Macquarie University PURE Research Management System

This is the author version of an article published as:

Joo, S. J., Chik, A., & Djonov, E. (2024). From my parents' language to my language: Understanding language ideologies of young Australian Korean heritage language learners at the primary and secondary school level. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(2), 147-160.

© 2021. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* on 12/01/2021, available online https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1871359

It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

From My Parents' Language to My Language: Understanding Language Ideologies of Young Australian Korean Heritage Language Learners at the Primary and Secondary School Level

Abstract

The increasing influx into Australia of (im)migrants whose first language is not English has made Australia linguistically more diverse than ever. Despite this, Australia remains a strongly Anglocentric nation, and migrants, in response, tend to abandon their heritage languages (HL) and shift to English relatively quickly. Korean migrants in Australia buck this trend, as they show a relatively high level of language maintenance. The Australian Korean community, nevertheless, experiences a language shift to English among different generations, and a sharp decline in the rate of high school students enrolled in Korean community language schools.

The present study expands existing accounts of HL maintenance in Australia. Specifically, drawing on interviews with six Korean-speaking children, it compares the views about the HL of primary and secondary school students. In line with language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard,1998), data analysis and interpretation employ positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990). A key finding is that their ideologies around the HL vary by school age. The comparison also suggests that their language ideologies are associated with the domains where they practise their HL, and the ways they position themselves. The study contributes to a dynamic understanding of multilingualism and HL education in a multicultural society.

Key words: Heritage language, Korean Australian children, language ideologies, positioning identity

From My Parents' Language to My Language: Understanding Language Ideologies of Young Australian Korean Heritage Language Learners at the Primary and Secondary School Level

The increasing influx into Australia of immigrants whose first language is not English has made multilingualism in Australian society flourish. Australians speak more than 300 languages at home (ABS, 2016). Of these, more than 150 are migrant languages, resulting from immigration from diverse source countries (Chik, Benson, Forrest & Falloon, 2019). While they are an immensely valuable resource both for individuals and for society (Chik et al., 2019; Mu, 2014), such languages are overall in a vulnerable position. Indeed, despite Australia's linguistic diversity, English is the only language spoken in 79% of all Australian homes (ABS, 2016). Migrant languages, at the same time, show high rates of intergenerational transfer loss (Karidakis & Arunachalam, 2016). In particular, secondary school students' plummeting enrolments in community language schools suggest that the language shift to English may be increasing as children of immigrant families transfer from primary to secondary school (Moloney, 2018). Korean migrants in Australia buck this trend, as they show a relatively high level of language maintenance (Forrest, Benson & Siciliano, 2018). The Australian Korean community, nevertheless, experiences a language shift to English among different generations (Shin & Jung, 2016), and a sharp decline in the rate of high school students enrolled in Korean community language schools (KEC, 2018).

To advance our understanding of language shift among children of immigrant families, we need to unearth the sociolinguistic dynamics of their communities. The present study takes a step in this direction as it presents the accounts of children of Korean migrants in Australia. Specifically, it compares the views of primary and secondary school students through the lenses of language ideologies (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002; Kroskrity, 2004;

Woolard,1998) and positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Focusing on six Korean-speaking Australian children, this study takes a qualitative approach to explore the languages they use, the value they assign to different languages, and the language ideologies and identity positions underpinning their reported linguistic practices. The study thus subscribes to the understanding that language ideologies are rarely about language alone (Woolard,1998), rather, they are associated with broader social structures, aspects of identity and other demographic variables such as school age (Kroskrity, 2004; Leeman, 2012). This study is guided by the following research questions:

(1) How do the language ideologies of Korean Australian primary school children compare with those of Korean Australian secondary school students?

(2) How are school-age Korean Australians' language ideologies associated with the ways they use the Korean language, and the ways they position themselves?

Young HL Learners and Their Language Ideologies

While no singular term refers to migrant languages reflecting their complex situations (Little, 2019), in Australia they are often called 'community languages' (Clyne, 1991, p. 3). This study, however, adopts the term 'heritage language' (HL) and follows the definition proposed by Valdés (2001, 2005), due to its global acceptance. In line with Valdés' definition, we consider a HL as any minority language to which migrants and children of migrants have an ethnolinguistic affiliation, where English is the majority language. Young HL learners are those who are raised in a home where a HL is spoken, and often speak English as a dominant language, with varying degree of proficiency in their HLs.

Since a HL is frequently assumed to be used only within a minority group, its speakers often shift to English, and assign relational, multiple and even complex values to their HL. In understanding their perspectives on HLs, the notion of language ideologies has been usefully applied in the field of sociolinguistics. Language ideologies are social constructs that reflect historical roles, economic values, political power and social functions of a particular language (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002; Woolard, 1998). They are language speakers' evaluative perceptions of a language and language practices, based on their beliefs and assumptions about the social utility, power and value of a language in a given society (Kroskrity, 2004). In the field of HL studies, language ideologies are among the most important predictors of what language would be chosen, maintained and valued (Leeman, 2012). Given the accelerated shift to English by young generations (Karidakis & Arunachalam, 2016), research into the role of young HL speakers' language ideologies can help understand and counteract these shifts. Most existing studies on HL ideologies, however, have focused on migrant parents' ideologies, as Wilson (2020) reminds us, reflecting an academic view of children as passive recipients of adult influence (e.g., Jang, 2020).

