor provided. For example, 익스큐싯스 (*excuses*) showed how the /s/ (or /ㅅ/) was unnecessarily repeated to emphasize the suffix *ses*. Likewise, in the two given phrases containing *of*, the *f* in *of all days to be late* and *None of your excuses* were both transliterated as /ㅍ/ in /옾/, one of the consonant equivalents for *f*: /ㅍ/ or /ㅂ/. If the editor had been following NIKL's suggestions, /ㅂ/ or /v/ would have been used for *f* as linguistically closer to /v/ in these phrases. The editor's use of two different consonants, /ㅂ/ and /ㅍ/ for /f/ in 옾*f*얼 as *of all,* and 옾*뷰*얼 as *of your,* also supported the inconsistencies in transliterations. Furthermore, users expressed that an extra consonant for *f* in *excuses, of all,* and *of your* complicated pronouncing transliterations (Table 3).

The editor's lack of precise linguistic knowledge resulted in making the same mistakes across the transliterations. The most common error was incorrect use of English letters for pairs of consonants that Korean does not differentiate or transliterate differently in relation to nearby sounds. Two examples were found in *Of all days to be late!* The *f* in *of* would have been better be transcribed as /v/, not as /f/, and the use of /s/ not /z/ for *s* in *days*, which also appeared in common words like *is*, *does*, and *was*. Impacts of mispronouncing these sounds might not be significant to intelligibility;

however, instructors have to assure that linguistic information in their materials is accurate, although they could discuss these sounds within intelligibility and translingual attitudes. Importantly, analysis of users' comments showed that these mistakes in transliterations signified the editor's lack of expertise in linguistics and altered their initial footing as an information provider. In some cases, repeated mistakes caused questioning of the efficacy of translingual practice.

The lack of consistency was observed in vowel transliterations, which could significantly affect users' intelligibility. The two different vowels in *all* /ɔ:l/ and /ər/ in *your* were transliterated as the same /얼/ (/eol/), probably because Korean vowels did not accommodate accurately distinguishing the target sounds. In addition, two occasions when the editor used English for vowels, *아ₑ 하를리 th 앵큐* (*I heartily thank you*) and *마ₑ 플레셔r* (*My pleasure*) showed wrong use of *e* to indicate /ɪ/ in /aɪ/. This mistake was not only linguistically problematic because it was wrong, but also pointless, as both pronunciation of *I* and *my* were less likely to confuse English students or cause communication breakdowns. In this case, use of English letters did not contribute to learning new sounds. For the same reason, using *a* for the initial position in *apology* was problematic, as it misrepresented the reduced vowel /ə/. Mistakes could mislead users to think that /e/ was a correct symbol for the sound, given that they were not pointed out by users and repeated in comments in which they corrected a wrong representation of the sound /ʒ/ in pleasure as /ㅅ/ (an equivalent of /s/). On the other hand, the same examples suggested the possibilities of delivering suprasegmental features, noted earlier as a critical area of pronunciation. For example, reduced sounds and natural linkages were observed in transliterating the two words in the phrases *of all, of your, could I,* and *get a* as one word. Other textual enhancements, such as the editor's use of smaller and bigger fonts for stress and content words also supported this possibility.

A Lack of Interaction with Users

Some users with linguistic knowledge pointed out some mistakes and supported the characterization of the editor as an amateur, which weakened the trustworthiness of the translingual practices and information from the posts. Disappointingly, without any communication with users, the editor missed opportunities to provide accurate information and to co-construct meaning with users. The low-stakes setting that enabled users' active participation was not fully utilized. Below, analysis of users' comments suggests how in educational settings, bringing learners' related experiences of using provided phrases or similar contexts into the classroom could initiate discussion about translingual awareness. Moreover, despite the benefits of providing translingual transliterations, the following section shows how providing incorrect information could devalue the editor's translingual practices. In consequence, the lack of the editor's interaction failed to resolve users' concerns about incorrect information, to elicit meaningful negotiation with users regarding using the phrases, and to discuss diverse and appropriate contexts as well as alternative expressions.

Users' Responses and Negotiation Strategies

This section reports two types of users' comments: responses to translingual practices, and meaning negotiation. Users' various negotiation strategies were observed across their responses to the editor's transliteration. Some users placed requests for incorporating more prosodic information in transliterations. Users also responded to mistakes, not limited to linguistic information. Active negotiation occurred when users questioned the editor's practices or the given information.

