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ABSTRACT

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) has become an important alternative to conventional means of communication in an age of rapidly developing electronic communication technology. As our communication crosses the borders of languages and cultures, CMC has become a site of international and intercultural communication. In this context, this study attempts to add to our understanding of the ‘others’ we meet in cyberspace through CMC.

Working from an interpretivist paradigm, this qualitative research is intended to understand how Korean female learners of English represent themselves in computer-mediated communication (CMC) using English across technology, language, and culture. In interviews with eight Korean female students at a large U. S. Midwestern university, the research participants were asked to share their experiences of CMC in English both in academic and non-academic settings. They often compared this with other modes of communication, CMC in Korean and speaking in English or Korean in real life situations. From the conversations surfaced the intricate process of how they negotiate their being Korean, being women, being non-native speakers of English as they communicate in cyberspace using English as a second language.

The research data were analyzed using QSR NVivo, a qualitative analysis tool, and the results were reported in two separate chapters, one addressing the data as a whole
and the other focusing on particular issues surfaced from data analysis. A few of the important findings from the study include: a) co-occurrences of multiple constructs in the participants’ CMC in English, which exemplifies the intricacy and complexity involved in their CMC; b) participants’ bodily engagement with technology in praxis; c) language being felt as the biggest barrier; d) cultural distance recognized in addition to language barrier; and e) gender found to matter less than expected in CMC in English. By drawing upon knowledge from two areas of study, foreign and second language education and cultural studies of technology, this study attempts to fill the gaps between CMC studies in these two fields. Findings of this study offer a few important pedagogical implications as to the incorporation of CMC into classrooms with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research Topic

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) has become an important alternative to conventional means of communication in an age of rapidly developing electronic communication technology. As our communication crosses the borders of languages and cultures, CMC has become a site of international and intercultural communication. In this context, this study attempts to add to our understanding of the ‘others’ we meet in cyberspace through CMC.

The number of people using electronic communication technology is rapidly increasing. According to one survey, about 606 million people worldwide were online as of September 2002 (NUA, 2004). The number of users in the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, and Australia combined was about 271 million, 335 million from other parts of the world. Not only is there an increase in the number of people moving into the electronic networks, the effect of globalization is also pushing many more people to communicate with others from different countries, cultures, and languages; E-mail is being used more frequently than face-to-face or telephone communication in business
settings according to a report by American Management Association in 1998 (Warschauer, 2000a).

Within this context, the role of the English language has gained in importance over the last few decades in many non-English speaking countries. The global expansion of English as a lingua franca in combination with the historical development of the Internet (an American invention) makes English “the language of cyberspace, where English dominates as it does in international business, entertainment, research, and other areas of communication” (Murray, 2000b, p.407) and English is now viewed as the “language of additional communication, rather than a foreign language” by language education professionals (Warschauer, 2000a).

When we communicate our own ideas to others, we represent those ideas through language. In the process, we make several assumptions about the listeners (or readers) of our speech (or writing): our relationships with them, the appropriate vocabulary to be used for efficient communication, and the most desirable way to deliver a message. Meaning, the final product of this process, is then conveyed to others in either spoken or written language. The message can, therefore, be regarded as a representation of our ideas intended for a specific audience, loaded with “a sense of our identity, of who we are and with whom we ‘belong’” (Hall, 1997, p.3) as well as beliefs concerning the identities of readers or listeners. For us to communicate our ideas and meanings properly, we need not only “a shared conceptual map” but “shared language systems and the codes which govern the relationships of translation between them” (Hall, 1997, p.21).

At the receiving end of the message, on the other hand, the listeners (or readers) go through the process of ‘interpretation’ to understand the meaning of the message.
according to the shared language systems and conceptual map. How well the message is communicated between speakers (writers) and listeners (readers) depends on how much both sides share the conceptual map and language systems with each other. As long as there is a gap, there always will be “a constant sliding of meaning in all interpretation, a margin – something in excess of what we intend to say – in which other meanings overshadow the statement or the text” (Hall, 1997, p. 33).

In case of communication between people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, this margin could become a bigger issue and turn into miscommunication or misrepresentation of each other. Here lies the challenge for non-native speakers of English to communicate in English in cyberspace. They need to cross the borders between different languages, cultures and media (technologies). Therefore, language learners’ computer-mediated communication (CMC) reflects a complex combination of their own culture, their English language proficiency (including their perception of it), and their attitudes toward the technology and CMC. In addition, gender, being closely related to language, culture, and technology, would play an important role. When I am engaged in CMC of any sort, I am conscious of my being a Korean woman as well as being a non-native speaker of English. At the same time, I am aware of the characteristics of CMC: not knowing to whom I am writing but knowing all my postings are being recorded and stored somewhere.

1.2 Conceptual Framework

As a way to communicate these ideas more efficiently, I have identified four different modes of language learners’ representation of self, in which four constructs
(technology, language, culture, and gender) are interrelated. The relationships among these are illustrated in Figure 1.1.