Some recent research has examined the role of young HL speakers' ideologies around their HLs, to understand their choice of which language to maintain and value. Mu (2014), for example, explored adult children of Chinese migrants in Australia, drawing insights from Bourdieu's (1986) theory which relates a language to symbolic (e.g., source of pride), social (e.g., a means of contacting others), and economic capital (e.g., for future career). In Mu's mixed-method research, Chinese speakers' beliefs about the benefits (symbolic, social, and cultural) brought about by their HL were positively correlated with their HL proficiency. Focusing on a Korean-speaking primary child in the United States, Song's (2016) ethnographic study suggested that the child showed signs of internalising the language

ideology endorsed by her school and parents, that is the ideology of English as a more legitimate language. Song's critical analysis of family discourse concluded that such ideology reinforced the participant's view of her HL as a less valuable language than English. Turning her attention to secondary school students, Kim (2017) interviewed seven Korean speakers in the United States. Kim concluded that adolescents held varied perspectives on their HL, depending on the experience of using their HL. The more actively they participated in Korean-speaking communities (e.g., family, friends of Korean heritage), the higher value they assigned to the language. In contrast, adolescents who did not actively practise their HL tended to be less positive in HL learning. Most recently, Wilson (2020) investigated French-speaking HL learners in childhood and adolescence in the UK, drawing on interviews, observations and language portraits. In her findings, regardless of their levels of positive attitude towards the HL, all participants reported that they preferred speaking English, based on pragmatism (e.g., higher grade in school assessment). While her sample included a broader age range, Wilson did not consider whether and how young HL speakers' ideas about languages are associated with schooling age.

So far, existing research has sporadically described the language ideologies held by HL speakers of different ages. The complexities of young HL learners' views about languages, however, require a more detailed discussion including a comparison of primary and secondary students. Alternatively, a few researchers have drawn on the data collected from a HL speaker in different times from childhood to adulthood (e.g., Worthy, Nuñez & Espinoza, 2016), or compared language ideologies circulating in primary and secondary schools (e.g., Allard, Mortimer, Gallo, Link & Wortham, 2014). However, further research with children and adolescents is needed in order to compare concurrent language ideologies in the two groups, from social, psychological, and relational perspectives.

Young HL Speakers and Their Identity

Along with language ideologies, HL scholars have extended their focus to explore the ways in which HL speakers' experiences with a HL relate to their sense of themselves. This line of research builds on sociolinguistic accounts of language learning which show that language learning is a social practice in which identities are negotiated (Norton, 2016); languages contribute to structuring how their learners perceive the world (Kroskrity, 2004); and learning a new language, thus, involves taking on new ways of being (Canagarajah, 2004). In addition, HL scholarship has highlighted the multifaceted and dynamic aspects of identity, as Hornberger and Wang (2008) note that "the notion that there are multiple selves/identities, which are situated and contextually negotiated, contested, shaped, and reshaped, becomes central in the learning of a HL" (p. 7).

Adopting a sociocultural approach, recent empirical studies have examined young HL learners' identity. Kim (2020) surveyed and interviewed 10 Korean-speaking young adults in the United States, and revealed Korean as a HL plays a critical role in constructing their identity. Koshiba (2020) focused on Japanese HL speakers in Australia. Drawing on interviews with three secondary school students, Koshiba discussed the ways in which they performed their ethnic identity in a HL class. The study concluded that the teenagers aligned, or not, the HL with their ethnic identity, depending on whether they valued the language for educational and career aspirations. Along this line, more research is needed to understand the reciprocal relationship between younger HL speakers' identity and their language ideologies around their HLs.

Young HL Speakers and Their Positioning

Some scholars have explored the ways language ideologies of young HL speakers are informed by their identity, particularly through the lens of positioning theory. The theory concerns ways in which individuals gain or negotiate access to rights and duties to perform particular kinds of meaningful actions, by assigning positions to themselves or others in a social episode (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & Moghaddam, 2003; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). The theory offers a triangle, which consists of positions, storylines, and speech acts, as a heuristic to explicate the manner in which social episodes are enacted across time. Storylines are loose clusters of narrative conventions that shape the unfolding of social episodes. Actors in storylines can position themselves and/or others; positions are clusters of rights and duties that actors in particular storylines perform. Speech acts are information conveyed, including not only what was said and done, but also how it was said and done. An essential goal of the theory is to highlight discursive practices that allow certain groups of individuals to perform, or inhibit them from performing, certain actions. The theory aims to accomplish this goal through a study of positions (e.g., social status, personal attributes or abilities) as well as of the social force of what is being said in discursive practices (e.g., discourse).

So far, few researchers have incorporated positioning theory into studies of young HL learners' language ideologies to investigate the way their positions shape their rationale for using or learning a HL. In her ethnographic research with a Spanish-speaking teenager in the United States, Abdi (2011) found that the focal student was discursively positioned as non-Hispanic in a high school Spanish class, due to a circulating ideology at school placing importance on oral fluency as a criterion for being a HL speaker. Abdi concluded that such ideology hindered the student from recognising her HL competence and actively practising

her HL skills in class. More recently, Seals (2018) used interviews with and language portraits drawn by two Russian-speaking primary children in the United States to illustrate that being positioned as knowledgeable users of the HL makes children more likely to develop a positive stance towards their HL. Combining the two constructs of positioning and language ideologies, Abdi (2011) and Seals (2018) described how a young HL speaker's position can enable or constrain HL learning. They, however, did not consider the way young HL speakers position themselves within the broad social context, but focused their attention on the way HL speakers are positioned by others, particularly in a school context. More research is thus required into the more dynamic relation between the positioning and language ideologies of young HL speakers.