Perceived Benefits of Translingual Practices
Table 2. Positive Comments to the Translingual Practices[5]

Phrases [Transliteration]	Comments
It's all my fault. [잇ᄎ 어얼 마ₑ 펄ᄐ]	1. Oh my… I love how the pronunciation is transcribed… (laugh) it's so easy [to read] (121 Likes) 2. Simply reading from the transliteration makes me feel like a native speaker. (46 Likes)
Please accept my apology.	3. … The letters are so strange to my eyes, yet I can read all of them. (103 Likes) 4. Hangeul is amazing… it can be combined with English and still perfectly pronounced (35 Likes) 5. Reading from the pronunciation is fun
Thanks for everything.	6. Hangeul and the editor are amazing. I can read this alien language (550 Likes) 7. I found myself reading it aloud (147 Likes) 8. Pronunciation transliteration is so cool!!!! (83 Likes)
The grape touched the ground. [더 구뤠잎 텃칄 더 구롸아운]	9. 텃칄 더 구롸우운hahaha Hangeul is awesome hahahaha (270 Likes)
Of all days to be late!	10. Wow it's a phrase that I wouldn't have thought of based on literal translation (132 Likes)

Users' positive comments consisted of three themes, mainly responding to the nonstandard pronunciation transliterations. Table 2 represented that many users repeatedly expressed how unique the approach was and how much more readily these transliterations helped their pronunciation (1, 2, 4, 5) than did traditional transliterations. The user who wrote comment 2 mentioned that the way the editor utilized English letters helped him/her to sound like a native speaker. Inserting English letters into transliterations seemed to be effective when there were no exact equivalents of the sounds in Korean, and the users with only foundational knowledge in English pronunciation were able to read transliterations successfully. Along with expressing the pleasure of reading the novel transliterations, some users disclosed strong attachment to their alphabet, Hangeul (4, 6, 9). They praised both the language and the editor's translingual practice by saying, for example, "Hangeul is a great writing system" for transliterating foreign sounds effectively. These comments implied that the users perceived the transliterations as a Korean literacy practice, and the English alphabet as a supplementary resource. An implication from these comments is to use Korean with instructors'

---

[5] Translations were discussed with a bilingual speaker of Korean and English.

control over the number of target sounds in transliterations. It could be particularly beneficial for beginners who are new to the English sound system and the majority of learners who are not familiar with the phonetic symbols.

Responses to the Editor's Mistakes: Requests

Table 3. Negative Comments

Phrases	Comments
One-way, or round trip? [원웨 e O 촤 아운 트륍?]	11. Reading the English [phrase] is easier than reading the pronunciation transliteration. Why?
The grape touched the ground	12. Wonder whether it would make sense if I read from Korean…
Could I get a receipt?	13. I don't want to blame the editor, but… Why don't you double check before publishing? Using the phonetic alphabet might be better than using Korean for pronunciation (7 Likes) 14. Agreed, agreed (with comment 13). This is not the first time [I saw a mistake]… Please just use the phonetic alphabet, dear editor.
Please throw in a few more [플리이즈 th 뤄 이너 ㅠ 모어 r]	15. Who says this in the States... Don't say it, your server will give you a weird look (8 Likes) 16. Is this [phrase] really practical? It is nice [of you] to introduce good phrases, but [I] would like to learn useful idiomatic expressions for daily life. (29 Likes)

　　　　Table 2 showed how the joy of reading creative transliteration and feeling proud of their own writing system were shared among some users. However, these positive comments disappeared as users got accustomed to the practice and pointed out mistakes. Table 3 shows comments of a few users who were disturbed by a lack of fluency and the editor's mistakes, which invoked their requests for clarification or correction. Some suggested alternatives. Among the comments that disapproved of exaggerating sounds or mixing two alphabets, the author of comment 11 questioned the efficacy of the transliteration, saying that it was harder to read than the English phrase. Comment 12 showed how the lack of reading fluency in the transliterations made users question translingual practices or, more significantly, distrust the editor's information (13, 16, 18 below). Even more directly, comments 13 and 14 called for adherence to traditional transcription symbols, demonstrating their knowledge of linguistics, which was *recontextualizing* to claim an advantageous footing for their claim. Some users (13, 14, 16), following their general understanding of communication and rhetorical norms, mitigated their challenges with such courteous comments as *I don't want to blame you, please, might be better* and the use of ellipses. Many comments were not mitigated to the same extent, which was not uncommon in online contexts, less concerned about a risk of losing or threatening face. A user's persuasive intent for improvement was shown in comment 14, *It is not the first time,* implying that the editor repeatedly made mistakes across posts. Instead of letting the mistakes go or reprimanding the editor, the user asked for accurate information (also comments 13, 16, 17). These comments suggested that there were users who were returning to the posts, acknowledging the value of the information but bothered by