The two borders (language and medium) that non-native speakers of English cross to participate in CMC in English are shown as two long shaded rectangles and four different shapes are used to depict four constructs – technology, language, culture, and gender. A different set of shapes (constructs) are placed on an arrow connecting self with each representation type to indicate a set of constructs that language learners are conscious of when engaged in each type of communication. For example, three shapes (corresponding to language, culture, and gender) are placed on the arrow connecting self with representation #2 to depict three constructs that language learners are conscious of when they use English (L2) in real life situations.
Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework - four constructs in four types of communication
Below is the speculation I came up with based on reflecting upon my own experiences of four different modes of communication:

#1 Representation of Self in L1\(^1\) in Real Life

Natives of Korea, talking to other Koreans in Korean, are conscious of their culture and gender as certain cultural norms for being Korean women (or men) necessarily affect the way they represent themselves. Thus this representation might be constrained by their cultural and gender awareness.

#2. Representation of Self in L2 in Real Life

When talking in English, there comes another layer in addition to being Korean, which is being non-native speakers of English. In some cases, the fact that they are speaking a different language other than Korean might bring a shift in the way they speak (different language behavior). In other cases, their English proficiency (not native-like) would force them to restrict and/or distort what they really want to say.

#3. Representation of Self in L1 in Cyberspace

When talking in Korean in cyberspace, being in cyberspace would shift the way they speak (in addition to their being Korean women or men). Maybe some level of awareness that they are engaging in public conversation rather than a private one would change the vocabulary or discourse in their conversation.

#4. Representation of Self in L2 in Cyberspace

When engaged in CMC in English, they now have to be conscious of all of the three characteristics mentioned above: being Korean women (or men), being non-native speakers of English, and also being in cyberspace.

The distance between representations 1 and 2 \(#\text{1-2}\) across language, between 1 and 3 \(#\text{1-3}\) across technology, and between 2 and 4 \(#\text{2-4}\) across language and technology have been explored by sociocultural studies in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (McMahill, 1997; Norton, 2000), cultural studies of technology (Turkle, 1995), and CMC studies in SLA field (R. Kern, 1995; Warschauer & Kern, 2000), respectively. However, the distance between representations 1 and 4 \(#\text{1-4}\) across culture, language,

\(^1\) L1 refers to first language or Korean and L2 refers to second language or English.
and technology has not been studied in depth; this is the topic of my study. Gender is being considered additionally because it is closely related to all of the three constructs: culture, language, and technology. Korean culture is very much gendered (Joongang-Ilbo, 2001b), and many researchers in the field of English education claim gender to be one of the major factors to look at in SLA studies (Bacon & Finnemann, 1992; Ehrlich, 1997; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998). In addition, gender is a focus of social and cultural studies of technology (Turkle, 1998; Wajcman, 1991). Therefore, looking at how female learners of English construct themselves in cyberspace and seeing how combinations of technology, language, culture, and gender work in the process would provide us with insights of how we view ‘others’ we meet in cyberspace.

1.3 Purpose, Objectives and Research Questions

This study is intended to achieve three purposes: a) to understand how Korean female learners of English represent themselves in CMC using English and how the combination of technology, language, culture, and gender work together behind their CMC use; b) to provide insights about understanding CMC by non-native speakers of English; and c) to provide pedagogical suggestions to educators in ways to use CMC in teaching, especially when non-native speakers of English are involved.

The objectives are as follows:

- To describe how the selected Korean female learners of English represent themselves in classrooms and in cyberspace.
• To interpret the participants’ self-representations in order to explore how and why they represent themselves differently or similarly in two different settings.

• And, to analyze how the combination of the participants’ (perceptions of) technology, language, culture, and gender are reflected in their CMC.

The major questions which guide this research include:

• How do Korean female learners of English perceive and describe their own representations in English in a classroom environment?

• Do these representations differ from their perceptions of their self-representations in Korean? If so, are the differences based on conscious intention across different language and culture? Why?

• How do they describe their experiences of CMC and face-to-face communications in English in an educational environment?

• How do their self-representations in CMC and in face-to-face communications differ? To what do they attribute the difference?

• How do they perceive their being female to be related to their representations in Korean, in English in classrooms, and in English in cyberspace, respectively?

• What are the distinctive characteristics of their utterances in classrooms and their writings in CMC? Where do the differences (if any) come from?
1.4 Being at border, not at the border

I wrestle with my own positionality and remain conscious of my being ‘at border’ throughout this study both methodologically and culturally. The dropping of the article ‘the’ was intentional based on the realization of the blurred and permeable borders I am at. First of all, my academic journey, from Computer Science and Statistics to Foreign and Second Language Education and then to Cultural Studies of Technology places me ‘at border’ of multiple disciplines with a few different perspectives on the issues of technology, language, culture, or gender. Having been engaged by both quantitative and qualitative methodology, I am also ‘at border’ methodologically.