Overall, our review of the relevant literature reveals several gaps in HL research. Firstly, few studies have compared HL-speaking primary and secondary students from the point of view of language ideologies and identity. In addition, there is a demand for research into the ways young HL speakers' self-positioning within the broad contexts is related to their language ideologies around HLs. As relevant research conducted outside the United States has been limited, more empirical evidence also needs to emerge from other multilingual contexts, such as Australia. Oriented towards bridging these gaps, the present research focuses on Korean HL speakers in Australia. The study contributes to a dynamic understanding of multilingualism and HL education in a multicultural society.

The Study

The present study adopts a theoretical framework guided by the constructs of language ideologies and positioning. Combining these theoretical perspectives is pertinent for this research, as HL speakers' views on languages can be made intelligible by analysing the

ways they take up positions within a multilingual context. Specifically, one's self-positioning in relation to languages shapes one's agency by implicitly limiting or allowing certain actions related to language using/learning, and the position reflects a cluster of beliefs about who a person is as a learner or a speaker of a particular language. Drawing on the two theoretical perspectives of language ideologies and positioning, this study employs a qualitative approach to gain in-depth understanding of young HL learners' lived experiences and perspectives on their HL.

Korean as a HL in Australia

Korean is one of the fastest growing migrant languages in Australia. Despite its relatively short history of immigration, the number of Korea-born diaspora more than doubled from 39,529 in 2001 to 98,776 in 2016. According to data across Australian censuses, Koreans are the least likely group to shift to English-only and show relatively high maintenance of HL compared to other ethnic groups (Forrest, Benson & Siciliano, 2018; Karidakis & Arunachalam, 2016), with 89.3% of Korea-born people reporting they speak Korean as a main language at home (SBS, 2018). The Australian Korean community, nevertheless, experiences language shift across different age groups. A particularly noticeable language shift may arguably be reflected in the fact that the rate of students enrolled in Korean community language schools drops when they reach secondary school. To illustrate, in 2018, there were 1790 primary students and only 312 secondary school students enrolled in Korean community language school programs in New South Wales (KEC, 2018), the Australian state in which the present study is located. In this regard, the Korean Australian community offers a relatively unexplored research context with the potential to compare the ways primary and secondary students perceive Korean as a HL.

Participants

This article presents findings from interviews conducted as part of a larger study on language ideologies of Korean migrant families in Sydney. The study began with a parent survey (n=300), which invited parents to express an interest in participating in the next, qualitative component of the study, together with their school-aged children. Out of the parent-child dyads who expressed an interest in this, two groups of children were purposefully selected in order to compare the language ideologies of primary and secondary students: (1) eight primary children (Grade 4-6), and (2) eight secondary students (Grade 7-9). To form a comparable sample, as suggested by Duff (2019), the participants had to meet the following criteria; (a) children whose parents spoke Korean as a main language at home, (b) children who were either born in Australia, or arrived in Australia before starting formal schooling (age around 5), and (c) children who were not sojourners and temporary visitors. All recruited children nominated English as their dominant language with varying degree of proficiency in Korean. For this particular study, we chose to focus on three primary school children and three secondary school students, because they represented relatively strong and consistent opinions about languages, thus providing different examples of language ideologies. Table 1 presents a list of participants in this particular study.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Name
(Pseudonym)</th><th>Grade (age) at the
time of data collection</th><th>Gender</th><th>Place of birth
(Age of arrival in AUS)</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Primary
school
students</td><td>Simon</td><td>Grade 5 (11)</td><td>Male</td><td>Australia</td></tr>
<tr><td>Julie</td><td>Grade 5 (11)</td><td>Female</td><td>Australia</td></tr>
<tr><td>Yechan</td><td>Grade 6 (12)</td><td>Male</td><td>Australia</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td>Seol</td><td>Grade 7 (13)</td><td>Female</td><td>Australia</td></tr>
<tr><td>Yeji</td><td>Grade 8 (13)</td><td>Female</td><td>Australia</td></tr>
</table>

Secondary school students	Hajin	Grade 8 (14)	Male	Korea (age 4)

Table 1. A list of participants

Data collection and analysis

Data collection took place from July to December in 2019 through semi-structured interviews. Typically, semi-structured interviews are intended to understand individuals' world and experiences from their standpoint (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). They are also often undertaken with children because they allow them flexibility in expressing their views and experiences in their own words (Prior, 2016). The semi-structured interviews in this project offered a means of gaining insights into young people's ideologies around languages.

Both the larger project and the current study were approved by the researchers' University's Human Sciences Subcommittee. As researchers working with human participants, including young children who are considered vulnerable participants, we familiarised ourselves with appropriate ethical research guidelines and followed these procedures carefully. The first author conducted an individual interview with each participant, following Prior's (2016) guidelines for an interview with young participants. For example, the interview questions were formulated to elicit children's reports of real-life experiences of HL use (e.g., use of Korean, when and with whom its use was preferred) by concentrating on concrete situations rather than abstract concepts. Each interview, including the consent procedure, lasted under an hour, and the average length of these audio-recorded interviews was 43 minutes per child. All participants chose English for the language of the interview, but they often switched between English and Korean. Interviews were transcribed

verbatim, and original participants' quotes in Korean were translated into English for presentation in publications.