inconsistent translingual practices and linguistic errors. They further suggest implications for adopting translingual practices in the classroom—a need to develop criteria for transliteration and for mistakes, for example.

Correcting the Mistakes and a Lack of Users' Translingual Attitudes
Table 4. Comments to Negotiate

Phrases	Comments
Could I get a receipt?	17. I used to pronounce it 뤼십트 (/rɪˈsiːpt/), but my speaking teacher corrected me yesterday: it's 뤼시-트 (/rɪˈsiːt/). The *p* seems not pronounced (110 Likes) 18. [You] would have easily found that the *p* is silent here, if you had googled it. You should have checked (44 Likes)
I've had it!	19. *I've had enough* sounds better… (81 Likes) 20. It should be *I've had enough. I've had it* only means *I've done it.* ☺ (50 Likes)
My mind is a blank.	21. *My mind went blank* sounds better here. *My mind is a blank* sounds like an international student who learned it from a textbook. (70 Likes) 22. *My mind is blank, my mind went blank, I've gone blank* are correct. *My mind is a blank* sounds awkward. (2 Likes)
Please throw in a few more.	23. I recommend not saying this… [They] will ask for a larger tip… or not give you your change back for giving *a few more.* I've experienced it… (67 Likes) 24. [We] don't say this in the US… [Americans] don't give you extras. (48 Likes) 25. [We] don't say this in Australia, either…
You're boring.	26. This is rude. It may hurt your friend's feelings. Speakers of the UK and the US are surprisingly delicate too. (62 Likes) 27. Um… well… some of the previous expressions might be okay based on the relationship and context, but this one can hurt feelings for sure. It is a country where people respect each other even if they're close… Even friends don't say something as blunt as *You look so fat. You should go on a diet.* (49 Likes)

Table 4 shows less common comments that corrected the editor's mistakes. Three types of errors that users addressed were (a) pronunciation errors (17, 18); (b) faulty expressions (19–22); and (c) culturally inappropriate expressions (23–27). In these comments, users employed various interactional and recontextualization strategies to support their corrections, involving active negotiation of their footings from the initial one-directional knowledge flow. Such active attempts at negotiation were possible due to the lack of hierarchy in the online space. The most common strategy was to express intimate knowledge of the target culture(s), and less frequently to refer to knowledge of English linguistics (phonetics and grammar) or familiarity with accepted transcribing methods. Strategies used to negotiate showed users' lack of translingual attitudes toward diversity, based on the

prevalent monolingual framework. The users' responses reflected how a nontraditional approach could provoke strong resistance. It has to be carefully implemented in formal educational settings.

First, the most frequently cited mistakes were the wrong usage of consonants, /s/ and /ㅅ/ for the /z/, /ㅈ/, or /ʒ/ sounds in *It's my pleasure* and *It was nothing*. Likewise, comments 17 and 18 pointed out that *p* in *receipt* should not be pronounced. One strategy was to borrow the voice of an authority, the speaking teacher of the author of 17, who made the same mistake until recently. These direct corrections from users appeared least frequently among comments as they required linguistic knowledge. The same reason could explain users' inability to address mispronunciation of vowels. Second, a few grammatically flawless phrases were nevertheless criticized for being contextually inappropriate: *I've had it!* and *My mind is a blank.*[6] The authors of 19 and 20, claiming that the first did not make sense as an expression of impatience, revealed their lack of knowledge that *I've had it* is a widely used phrase to express exasperation. Users' negation also reflected their lack of a translingual attitude, refusing phrases they had not encountered or used before. The way of rejecting the given phrases as not used in some countries indicated users' monolingual attitudes toward spoken English. In relation to a desire to sound like a native speaker (from Table 2), not like an international student, these comments supported a need to raise English learners' translingual sensitivity. Comments 21 and 22 were similar examples of negotiating the one given, by offering alternative phrases.