In relation to the Korean women participating in this study, I claim to be an ‘insider at border’ in section 3.2.3 (Methodological positioning) as a researcher sharing gender, culture, and language with them. My being ‘at border’ continues to work in later parts of the study, data analysis and writing stages, where I wrestle between the value of messiness in qualitative data and the reminiscence of neatness in positivist quantification. Being conscious of where I have been and where I am now, this ‘at border’ positionality is revisited in several places in my dissertation. By putting this section in my first chapter, I would like have the readers of my study be reminded of my intentional and conscious decision of situating myself as a person ‘at border.’

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

An understanding of the following terms is essential to this study:

Asynchronous CMC. A type of CMC where messages are posted at any time, and read and responded to by other users also at times which suit them.
Examples of asynchronous CMC include e-mail, newsgroup, listserv, or discussion boards such as WebCT postings in this study.

Chat. A form of real-time electronic communications where participants type what they want to say and it is repeated on the screens of all other participants in the same chat.

Chat room. Any system that allows any number of logged-in users to have a typed, real-time, on-line conversation, either by all users logging into the same computer, or more commonly nowadays, via a network. The basic unit of group discussion in chat systems is called chat room. Once one joins a channel, everything one types is read by others on that channel.

CMC (Computer-Mediated Communication). Human communication via computers and includes many different forms of synchronous, asynchronous or real-time interaction that humans have with each other using computers as tools to exchange text, images, audio and video.

Code (Node). In QSR NVivo, an object is defined to represent an idea, theory, dimension, characteristic etc. of the data. Text in documents is coded at a node (code).

Coding. The action of identifying a passage of text in a document that exemplifies some idea or concept and then connecting it to a node that represents that idea or concept.
Constructs. Synonym for factors. Four constructs, technology, language, culture, and gender, are referred to as factors or constructs interchangeably throughout this study.

Co-occurrence (of factors or constructs): When participants mention two or more constructs (factors) together in their remarks, those portions are coded for the multiple codes and this is referred as co-occurrence of the constructs (factors).

Cyberspace. A metaphor for describing the non-physical terrain created by computer systems. Online systems, for example, create a cyberspace within which people can communicate with one another (via e-mail), do research, or simply window shop. Like physical space, cyberspace contains objects (files, mail messages, graphics, etc.) and different modes of transportation and delivery.

Factors. Synonym for constructs. This term is often used in Chapters 4 and 5, where results of data analysis using QSR NVivo are reported.

L₁: First language (Korean in this study).

L₂: Second language (English in this study).

Listserv. A listserv is a common kind of mail list; a software system that automatically (without human intervention) handles various administrative tasks related to an electronic discussion group. Some of the tasks performed are maintaining a group’s subscription list, providing help information, and providing copies of archival messages.
**MSN Messenger.** A chat (synchronous CMC) tool offered for hotmail users by Microsoft as a part of Microsoft Explorer.

**Panes (Cases).** Four possible types of communication across technology (medium) and language borders by Korean learners of English: L2CS (Using English in cyberspace), L2RL (Using English in real life), L1CS (Using Korean in cyberspace), and L1RL (Using Korean in real life). These terms are often used in Chapter 4 where different factors (constructs) are related to different types of communication.

**QSR NVivo.** Qualitative data analysis tool developed by QSR International. It helps researchers to organize and analyze complex textual data. Some of the features of the software include: import and code textual data, edit the text without affecting the coding; retrieve, review and recode coded data; search for combinations of words in the text or patterns; and import data from and export data to quantitative analysis software.

**Synchronous CMC.** A type of CMC where messages are exchanged during the same time interval. Examples of synchronous CMC include chat and instant messaging such as MSN Messenger.

**WebCT.** Stands for “Web Course Tools.” Developed by a university professor at The University of British Columbia in 1995, WebCT is a course management system comprised of an integrated set of educational tools for constructing and managing an online course environment.
1.6 Significance of the Study

Living in the age of globalization, our communication often spans beyond geographic or linguistic borders. The rapid development in telecommunication and information technology has brought us into a new world community of global economy and the use of CMC is becoming commonplace both in our everyday lives and work environments. English, being the language of the Internet, non-native speakers of English engaging in CMC inevitably meet the challenge of crossing the border of culture and language. In this regard, not only language learners in educational settings but also virtually everyone in cyberspace whose native language is not English can be regarded as language learners in cyberspace. Therefore, better understanding of how culture, language, and technology can and do affect/change/reform CMC by language learners could bring better understanding of ‘others’ we communicate with in cyberspace.