Analysis of the interview data followed Merriam and Tisdell's (2016) guidelines for qualitative data analysis, which involves an inductive and comparative approach, assisted by the qualitative analysis software NVivo. The interview transcripts were read and re-read to identify meaningful patterns and themes. While allowing new themes to emerge, this process was guided by our research questions. Examples of the themes we identified include participants' HL practice, beliefs regarding the value of a HL, and similarities and differences in relation to level of schooling. After having identified these themes, we highlighted the speech acts performed by participants that best represented these topics. For the next level of analysis, we adopted discourse analysis, informed by Gee (2011), in order to gain empirical evidence of the participants' self-positioning, and see what the participants reported happening as a result of a particular positioning act. Specifically, we applied Gee's (2011) framework of 'significance', 'identities' and 'sign systems' (pp. 17-19) as a discourse analytical tool to explore whether and how a speech act was performed (1) to assign or deny salience to certain experiences or ideas (e.g., learning or maintaining a HL); (2) to relate language to identity (e.g., English speaker vs. Korean speaker); and (3) to privilege or undermine the value of specific sign systems (e.g., Korean vs. English). Guided by the questions, we systematically reviewed the transcripts. During and after all these phases, we employed the constant comparison method (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) to examine the differences and similarities between the two groups (primary vs. secondary students) in terms of their language ideologies and self-positioning. The following section presents a description of the themes we uncovered.

Findings

Some noteworthy differences between primary and secondary school students could be explicated by considering two emerging themes: (a) Korean HL learners' agentive use of Korean in different domains, and (b) their evaluations of languages. In what follows, examples of storylines representing each theme are presented in turn.

Korean HL learners' agentive use of Korean in different domains

The language choice made by young Korean HL speakers was a situational option. They did not simply opt between Korean and English, but agentively modulated their language choice, depending on their interlocutors and purpose of communication. Across the data, primary children recursively drew linkages between their HL use and the feelings they identified for themselves. Yechan's interview highlighted the moments when he chose Korean:

> Excerpt 1
> I'm bilingual, when I'm fully awake and fully happy…but (when) I'm really down… I just keep forgetting (Korean) words, phrases (and/or) sentences… if I don't know what to speak (or) what they're saying to me (in Korean), I have to always be prepared, but I'm scared, it'll just be awkward. (Yechan, male/Grade 6)

Yechan positioned himself as bilingual only in a situation when he was "fully awake" or "fully happy" enough to communicate with others in Korean. He, otherwise, lacked confidence in speaking Korean, especially when emotionally struggling. He stated that, when experiencing such emotions, he found speaking Korean to be a daunting task, which made him feel embarrassment emanating from his unsatisfactory HL performance. In this storyline, he seemed to shift back to a position as an English monolingual. Similarly, Simon more explicitly reported a specific sphere of his HL:

Excerpt 2
I'm Korean when I'm sad, happy, and scared. (In) these feelings, I speak Korean to help my parents understand what I'm trying to saying. But when I'm mad, and want nobody to understand me, I speak really fast in Australian (English). When I speak Korean depends on my mood.
(Simon, male/Grade 5)

Simon stated that he identified as a Korean speaker, only in a situation where he should be emotionally understood by Korean-speaking significant others such as parents. Similar to Yechan in Excerpt 1, he appeared to treat Korean as the language of emotional or familial values. The interviews with Yechan and Simon suggest that the two children used Korean only when the language suited their emotional needs. More examples of a linkage between HL use and emotional states include "I speak Korean when I feel comfortable" (Julie, female/Grade 5), "(W)hen I feel a little excluded, I keep this conversation (in Korean) quite short" (Yechan, male/Grade 6), and "I get really agitated so I can't speak Korean that well" (Simon, male/Grade 5).

In contrast, the secondary school students mentioned different domains of their HL use. They especially reported the role of Korean in mediating their communication not only within the family, but also with Koreans outside their family. This point was discussed by Hajin, when he was asked about if he had Korean friends at school.

Excerpt 3
Hajin: I have a lot of Korean friends at school. After I started going to high school, I got to speak Korean more often… share Korean food more… hang out with more Korean friends… being surrounded by Korean people, so I attempt more to speak Korean.
Researcher: Why do you think this happens?
Hajin: It's easier to make friends with Korean people, because we have more similarities than Australians.
(Hajin, male/Grade 8)

This storyline illustrates that Hajin viewed himself as one of those affiliated with Koreanness, and felt the sense of belonging to a Korean group. Though not explicitly stated, there is a “Korean” and “Australian” divide in his statement; he referred to his Korean peers including himself as “we” who were drawn together from a common interest and culture, whereas he othered non-Korean peers, referring to them as “Australians”. Given this division, he seemed to agentively choose the Korean language as a mean of socialising with his “Korean friends”. The next quote from Yeji further indicates that she extended the domains beyond Korean-speaking peers.