The third pattern, negating the entire expression when they deemed it inappropriate to say, also disclosed users' monolingual perspectives. Users pointed out the inappropriateness of saying *Please throw in a few more*, displaying their knowledge about sales practices and the tip culture (23, 24), which is foreign to many Koreans. This occasion suggested a need to contextualize the phrase for learning idiomatic phrases, discussing contexts in which price negotiation might or might not be acceptable. Here, sharing personal experiences of using the phrase abroad (23) was one way to convince other users not to use it. Comments 24 and 25 also referred to their observations of what was typical in the US and Australia, implying their residence in the countries to take the advantage in footing and to prove validity of what the users said at the same time. To support their claims, users mentioned the US most frequently, followed by the UK, Australia, Canada, or specific cities (e.g., New York). The pattern might reflect an assumption about English, not limited to pronunciation, accepting those from certain countries as standards. The users disclosed a rigid standpoint towards phrases that did not sound correct but which could be still understandable.

Comments 26 and 27 also referenced their familiarity with English-speaking culture in their responses to the most controversial phrase, *You're boring*, derived from the *Tell your boring friend to shut up* posting. Claiming that this phrase was inappropriate in any context, users negotiated misuses of the phrase by sharing their understanding of communicative norms and conventions among English speakers, so other users who learned the phrase from the posts could avoid possible conflicts. Although what "speakers of the UK and the US [영미권 사람들] are surprisingly delicate" meant (26) needed clarification, this example showed how users negotiated meaning and learned from each other without relying on the editor. This vague phrase, by limited-English speakers from two contexts, was another example showing the users' biased understanding of legitimate English-speaking contexts, although such communicative norms could be applicable to broader contexts. Likewise, comment 27 brought up two general elements for communication across cultures, relationships, and context, but

---

[6] Use of these phrases was controversial among the four readers of this manuscript, who had different opinions on contextual correctness.

still implicitly referred to "a country" without explanation. Even in these short comments, users showed limited understanding of English-speaking contexts, which they tried to overgeneralize. This strategy that users employed to elicit other users' agreements, referring to personal experiences in countries or cities that they considered legitimate representatives of English-speaking contexts, indicated monolingual standards accepted by users.

Discussion

The findings showed the potential of adopting translingual transliterations using learners' first and target languages, and other visual enhancements for teaching intelligibility and varieties of English. Analysis of users' responses supported the efficacy of the translingual approach to deliver segmental and suprasegmental aspects, and informed areas that teachers can enhance and avoid. Importantly, users' preferences for the varieties of English spoken in particular countries suggested a need to renegotiate existing conceptions about standard English and its speakers as global citizens, and raise awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity. It is important to note that the primary purpose of this paper is not to invent other rules or symbols for sounds that already exist, but to encourage instructors' translingual attitudes regarding flexibility with using available resources and acknowledging their learners' unique resources to facilitate language learning. Informed by translingual and multilingual frameworks, this investigation suggests a way to teach pronunciation easily for teachers and students based on the observations of informal learning in the online space.

Translingual Approach to Teaching Intelligibility

To Deliver Segmental Features for Beginners

This study illustrates how using first and target alphabets in transliterating pronunciation of sentences could be a pedagogically effective alternative to the traditionally used word-level pronunciation in teaching materials. Using students' first language as primary and the target language as supplementary, this practice may be particularly advantageous for beginners, as it does not require advanced linguistic knowledge or specialized symbols, nor an extra pronunciation class, which many current curricula cannot accommodate (e.g., Munro & Derwing, 2006). A strength of using both languages in transliteration is the immediate representation of accurate pronunciation, which is important in learning English, in which few letters are always pronounced the same. In elementary school, teachers can start with adding a few English letters strategically in transliterations written in the students' first alphabet, to highlight target sounds, for example, *th*, *r* and *l*, English-specific phonemes of which many L2 speakers are aware but find difficult to pronounce. To decide sounds, teachers have to consult with their curriculum or teachers' guidebook. As students get used to English letters and multiple corresponding sounds, teachers can draw students' attention to the patterns of how the same English letters are pronounced differently in different environments, as s pronounced as /ʒ/ in pleasure, f as /v/ and s as /z/ in *of all days*. Using sound symbols in transliterations could be a good way to draw students' attention to pronunciation rules.