To shift the focus to a more pedagogical domain, the recent trend of moving toward integrating more technology into educational settings should be noted. This is happening with or without the consent of teachers and/or learners. Distance education is expanding its reach in the United States as the recently increasing number of television commercials of “get your degree on line” proves. This trend is also evident in Korea, where the establishment of cyber universities were proposed as early as 1996 (Eastmond & Kim, 2000).2 Aside from the movement toward fully on-line education, teachers and course designers are making more efforts to overcome the time and spatial limits of traditional classrooms by incorporating some kind of CMC (chat, listserv, or newsgroup) as a part of courses. In both fully on-line and “hybrid” (a mix of face-to-face and on-line

---

2 For more detailed discussion, see section 2.3.2 The trend of information technology in Korea.
learning) courses, electronic communication among students and teachers become an important part of teaching and learning. In the midst of all this, cultural studies of technology seem to be a necessity to help educators make informed choices of technologies in their teaching. This kind of study would also suggest better ways for teachers to facilitate CMC by looking at how the social contexts of language learners shape their interactions in CMC.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is intended to serve three main purposes: a) to briefly introduce what it means to be Korean women; b) to describe my positionality in terms of the research topic and methodology; and b) to locate the topic of this study in the context of relevant studies and current trends. The first section (2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)?) is short discussion of literature review on Korean women, which will help readers understand this study, CMC by Korean women. The second section (2.2 Developing positionality toward four constructs: Technology, culture, gender, and language) will be devoted to define my positionality between and among the interplays and tensions of the four constructs. Starting from my rationale for selecting the four constructs, this section will include brief review of literature on interplays and tensions among the four constructs. To end the section (2.2.4 Arriving at my positionality), I will describe how I position myself as a Korean female researcher studying other Korean women’s CMC in the context of the preceding discussion on technology, culture, gender, and language.

In the third section (2.3 Review of CMC studies in the field of foreign and second language education), relevant studies of language learners’ CMC will be reviewed from a few different perspectives including research foci, modes of analysis, and methodology.
In addition to the discussion of how they inform this study, some of their limitations will be pointed out to suggest gaps in the existing body of CMC research literature. The last section (2.4 Rationalizing the study in the context of reviewed literature) will discuss how this study, informed by the literature reviewed in the three preceding sections, has a potential of filling such gaps by overcoming some of the limitations in CMC research noted earlier.

**2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)?**

Living a life of a Korean woman in Korea for almost thirty years and then a life of a woman from an Asian country in the U.S. brought me to a realization that Korean women have a unique history of our own, different from women in any other Asian countries. Through a reading of literature on Korean women, I have developed new insights into various issues whose meanings I have never questioned before. In this section, I will discuss some of the themes that emerged from my reading, starting with Confucianism, which appears to be the most important in learning about Korean culture and Korean women.

**2.1.1 Korean women under Confucian thought**

Confucianism, founded about five hundred years B.C. by a young scholar named K’ung Fu Tzu, pronounced Confucius in English, is a worldview, a social ethic, a political ideology, a scholarly tradition, and a way of life (Tu, 1998, p. 3). The main idea of Confucius was the cultivation of virtue and the development of moral perfection, often summarized as the four fundamental virtues of Confucianism: sincerity, benevolence,
filial piety, and propriety (*The Geography of Confucianism*, 2001). Confucianism defined an individual in relation to others and one was always taught to follow a set of mutual obligations to others under so-called Confucian “five relationships”: ruler/subject, father/son, older/younger, husband/wife, and friend/friend (Clark, 2000a, p.30-32).

Under the influence of Chinese literate culture, Confucianism had spread to the neighboring countries by the first century B.C., making China, Korea, and Japan distinctively “Confucian” states. Among all the dynasties influenced by Confucianism, the Chosun (Yi) dynasty in Korea (1392 – 1910) is said to be the most thoroughly Confucianized. Yi Song-gye, the founder of the Chosun dynasty, proclaimed Neo-Confucianism to be the official state orthodoxy in Korea, replacing Buddhism. Since then, Confucian thought has permeated its court politics and elite culture, ruled by the aristocracy (*Yangban*), and its influence has been the root of Korean thought to this date “as manifested in political behavior, legal practice, ancestral veneration, genealogy, village schools, and students activism” (Tu, 1998, p. 30).

The introduction of Confucianism accompanied with it the oppression of women in Korean society and within its family. Neo-Confucianism traces the “inferiority” of women to the nature of the cosmic world. The theory of *Yin-Yang* is at the center of the Confucian image of women in Korean belief system. The duality of female (*yin*, the symbol of the earth) and male (*yang*, the symbol of heavens) being accepted as the basis of the natural order, Confucianism “subordinated women to men, assigned them to stereotypical social categories – chaste woman, devoted wife, dedicated mother – and confined them spatially in the inner rooms of the house” (Deuchler, 1983, p. 2). In addition to *Yin-Yang*, concepts like *Nam-Jon-Yeo-Bi* (the treatment of women as inferior
to men) or *Nam-Nyeo-Gu-Byeol* (the difference between men and women) are at the root of Korean women’s lives.