> Excerpt 4
> Yeji: When we start high school, we’re getting (more) interested in K-drama, and K-pop.
> Researcher: Do your friends want to learn Korean, because of K-pop?
> Yeji: Definitely. My friend is Chinese. She doesn't know how to speak her own language properly. If I use everyday Korean language, she understands (it) for some reasons. When I speak Korean to my Korean friend, she starts speaking (Korean) and understands what I'm saying (in Korean).
> (Yeji, female/Grade 8)

Yeji explained that she used her HL at school, even in the presence of friends of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. She related her participation in a community of friends who were interested in K-pop and K-drama to her agency in actively using Korean to share knowledge about Korean culture. This pattern was particularly evident in the responses of girls in the project as a whole, some of whom identified Korean as the language of interest in their friendship groups on account of its high value as the language of Korean culture.

Taken together, the primary-aged participants viewed Korean as a language with limited domains of use, while the teenagers felt empowered by their ability to speak Korean in domains beyond the family. This finding may provide a clue to understanding of Korean Australian children’s evaluations of their HL, which is discussed next.

Korean HL learners' evaluation of languages

Our data suggest that the primary and secondary school students developed contrasting perspectives on their HL. The primary children undervalued their HL, even as a language for communication with their Korean peers. This view was shared by Julie:

> Excerpt 5
> My family friend is Korean but we speak English… we understand each other more because we are Korean obviously, but (the language we speak) doesn't really affect how we play with each other… it doesn't affect how we treat each other.
> (Julie, female/Grade 5)

While she identified her and her family friend as "Korean obviously", she did not nominate Korean as the main language for their communication. Julie probably chose English, based on pragmatic reasons (e.g., easy to speak), like the children in Wilson's (2020) studies. While not insisting on exclusively using English, she nonchalantly responded that she could socialise with her Korean-speaking peers in either English or Korean language, and the chosen language did not affect the way they related to each other.

Furthermore, the primary children generally agreed to learn Korean, but they did not feel obligation to maintain the language. When asked how fluent he desired to be in Korean, Simon shared:

> Excerpt 6
> Just as fluent as I can get without forgetting any English. I think that being bilingual is unique. But (it's) the fact that I'm bilingual in English, one of the most popular languages and then being able to speak Korean, which is not as popular… being bilingual in Korean and English is not more bilingual than Chinese (or) Indian because Korea is more of a smaller nation.
> (Simon, male/Grade 5)

While he acknowledged a sense of uniqueness for being able to speak two languages, Simon reported preferring English because he thought speaking Korean would result in his partial acquisition of English. He also made pejorative reference to the Korean language in his comments such as “not as popular” and “Korea is more of a smaller nation”. These speech acts indicated that he did not recognise Korean as a cultural asset, but rather distanced himself from Korean speakers. Similar evaluation was found in the interview with Yechan:

> Excerpt 7
> I made it into regional spelling bee. I like to say (what) I acquired (because) no one is quite good at that stuff. So I'm just really proud of that. As I go to regionals, I'm just really practising a lot more than I have been and found a lot of new words.
> (Yechan, male/Grade 6)

Asked if he would add any comment before finishing the interview, Yechan introduced a new storyline in which he had won his local school spelling competition and moved on to compete in a regional competition. Whilst the interview centred on the Korean language, he cited his good English spelling skills as a source of pride, without being prompted. This comment again reflects the supremacy of English over the HL, similarly to Simon’s words in Excerpt 6.

In addition, primary children rarely referred to their HL as a symbol of their ethnic identity. This is evident in the following excerpt. When asked if she had thought that a language could identify its speakers, Julie explained:

> Excerpt 8
> It could only tell a little hint but I don't think it will really show a full identity. If she can speak Korean, it could at least predict one of her parents might be Korean... I learned Italian from (my) school and I could speak a little (but) that doesn't make me an Italian person.
> (Julie, female/Grade 5)

Rather than a marker of ethnic identity, Julie saw HL competence as “a little [small] hint” for a person’s ancestry. This quote indicates that she would less likely view her Korean competence as a defining feature of her own identity, but as reflecting the linguistic trajectory of her parents. Interestingly, she did not seem to make a clear distinction between Korean as her HL and other foreign languages such as Italian either.

Contrasting with the primary children’s evaluations, the secondary school students tended to view the HL as an important resource to be cultivated. Their rationale for maintaining the HL revealed their positioning as children of Korean migrants, and this positioning was associated with their views of HL as an asset for promoting their social status. This point was exemplified in Seol’s comment, where she was asked about how she performed in English as a school subject:

> Excerpt 9
> When (I’m) writing an essay for school, I can't think of the words, because I don't use English at home. I don’t learn anything from my parents, because they don't speak English. So if my English fails me, I can go back to my Korean and I can use my Korean as backup… if English dies down, I might as well have another language to speak, and that language has to be Korean, and I can show off to my friends saying I can speak two languages. (Seol, female/Grade 7)

Seol shared that she struggled to meet the demand of Standard Australian English, positioning herself as a person with limited fluency in English, which she attributed to her limited exposure to English at home. Asked to address some reasons for Korean learning, she added that she might need Korean as “backup” to support her communication skills, in case “English fail(s)” her. She also explained that being proficient in the two languages was an ability to “show off” to her peers. Her response acknowledges the value of being able to speak her HL as well as the majority language, in terms of its potential to bring about status

and power for her, and points to her understanding of being bilingual as a source of pride as well.