To Deliver Suprasegmental Features

This practice suggests presenting suprasegmental features, which are often overlooked in general English classrooms and teaching materials (e.g., Baker, 2011; Breitkreutz et al., 2001) despite their impact on intelligibility. The editor's ways of showing stressed/reduced vowels in words, blends, linking, and assimilation as linkages *of your*, *of all*, and *could I* into one word (Table 1) exemplify this potential. Flexible transliterations allowing multiple alphabets and visual cues could assist learners to be aware of prosodic features that could improve their intelligibility and enable them to communicate

with diverse interlocutors effectively. Thus, languages, sound symbols, and visual cues can be used strategically to address how sounds are pronounced depending on other letters in a word. What the editor did, incorporating simple typographical cues such as different font sizes and bold facing to represent stress, intonation blends, and linking can draw attention to stressed or reduced sounds. Likewise, teachers may discuss vowels explicitly for stress patterns for multisyllabic words (Cutler & Clifton, 1984; Field, 2005; Levis & Barriuso, 2012). Additionally, teachers can make students transliterate familiar loanwords that are pronounced differently in English and Korean (body, lobster, battery, coyote, etc.) as a classroom activity. The practice can address prosodic errors that Korean English speakers commonly make with multisyllabic words or phrases, pointing out how their L1 habits affect L2 pronunciation.

To Provide Accurate Information and to Negotiate Criteria with Students

The editor's mistakes observed in this study can be sample materials to discuss common pronunciation mistakes, but also suggest a need to ensure that all the information is accurate to avoid the challenges reported. Users' criticisms of incorrect information highlight the importance of accuracy, not only to save teachers from being accused of lacking knowledge, but also to prevent students' resistance to translingual practices. Some users' negative responses to their inability to read the transliterations fluently lead to another suggestion to make transliterations legible without the need to look at the given English sentences, which is to remove reiterations of the same sounds and exaggeration of stressed vowels. Teachers might bring up the mistakes of the editor to negotiate transliteration rules with students, which can serve as training in navigating resources and developing their own strategies for language learning (for example, consulting guidelines for transliterating foreign languages from a national institute like the NIKL). Instead of prescribing the rules from the NIKL or teachers, teachers can talk about similar sounds that are transliterated the same in Korean (e.g., / ㄹ / for l & r, and / ㅈ / for z, ʒ, ʥ, & ʤ) and discuss possible impacts of wrong pronunciation on communication. By explaining their decisions, students can evaluate the effectiveness of their own and others' reasoning and rules while developing strategies for intelligible pronunciation.

Other expected learning outcomes of the negotiation activity include encouraging students' interactions in class. However, inviting students to participate in translingual practices may require teachers' significant efforts to model and scaffold (see Canagarajah, 2001, 2011; Michael-Luna & Canagarajah, 2007). There is still a need for empirical research on translingual practices, yet modeling and scaffolding have been suggested as effective, especially for students who are accustomed to a monolingual perspective in a linguistically homogeneous context like Korea. For example, asking dialogic questions (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 415) about students' choices can be ways to scaffold. Teachers also need to frame their classrooms as safe spaces, in which students feel free to converse and collaborate (Canagarajah, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010) in settings where students are normally assigned defined roles as knowledge-recipients. Reflecting on the editors' creativity and inaccuracies as opportunities to elicit users' interaction, teachers may try similar patterns to invite students to begin meaning negotiation, for example, cultural understanding for *You're boring* and *Please throw in a few more*. Discussing such idiomatic expressions as communicative tasks (Canagarajah, 2011) with diverse interlocutors, students understand why the same expressions can be culturally appropriate in some contexts and inappropriate in others.