*Sam-Jong-Ji-Do* is another important concept in explaining the status of Korean women at different stages of their lives – a daughter – a wife – a mother. A daughter should obey her father; a wife should obey her husband; and a mother should depend on her son (H. J. Cho, 1996, p. 85; E. Choi, 1994, p. 192). Based on the accepted norm of *Yin-Yang*, the position of male head of the family was heightened and as a result, the deep-rooted preference of son was engendered. In Korean family, a son has been regarded as “an emblem of the family lineage, a performer of the ancestral rituals, a supporter of parents in their old age, and an object of family pride. … A daughter, on the other hand, was expected to grow up, marry, and move away to become part of her husband’s family” (Clark, 2000b, p.158). Along this line of thought comes the justification of unequal investment in education for sons and daughters. The Confucian belief during the Yi dynasty that “women’s academic learning was supposed to be improper and contrary to the way women as mother and wife and society by neglecting household affairs” (K. W. Cho, 1994, p.210) functioned to delimit the range of female education to the teaching of feminine values and domestic skills and exclude women from the formal educational system.

### 2.1.2 Korean women in modern Korean society

The extent of external changes accompanied with modernization and democratization in Korea did not bring much change in its viewpoint of Korean women. According to a study conducted in the late 80s, the concept of *Nam-Jon-Yeo-Bi* is well
alive in the mentality of Korean men who continue to view women as secondary and insignificant compared to men, often referring to natural and biological differences between the sexes (E. H. Kim, 1998) and the Confucian ideology of womanly virtues, which enabled systematic “control and subjugation of women” still remain as a part of Korean traditional value (Gelb & Palley, 1994).

The traditional sex roles and relations did not disappear with an increase in women’s economic contribution in contemporary Korean society. Woman is still considered an “inside person” and women’s spheres are still regarded as “private” and “domestic,” as opposed to men’s sphere being considered “public” (J. M. Kim, 1995, p.174-175). The gender division of work is still respected within families (Shim, 2000) and the notion of “a good wife, wise mother” is mentioned as a virtue for a wife by many Korean husbands of the late 80s (E. H. Kim, 1998). While Korea has seen an increase in women’s educational attainment, this did not improve their status due to the deep-rooted traditional Confucian image of the virtuous woman within the process of socialization and education (K. W. Cho, 1994, p.207). Gender bias can be easily found in curricular, school practices, or motivation for educating children (job prospects for boys and advantage for marriage for girls), revealing the dominant male perspectives in the social structure of school system (O.-j. Lee, 1996).

As seen so far, the Confucianism has been an indispensable part of Korean mentality, culture, and society for more than six hundred years. While the effect of modernization and Westernization might have changed the material culture in Korea, “its behavioral culture maintains and embraces some Confucian traditions, and it is slow to change” (Palley, 1994, p.275). A recent news article printed on the International
Women’s Day (March 8th) gives a snapshot of the most recent picture of gender relationship in Korea.

Now for the first time our government has a Ministry of Gender Equality, ... We still have a long way to go. According to a white paper on women’s affairs published last year, Korea ranks 30th in the world in terms of equal treatment of men and women and a much lower 63rd in terms of women’s power. ... average pay for women is barely two-thirds that of men. ... highly educated women face difficulty in finding employment. (Joongang-Ilbo, 2001b)

In the mean time, Korean women themselves seem to be trapped between the imposition of Confucian values and their enhanced consciousness attained by improved education and socioeconomic participation. Being conscious of the anachronism of the Confucian norms of traditional sex roles, Korean women are not yet ready to resist them in order not to arouse tensions and conflicts they might encounter as a result (K. W. Cho, 1994). In addition, Korean women themselves practice sexual discrimination; not only do they still prefer sons to daughters, but they also emphasize different virtues for boys (leadership qualities) and girls (patience) in raising their own children (Y. H. Kim & Han, 1996, p.164).

These self-contradiction and struggles that Korean women experience will be one of the foci of this study. As students studying at a U.S. university, Korean women in my study might be considered as those at raised position. However, they might in fact be experiencing internal and/or external struggles with the gender relationship, considering the influence of Confucianism so deeply entrenched in Korean society, culture, and mentality. As Korean women placed in U.S. academic culture, which appears to expect equal contribution and participation from women, they might be struggling to escape the entrapment of Confucian thoughts which has been a part of their lives. I myself have
experienced some of these struggles and I found similar struggles within the Korean women participated in this study.