In addition, the teenagers clearly construed the HL as a defining element of their identity. This sentiment was highlighted in the following excerpts from the interviews with Hajin and Yeji.

> Excerpt 10
> I’m pretty sure it’s important to learn Korean, even if you’re still living in Australia. It’s a part of your identity, because your parents and grandparents are probably from Korea. It’s pretty worth it.
> (Hajin, male/Grade 8)
>
> Excerpt 11
> Yeji: I think you can't identify yourself only biologically as a Korean. It doesn't really make sense. I think you should know your language, because it's your own language.
> Researcher: So you think Korean is your language? Not your parents’ language?
> Yeji: Yeah. because it's a part of me. So if I don't know my own language… it doesn't seem right to me… I can’t call you a Korean if you don’t know how to speak Korean.
> (Yeji, female/Grade 8)

Hajin and Yeji offered their rationale for maintaining Korean as a necessary means for understanding what it means to be Korean. In conceptualising themselves, they drew on their HL; they referred to the Korean language as “(their) own language” and “a part of (them)”; maintaining Korean is “worth” and “right” to them. Their choice of the languages points to the idea that their identity is shaped and enacted through HL use, and the HL is key to one’s membership of a Korean ethnic community.

In sum, the findings revealed contrasting views between the primary and secondary students. The primary children undervalued their HL, but valued English as a linguistic and social resource. Meanwhile, the teenagers developed emerging perspectives that Korean was

(1) a linguistic resource for communication with Koreans and non-Koreans, (2) a valuable substitute for limited English skills, and (3) an essential marker of ethnic identity.

Discussion

While existing HL research has focused on similar-aged participants, such as primary children (e.g., Seals, 2018; Song, 2016), secondary students (e.g., Abdi, 2011; Kim, 2017), or adult children of migrants (e.g., Mu 2014), the choice for comparing HL speakers of different schooling ages within the same demographic group is a distinguishing feature of the current study. Specifically, this article has presented a qualitative comparison of primary and secondary students who are Korean HL learners in Australia, in terms of their language ideologies and positioning as language speakers. Our analysis identified three major differences regarding ideologies around a HL across these two age groups. Firstly, there was a clear demarcation in the domain of HL use between primary and secondary students. Primary children reported associating their HL with restricted domains, where the HL served relatively limited communicative functions. Meanwhile, teenagers used Korean as a tool for talking about more varied topics, with Koreans and non-Koreans, and across home and school contexts. As they engaged in broader HL experiences, they reported more positive views towards the language. Being surrounded by those affirming the significance of the HL seemed to motivate them to speak Korean, similarly to other HL speakers in the studies of Worthy et al. (2016) and Kim (2017). Conversely, the ideologies teenagers may begin to internalise during the transition to adolescence may be expressed directly in their linguistic practice. This idea validates the argument of Woolard (1998, p. 9), who proposes three 'sitings' of language ideologies (e.g., one's explicit commentaries on languages, or implicit assumptions about languages). People's actual linguistic/discursive practice is one of the 'sitings' where their language ideologies are rife. In our study, Korean Australian children's

reported choices of which language to speak in various situations similarly reflect their language ideologies. The reciprocal relation between language practice and ideologies is highlighted in Blackledge and Pavlenko's (2002) and Kroskrity's (2004) argument that an ideology does not simply serve as a metanarrative describing thoughts about the practices of language speakers, but functions as a constitutive element of their language use. As such, Korean HL speakers' ideologies take root in both evaluative discourse and habitual practice; the former shapes the latter, and vice versa.

Secondly, an analysis of HL speakers' self-positioning also highlighted the differences between the primary and secondary students. We found the primary children in our study positioned themselves as English speakers and differentiated themselves from Korean speakers, asserting the higher pragmatic and social value of English. At the same time, we saw all three of the teenagers actively contesting their positioning within the Korean migrant community, openly espousing a Korean identity and favouring use of their HL. Each group of participants also ascribed different rights or duties on themselves, in keeping with the premise of positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990; Harré & van Langenhove, 1999). Primary children who were oriented toward the mainstream society did not report an obligation to maintain Korean as their HL. (Re)positioning themselves as having Korean heritage, the teenagers, by contrast, adopted a belief that they needed the HL to survive as a child of Korean migrants, and actively took up the duty to continue their learning of Korean. This finding validates Davies and Harré's (1990) argument that once an individual has taken up a particular position as one's own, he or she inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of the position; and from a vantage point or position, they give meanings to their own, and/or others' talk and actions (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003). By analysing their self-positioning, we thus illustrate a range of ways in which Korean Australian children draw on

speech acts to appropriate their positions. As our analysis reveals, the positions Korean Australian children adopt in relation to their HL are both reflected in and shape the speech acts they engage in. We can also argue for language ideologies emerging from HL speakers' rationales about not only their perceptions of languages, but also why they hold particular perspectives. We further elucidate the ways in which HL ideologies can be a site of identity construction, offering empirical support to the tenets of a sociocultural approach to a language as inseparable from identity (Kroskrity, 2004; Leeman, 2012; Little, 2019). This finding creates an important distinction not often discussed in research on young HL learners, which has not focused on young HL speakers' agency in HL use or identity construction, viewing them instead as passive recipients of the ways they are positioned by others (e.g., Abdi, 2011; Seals, 2018).