Translingual Approach to Raise Students' Translingual Attitudes

Users' comments that reflect monolingual orientations further suggest the need to discuss the nature and purpose of conversational situations that are not limited to some countries. From a monolingual perspective, the main objective of teaching speaking is to instill (what is perceived as) standard pronunciation, assuming their interlocutors carry particular pronunciations. By implication, it makes people judge their and others' speech according to its proximity to that standard. This approach, reinforced and consumed worldwide through the pervasiveness of particular cultural aspects of the US in the public media (Lippi-Green, 2012), was observed during analysis. The impact of what Pratt (1991) dubbed "the transnationalized metropolis of the United States" (p. 37) was evident in the editor's intention of creating the posts for learning idiomatic English phrases and users' satisfaction with speaking like native speakers. It raised the question of why knowing those expressions in English so as to emulate nativelike accents was of value to users of this entertainment application. Some users' tendencies also supported their lack of translingual attitudes, referring to particular English-speaking countries as the trustworthy source of linguistic and cultural knowledge. These claims of knowledgeability revealed not only users' strong preferences for American and Anglocentric accents but also the presupposed privilege attached to such English.

Informed by the perspective of translingual competence and intelligibility, this observation suggests that pronunciation teaching needs to address how Korean English learners evaluate authenticity in English pronunciation and perceive legitimate English-speaking contexts. Deconstructing learning goals aligning with the reality of global English language diversity (Chan, 2016; Creese et al., 2014; Doerr, 2009) could initiate discussions about intelligible pronunciation in class. In this way, translingual practices also accommodate recent emphases in English education in many countries on promoting critical thinking and preparing students to communicate with diverse speakers in the world (e.g., ACTFL, 2006; Korean Ministry of Education, 2015; MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2007). Policymakers, teachers, and students themselves need to develop their own translingual lenses, reflecting on existing standards for pronunciation and how well their materials and pedagogical approaches represent the realities of the global communicative contexts (Kramsch, 2012). With such attitudes, learners could respond to various versions of English differently, rather than judging them as wrong.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

I would like to acknowledge methodological limitations of this report. With an inability to intervene in posting production and interactions in the application, the data represented authentic informal practices of English learning, yet missed "participants' perspectives." Listening to Korean English learners' perspectives on these kinds of practices and mistakes could have provided meaningful data to discuss the potential of translingual practices for learning. In the same sense, collecting users' or learners' oral production of transliterations could provide evidence for the effectiveness of the translingual practice, measuring how their pronunciation and intelligibility have improved. Furthermore, the informal context of this paper requires careful planning by teachers, to offer accurate information and to elicit active participation in the classroom. Therefore, future research is expected to include various data types from English learners, both in-depth responses to transliterations and spoken production of transliterations, as well as investigating classroom practices about how adopting this co-constructive translingual approach influences students' intelligibility and their translingual attitudes.

Conclusion

This study analyzed practices of informal English learning and made suggestions for pronunciation instruction in educational settings. It addressed the less studied area of teaching pronunciation in relation to developing students' general competence for interactions in various English contact zones. The findings suggested the need for teaching practices that emphasize key features of intelligibility in specific contexts rather than their approximation to native speaker standards. Using students' first language as a primary resource for pronunciation instruction could be one way to make rich linguistic information accessible to novices, an area of teaching which is often marginalized due to teachers' reluctance and lack of confidence, and residual attitudes toward the prestige of native-speaking standards. Instead of relying on traditional approaches such as chanting in response to audio materials and drills focusing on producing individual sounds and words, co-constructed translingual activities could bring students' attention to both segmental and suprasegmental features of speech, which are necessary for their intelligibility. Negotiation and interaction around the practices are expected to develop students' ability to utilize resources for learning. Lastly, given the current status of English as a major means of communication globally, this paper revealed a need to raise students' translingual awareness of the broad diversity of English speakers.

Acknowledgement

Disclosure Statement

References

ACTFL. (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century.* Allen Press.

Anderson-Hsieh, J., Johnson, R., & Koehler, K. (1992). The relationship between native speaker judgements of nonnative pronunciation and deviance in segmentals, prosody and syllable structure. *Language Learning, 42*, 529-555.

Baker, A. (2011). Discourse prosody and teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *TESOL Journal, 2*, 263-292. doi:10.5054/tj.2011.259955.

Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S., & Spotti, M. (2012). Endangering multilingualism. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta, & T. Räisänen (Eds.), *Dangerous multilingualism: Northen perspectives on order, purity, and normality* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Breitkreutz, J. A., Derwing, T., & Rossiter, M. (2001). Pronunciation teaching practices in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal, 19*(1), 51-61.