2.2 Developing positionality toward four constructs:

Technology, culture, gender, and language

2.2.1 Why do I need the four constructs? Where do I start?

I would like to start this section with my rationale for identifying the four areas – technology, culture, gender, and language – to be considered in this study, computer-mediated communication (CMC, hereafter) in English by Korean female students at a large U.S. Midwestern university. As described in the conceptual framework of this study (1.2 Conceptual framework), I reflected upon myself being engaged in CMC in the process of identifying these four constructs. Having read literature on technology and its cross section with gender and culture, coupled with my theoretical and experiential knowledge of Second Language Acquisition, I became conscious of my being Korean (culture), being a woman (gender), being a non-native speaker of English (language), and being in cyberspace (technology) whenever I write to others over electronic network. Once I recognized this, it seemed obvious that leaving out any of these constructs could only result in a partial picture of CMC by Korean women.

At the time of drawing the conceptual map, I came up with each of the four constructs as I pondered over the four possible grids across language and medium as if each of them was a separate construct. However, as I read literature on technology, culture, gender, and language, it was hardly the case where I found any of them discussed separately. Instead, the intricate structure of interrelationships among these four areas
became more complicated as I continued reading. When I was reading on technology, it seemed like a hub connecting the other three – culture, gender, and language – from the center and each of them appeared to be comprehensible in relation to technology and so was the case when reading on culture, gender, or language.

One of the problems that I had to face in developing my positionality was deciding a starting point. Realizing the seemingly equal amount of contribution and/or importance of the four areas to my dissertation topic, this was a difficult decision to make. It was also a moment of discomfort with my learned inclination toward the need for establishing a starting point itself, with the limitation of my reasoning which calls for *a priori* (and often hierarchical) structure to develop its logic, and with the limitation of the medium itself – the linearity of written text printed on papers. It was after considering several different versions of conceptual organizations when I have finally decided to anchor the logical thread of this section at technology, because this is the context and location of Korean women’s CMC, communicating in cyberspace using computers.

Therefore, the beginning of this section – the departure point of my journey to my positionality on \{Technology ~ Culture ~ Gender ~ Language\}³ – will be the discussion of my perspective on technology and the implications of culture, gender, and language in relation to technology in investigating CMC by Korean women. Followed by this will be the discussion of interrelationships between technology and three other constructs – \{Technology ~ Culture\}, \{Technology ~ Gender\}, and \{Technology ~ Language\}. Not only these, reading various other studies directed my attention to the intricate interconnectedness among the three constructs themselves, which are discussed here
under \{\text{Gender} \sim \text{Language}\}, \{\text{Gender} \sim \text{Culture}\}, \text{and} \{\text{Language} \sim \text{Culture}\}. \text{In each section, a brief review of literature will be provided, which will subsequently help me develop a set of questions and/or issues to be addressed in my own study. While the topic of my dissertation is an examination of four constructs simultaneously, I believe that the examination of interrelationships between two constructs at a time will equip me with insights and perspectives to arrive at my positionality on \{\text{Technology} \sim \text{Culture} \sim \text{Gender} \sim \text{Language}\}. The overlaps among and combinations of those interplays and tensions will each become pieces of the whole picture that I would like to paint. Drawing on all of the discussions of interrelationships among the constructs, I will present how I arrive at my positionality as I step into the context of CMC by Korean women at the end of this section.}

\textbf{2.2.2 Starting from technology, moving onto culture, gender, and language}

\textbf{2.2.2.1 My perspective on technology} \hspace{1cm} \text{In this age of electronic communication and information technology where life without technology is almost inconceivable, I am taking the position of viewing technology as an integral part of our lives, shaping our understanding of who we are and what we do and (re)forming our ways of lives and ways of seeing the world. To anchor my perspective to existing philosophical thoughts on technology, I am turning to Martin Heidegger’s phenomenology and John Dewey’s pragmatism (Coyne, 1995). Technology is not to be analyzed as an “object-as-such” (Ihde, 1993, p. 40), but its use involving our bodily engagement with technology in \textit{praxis} should be the focus of analysis. Applying Heidegger’s illustration of hammer to

\footnote{\{\text{Construct A} \sim \text{Construct B ( ~ construct B …)}\} was used to denote interrelationships between/among...}
the recent tragic event of terrorist attacks on New York city and Washington, D.C. on September 11th, 2001, it is not the technology of Boeing 767 that is blamed for the thousands of innocent lives taken away on that day. Rather, it is the use of those planes combined with other advanced information and communication technologies by the ones responsible for this unthinkable tragedy that we are concerned about. And it is not the functionality or the bandwidth of cellular phones but the act of making the last calls to their loved ones from the underground of the World Trade Center or from the planes crashing into the ground that brings tears into our eyes.

It is the human experience and our doing with technology that should be the focus of our discussion of technology. In a way, this echoes in Marshall McLuhan’s phrase “medium is the message” (McLuhan, 1964). He refuses the rationalistic view of technology separating medium from its content or message and is concerned about its indifference to bodily engagement. Instead, he notes the importance of human action with technology and the formative power of technology implicit in who we are and how we see ourselves. Paul Levinson also pays his attention to human experience with technology in his historical review of information technology. With what he calls “soft determinism,” he evaluates “an interplay between the information technology making things possible, and human beings turning that possibility into a reality” (Levinson, 1997, p. 4) where human choice is a necessary factor to be taken into account in examining the impact of media.