Overall, the ways HL speakers practise their HL and position themselves as HL speakers can reflect their evaluative ideologies around their HL. In this respect, some differences between the primary and secondary groups were evident too. Specifically, linguistic hierarchy manifested itself in in the primary children's accounts. They tended to attribute a lower, more peripheral, status to the Korean language, and sometimes reported that Korean proficiency could hinder their linguistic success in English. Conversely, they privileged English over Korean, valuing English as their symbolic and social capital in Bourdieu's (1986) terms. Similar ideological assumptions have been found among other HL speakers such as Spanish children (Allard et al., 2014) and a Korean child (Song, 2016). In defining the ideologies, researchers have proposed terms such as 'monoglossic' (Allard et al., 2014, p. 343), and 'English as a legitimate language' ideology (Song, 2016, p. 16). Whatever term is selected, a corollary of such language ideologies is that HL speakers choose English only at the cost of HL maintenance, and frame their ethnic community from a deficit

perspective, as not using a recognised language (Song, 2016). The ideology further construes monolingualism as the norm and denies the legitimacy of hybrid language practices (Allard et al., 2014). If persistent, it can not only challenge parents' or the community's efforts to promote HL learning but lead them to give way to English as the majority language instead. Another finding, however, offers a more hopeful message, suggesting that HL learners' perspectives on languages may evolve in favour of HL maintenance from childhood to adolescence.

Unlike younger children, the teenagers reported positive views on their HL. While it is possible that the adolescents provided responses that they felt may align better with the researcher's own views towards a HL, as Merriam and Tisdell (2016) have pointed out, an important difference that emerged was that they took pride in their proficiency in Korean; they considered it as a resource potentially offering advantages; they construed it as emblematic of their origins; and they were, thus, staunch advocates of HL education for any child of a Korean family. For them, HL competence represented a form of linguistic, economic, and social capital, in Bourdieu's (1986) terms. The prevalence of these views in the secondary students' group is surprising, as it could not be inferred from their lower rate of enrolment in Korean community language schools in the group. Contrary to the community language school enrolment statistics (KEC, 2018), our analysis revealed that the adolescents were keen to maintain the HL for both pragmatic and emotional motives. The findings thus suggest that a language ideology may play little role in their decision on whether they should attend community language schools. Rather, broader social forces other than an individual's ideologies possibly have brought about a sharp decline in their enrolment in the HL education programs. Those forces may play a more dominating role in their decisions to continue HL learning through such programs than individuals' affinity for their HL and culture.

As seen so far, our study has revealed the existence of multiple ideologies within a small group of Korean Australian children. This finding aligns with Kroskrity's (2004) explanation that language ideologies are not uniform, but multiple and can be contradictory, even within one and the same sociocultural group. Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001) also define language ideologies as not stable but constantly shifting. Our findings support these ideas, as they show that Korean Australian children's ideologies are not firmly crystallised, but vary by age and schooling. The difference may be reflected of the ongoing maturation of their social cognitive or linguistic abilities during this time. Children at the primary school level may see their HL as an unpleasant and even unwelcome element, because they may not achieve communicative proficiency in it, as previous studies have reported for HL learners in Canadian (Abdi, 2011) and Britain (Wilson, 2020). Younger children may also tend to accept uncritically the ideologies that they are exposed to at a mainstream school, as Song (2016) has suggested. Teenagers' increasing maturity, however, may equip them with the skills needed to critically evaluate given ideologies and develop their own value systems. As they understand the linguistic landscape of Australia during the time, secondary students may start to appreciate their HL, as did a Spanish HL speaker in the study of Worthy et al. (2016). This idea resonates with research findings showing similar views, in favour of HL maintenance, in adult HL speakers (Mu, 2014) and migrant parents (Jang, 2020; Song, 2016). Taken together, the finding of the differences between primary and secondary students adds a new dimension to HL research, because previous HL research has, so far, uncovered misalignment which exists between other agents, such as parent/s and child/ren (e.g., Song, 2016) or primary and secondary schools (e.g., Allard et al., 2014).

We conclude this section by applying Little's (2019) metaphor to our findings. In her metaphor, Little likens a HL to a vase that is inherited down the generations, and emphasises that each individual inheriting the vase (HL) may develop multiple reactions to the inheritance. In the light of the metaphor, the primary children in our investigation do not want to give it up, but keep it in a cupboard, half-forgotten except when they need emotional connection with a significant person, such as its inheritor who is willing to pass it on to them. By the time they reach secondary schooling, children, however, may start to see it as something worth inheriting, as they begin to recognise its social and economic value. They display it in places where others can appreciate it; they take ownership of the vase from its inheritor, keeping it closer to them, and they eventually come to love it.

Conclusion

The present study offers a new perspective on the HL research area for three reasons. Firstly, this study is one of the few attempts to compare primary and secondary school students' ideologies around a HL, and suggest some differences between the two groups. Second, this research illustrates that young HL learners' ideologies not only emerge from their ideas on a language itself, but from their linguistic practice. Thirdly, it sheds a light on the ways in which HL ideologies are reciprocally related to the position young HL speakers assign themselves.