Canagarajah, S. (2001). The fortunate traveler: Shuttling between communities and literacies by economy class. In D. Belcher & U. Connor (Eds.), *Reflections on multiliterate lives* (pp. 23-37). Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 410-417.

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

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., Goodwin, J., & Grinder, B. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation* (2nd edition). Cambridge University Press.

Chan, J. Y. (2016). A multi-perspective investigation of attitudes towards English accents in Hong Kong: Implications for pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(2), 285-313.

Chun, D. (1988). Teaching intonation as part of communicative competence: Suggestions for the classroom. *Teaching German, 21*(1), 81-88.

Chun, D. (2002). *Discourse intonation in L2: From theory and research to practice*. Benjamins.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning. *Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103-115.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Takhi, J. (2014). The ideal 'native speaker' teacher: Negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 98*(4), 937-951.

Cutler, A., & Clifton, C. (1984). The use of prosodic information in word recognition. In H. Bouma & D. Bouwhuis (Eds.), *Attention and performance X* (pp. 183-196). Lawrence Erlabum.

Derwing, T. M. (2010). Utopian goals for pronunciation teaching. *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 24-37). Iowa State University.

Derwing, T. M., Diepenbroek, L., & Foote, J. (2012). How well do general-skills ESL textbooks address pronunciation? *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(1), 22-45.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 1-16.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 379-397.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Doerr, N. M. (Ed.). (2009). *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects*. Walter de Gruyter.

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal, 100*, 19-47.

Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: The role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 399-423.

Foote, J. A., Holtby, A., & Derwing, T. (2011). Survey of the teaching of pronunciation in adult ESL programs in Canada, 2010. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*(1), 1-23.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Blackwell.

Guion, S. G. (2005). Knowledge of English word stress patterns in early and late Korean-English bilinguals. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*, 503-533.

Hahn, L. D. (2004). Primary stress and intelligibility: Research to motivate the teaching of suprasegmentals. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 201-223.

Hall, S. (1991). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization, and the world system* (pp. 19–41). University of Minnesota Press.

Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A bilingual lens. *Theory into Practice, 51*(4), 239-247.

Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 535-543.

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

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Koehler, R. (2010). *Hangeul: Korea's unique alphabet.* Seoul Selection.

Korean Ministry of Education. (2015). *2015 개정 영어 교육 과정 [2015 Revised English education currirulum].* Ministry of Education.

Kramsch, C. (2012). Theorizing translingual/transcultural competence. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 15-31). Heinle.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 1,* 296-311.

Lee, J. W. (2016). Beyong translingual writing. *College English, 79*(2), 174-195.

Levis, J. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 369-377.

Levis, J., & Barriuso, T. A. (2012). Nonnative speakers' pronunciation errors in spoken and read English. *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 187-194). Iowa State University.

Li, W. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39,* 9-30.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

MacDonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation - views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect, 17*(3), 3–18.

Michael-Luna, S., & Canagarajah, S. (2007). Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4,* 55-77.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession,* 234–245.

Müller, M. (2013). Conceptualizing pronunciation as part of translingual/transcultural competence: New impulses for SLA research and the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(2), 213-229.

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning, 45*(1), 73-97.

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. (2006). The functional load principle in ESL pronunciation instruction: An exploratory study. *System, 34*(4), 520-531.

Murphy, J. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *System, 42*(1), 258-269.

National Institute of Korean Language, The. (n.d.). *How to write foreign languages in Korean.* Retrieved from National Institute of Korean Language. https://www.korean.go.kr/front/page/pageView.do?page_id=P000105&mn_id=97

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession,* 33-40.

Saito, K. (2012). Effects of instruction on L2 pronunciation development. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(4), 842-854.

Saito, K., & van Poeteren, K. (2012). Pronunciation-specific adjustment strategies for intelligibility in L2 teacher talk: Results and implications of a questionnaire study. *Language Awareness, 21*(4), 1-17.

Sohn, H.-M. (1999). *The Korean language.* Cambridge University Press.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39,* 9-30.

Yoo, E. (2015, Feb 5). *Social media curation platform PikiCast appeals with selected content.* Retrieved from TechNode: http://technode.com/2015/02/05/soc.