Under rationalism, technology is viewed as an object-as-such and the discussion of technology has often focused on evaluation of its effects using empirical approaches
(Coyne, 1995, p. 22). This line of discussion, in its extreme, might fall in one of the two extremes, technophilia or technophobia and subsequently force us to answer the yes/no question of whether to use technologies or not. However, this is not the time to ask such a question because technology (information and communication technology, in this study) is not something that we can choose to have or not; it is here to stay at our time whichever end of the extremes we take, technophilia or technophobia.

This is, therefore, a time to engage in “more “know-why” questions than … “know-how” questions, … to dig deeper, and reflect more about the effects of the ways we use technology” (Nardi & O'Day, 1999a, p. x) as residents of the “information ecology,” in which human activities served by technology is the focus. In this study, I intend to ask some of those “know-why” questions to the research participants as well as myself regarding the effects of our acts of using information and communication technology on our (the participants’ and my own) lives. Rather than asking “know-how” questions focusing on the efficient and productive result of technology use, I will get closer to the people using technology and dig deeper into the inner processes they go through by asking them “why” they use technology in such ways. Some of the questions will include: How do our being Koreans, being female, and being non-native speakers of English affect the ways we engage in CMC in English? How do our experiences of communicating in cyberspace in English, on the other hand, affect our lives as Korean, female, non-native speaking individuals? Why do they affect in such ways?

### 2.2.2.2 Where do culture, gender, and language come in?

Looking from this perspective, technology should not and cannot be examined apart from human lives.
When CMC by Korean women is looked at, therefore, the surroundings of those people involved should become an essential part of the discussion. This is where culture, gender, and language come in to play in my study. Their being Korean, being women, and being non-native speakers of English should be taken into account to discuss their CMC in English. Their culture, gender, and language in relation to CMC should therefore be the necessary components in the study. This will include not only the discussions of the relationship of technology with culture, gender, and language in general, but the examination of Korean women’s culture, gender, and language in relation to their CMC, in particular. It will also include interplays among culture, gender, and language and how they play out in Korean women’s CMC with people of different and/or similar culture, gender, and language.

Technology is said to be deeply embedded in culture according to Don Ihde who showed how people in different cultures develop different technologies to serve similar purposes or use similar technologies for different purposes and how crossculturality was an important part of technological innovations (Ihde, 1993, p. 50, 65-66). While culture was once defined as “a description of a particular way of life which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour” (Du Gay, Hall, Janes, Mackay, & Negus, 1997, p.12), the meaning of culture in the current age of information technology and globalization should be reexamined to encompass its social, economic, and political processes.

Gender is another big piece of the puzzle in my study. Not only is it present in the gender of Korean women that I would like to meet in my study, but it is also present in my own gender, being a female researcher looking at CMC by other females and/or
males. In my study, I am perceiving gender to have always been a part of human culture since the beginning of human history in a form of sex/gender system, functioning as “some ideological framework … which layers vast cultural meaning on the evolved sexual dimorphism of the human organism, setting different roles, expectations, assessments, and values for members of different sexes” (Hopkins, 1998, p.3). To place it in relation to technology and science, gender is viewed as “not simply an effect of the circulation of representations and discourse, but also the effect of specific social, economic, and institutional relations of power” (Balsamo, 1996, p.162). As it will be seen in later part of this section, gender stands at the cross section of culture, technology, and language. Gendered culture transfers its genderedness (bias) to its technology, and a historical examination of language reveals how gender permeates the very language we use.

The place of language in my study is as a means of communication in cyberspace noting the fact that non-native speakers of English being engaged in CMC in English have to cross the border of different languages, from Korean to English. My initial focus in terms of language was on issues including the role of English as a *lingua franca* and concerns about English becoming “the language of cyberspace, where English dominated as it does in international business, entertainment, research, and other areas of communication” (Murray, 2000b, p.407). However, examining the interrelationship of language with technology, culture, and gender offered broader perspectives for my inquiry. Language is now viewed as a system of representation reflecting conceptual maps shared within culture with which we relay our ideas to others (Hall, 1997, p.15-24). In the mean time, the genderedness of language also informs the interplay of technology,
culture, and language, which will help me look into how Korean women negotiate gendered norms of language use in Korean and also in English in their CMC.