Our findings also have implications for HL education and research. Firstly, schooling level may be closely associated with the way young HL speakers perceive their HL. This finding thus strongly suggests that an age-sensitive approach is essential for supporting and increasing their participation in HL learning. Given younger children's notion of Korean as less valuable, we need to create a more supportive culture where they can rationalise their HL

competence as linguistic capital in both instrumental and symbolic terms, particularly in mainstream school settings. For adolescents, we need to identify socio-political barriers that impede their involvement in HL learning, despite their relatively higher positiveness. There then needs to be a collaboration between educational authorities, schools, parents and other community groups to overcome the barriers. If these efforts endure over time, the shift to a dominant language may be ameliorated or even avoided.

This study, however, has a limitation. It focuses on the perspectives of six Korean HL learners, and does not claim to be a representative of all HL learners. Examining the perspectives of other young learners in different multicultural contexts may thus provide further insight on how they negotiate ideologies related to HL practice and identity. As suggested above, in understanding environmental factors impeding HL learning, a complementary investigation would further analyse examples of young HL learners' life context or HL practice.

References

Abdi, K. (2011). ‘She really only speaks English’: Positioning, language ideology, and heritage language learners. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *67*(2), 161-190.

Allard, E., Mortimer, K., Gallo, S., Link, H., & Wortham, S. (2014). Immigrant Spanish as liability or asset? Generational diversity in language ideologies at school. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *13*(5), 335-353. doi:10.1080/15348458.2014.958040

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2016). *2016 Census: Multicultural.* Retrieved Sep 16, 2020, from https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/lookup/media%20release3

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2002). Introduction. *Multilingua, 21*, 121-140

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 116–137). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chik, A., Benson, P., Forrest, J., & Falloon, G. (2019). *What are languages worth? Community languages for the future of New South Wales*. Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University Multilingualism Research Group.

Clyne, M. (1991) *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *20*(1), 43-63.

Duff, P. (2019). Case study research: Making language learning complexities visible. In J. McKinley, & H. Rose (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 144-153). New York, NY: Routledge.

Forrest, J., Benson, P., & Siciliano, F. (2018). Linguistic shift and heritage language retention in Australia. In S. Brunn, & R. Kehrein (Eds.), *Handbook of the changing world language map* (pp. 1-18). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Harré, R., & Moghaddam, F. M. (2003). Introduction: The self and others in traditional psychology and in positioning theory. In R. Harré & F. M. Moghaddam (Eds.), *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political, and cultural contexts* (pp. 1–11). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1999). The dynamics of social episodes. In R. Harré, & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 1-13). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hornberger, N. H., & Wang, S. C. (2008). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Eds.), *Heritage language education: A new field emerging* (pp. 3–38). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Jang, S. Y. (2020). The pluralist language ideology of Korean immigrant mothers and the English-only principle in early childhood education programs. *Language and Education*, *34*(1), 66-80.

Karidakis, M., & Arunachalam, D. (2016). Shift in the use of migrant community languages in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *37*(1), 1-22.

Kim, J. I. (2017). Immigrant adolescents investing in Korean heritage language: Exploring motivation, identities, and capital. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *73*(2), 183-207.

Kim, Y. K. (2020). Third space, new ethnic identities, and possible selves in the imagined communities: A case of Korean heritage language speakers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-17.

Korean Education Centre. (2018). *2018 주말 한글학교현황 [2018 Weekend Korean language schools].* Retrieved Aug 16, 2018, from http://www.auskec.kr/bbs/board.php?bo_table=prog1&wr_id=6

Koshiba, K. (2020). Between inheritance and commodity: The discourse of Japanese ethnolinguistic identity among youths in a heritage language class in Australia. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1-14.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leeman, J. (2012). Investigating language ideologies in Spanish as a heritage language. In S. M. Beaudrie, & M. Fairclough (Eds.), *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field* (pp. 43–59). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Little, S. (2019). Great Aunt Edna’s vase: Metaphor use in working with heritage language families. *The Family Journal*, *27*(2), 150-155.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mu, G. M. (2014). Learning Chinese as a heritage language in Australia and beyond: The role of capital. *Language and Education*, *28*(5), 477-492.

Moloney, R. (2018). Learning languages early is key to making Australia more multilingual. *Languages Victoria*, *22*(1), 79-81.

Norton, B. (2016). Identity and language learning: Back to the future. *TESOL quarterly*, *50*(2), 475-479.

Prior, J. (2016). The use of semi-structured interviews with young children. In J. Prior, & V. Herwege (Eds.), *Practical research with children* (pp. 135-152). New York, NY: Routledge.

SBS. (2018). *Cultural atlas: South Korean culture*. Retrieved Aug 16, 2018, from https://culturalatlas.sbs.com.au/south-korean-culture/south-koreans-in-australia

Seals, C. A. (2018). Positive and negative identity practices in heritage language education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *15*(4), 329-348.

Shin, S. C., & Jung, S. J. (2016). Language shift and maintenance in the Korean community in Australia. *International Journal of Korean Language Education*, *2*(2), 223-258.

Song, K. (2016). "No one speaks Korean at school!": Ideological discourses on languages in a Korean family. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *39*(1), 4-19.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37–80). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized?. *The Modern Language Journal*, *89*(3), 410-426.

Wilson, S. (2020). Family language policy through the eyes of bilingual children: The case of French heritage speakers in the UK. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *41*(2), 121-139.

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 20–86). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Worthy, J., Nuñez, I., & Espinoza, K. (2016). "Wow, I get to choose now!" Bilingualism and biliteracy development from childhood to young adulthood. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *39*(1), 20-34.