2.2.3 Interplays and/or tensions among four areas

2.2.3.1 {Technology ~ Culture} Across various discipline areas, there have been many studies examining the direct effects of employing different types of technology (Abrams, 2003; Beauvois, 1992; Berge & Collins, 2000; D. Chun, 1994; Gunawardena & Duphorne, 2000; Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004; R. Kern, 1995; Kol & Schcolnik, 2000; Kung, 2004; Poole, 2000; Sotillo, 2000; Sullivan & Pratt, 1996; Torii-Williams, 2004; Warschauer, 1996b). Those studies, usually applying quantitative methodology, often focus their discussion on the surface level changes or short-term effects of technology, failing to address wider and deeper dimensions of technology use. The standpoint of looking at the intersection of technology and culture suggests a different set of questions: what are the surrounding environments of the technology being used and how does the use of technology socially and culturally change the lives of its users beyond the mere change measured in quantity. Examples of such studies ranges from the examination of cultural and social implication of the medium itself (Coyne, 1995; Du Gay et al., 1997; Nardi & O'Day, 1999a; Star, 1995; Throne, 2003; Ulijn & Campbell, 2001), the discussion of its effects on the users’ perceptions of identity and community (Burbules & Callister, 2000; Escobar, 1996; Foster, 1997; Hian, Chuan, Trevor, & Detenber, 2004; Itakura, 2004; Kanno & Norton, 2003; Nardi & O'Day,
In the mean time, there also have been studies focusing on the implications of technology use in educational settings. Although numerous studies across various discipline areas are rooted in utopian or technophile perspectives offering blindly positive promises of technology, I have found many other studies speaking from dystopian and/or more balanced perspectives, expressing various concerns and precautions about the way technology is being used and social, cultural, and political contexts around it (Bromley & Apple, 1998; Bryson & de Castell, 1998; Butler-Pascoe, 2003; Crystal, 2001; Damarin, 2000; Fabos & Young, 1999; Guernsey, 2001; Noble, 1998; Schofield, Davidson, Stocks, & Futoran, 1996; Shields, 1994; Wise, 1997). Some of the issues raised by these studies include: unequal opportunity for access to advanced technologies for different groups of students, commercialization of education exacerbated by the recent use of the Internet, and cases of abuse/misuse of technology resulting in disempowering students and/or teachers alike.

In relation to my topic, this discussion will guide me in addressing questions concerning how Korean women perceive their own cultural identity and their sense of community when engaged in CMC with their classmates from different cultures. Where would they see themselves in relation to the CMC communities they are engaged in? Would they perceive the evanescence of cyber communities being imagined communities (B. Anderson, 1991, p.6-7)? Would they be able to recognize their cultural hybridities and their lives at borders in-between nations and cultures (Bhabha, 1994) as new possibilities? Additionally included will be the examination of the recent trend of
informational technology in Korea and the meaning of CMC in a Korean context; how Koreans perceive and use this new medium of communication, how different it is from the U.S. perspective, and how the distance between the two are negotiated and reflected in the CMC of Korean women in U.S. classroom contexts.

2.2.3.2 {Technology ~ Gender} Throughout the history of technology, gender systems that are given in human culture are constantly re-evaluated and altered as new technologies “arrive.” According to Hopkins, this occurs in four ways: technology’s association with gender, technology reinforcing gender systems, technology subverting gender systems, and technology altering the very nature of gender and sex (Hopkins, 1998). Drawing upon this, the themes I discuss in this section are: gendered technology/science, gendered body, and standpoint epistemology and situated knowledge.

The association of technology with men permeates the history of technology so much that examples of this are found without much difficulty. The direction of technological development has not been in favor of women and women’s contributions to technological history are often hidden (Plant, 1995, example of ADA language; Wajcman, 1991); the existing gendered system has always been reflected in the design of new technology (Brunner, Bennett, & Honey, 1998; de Castell & Bryson, 1998) to reinforce the gender system; interactions between bodies and technologies engender gendered embodiment of technology in various forms (Balsamo, 1996, 1999; Featherstone & Burrows, 1995; Turkle, 1998); and finally, women have been systematically excluded from the field of science and technology (Rasmussen & Hapnes,
1999), which might have been essential for the reproduction and reestablishment of the existing gender system.

In this regard, the history of gendered technology and science is often summarized as follows:

Men take charge of technology development => they unconsciously and/or consciously put their own biased social values in the process => they produce technology that can benefit themselves => this opens up more opportunities for men => and the cycle continues to roll from the beginning.

Based on this, I am arguing that technology cannot and should not be discussed without considering gender because “Technology has everything to do with who benefits and who suffers, whose opportunities increase and whose decrease, who creates and who accommodates” (Bush, 1983, p.163), where technology itself can be thought to be an equity issue.

While male dominance in the field of technology has been the major thread, another strand of studies has been looking at the possibilities of women engaging in active use of technology. Arguing against uncritical association of men and boys with computer technologies (Turkle, 1999; Wakeford, 2000), many recent studies has shown how women can use technology in their own ways to empower themselves and to prove against the masculinity of technology (Arizpe, 1999; Ebben & Kramarae, 1993; Gomez-Pena, 1996; Guymer, 1999; Spender, 1995).

Men’s act of “taking charge of” technology development was far from contingent, however. The history of philosophy (Ihde, 1993) is filled with male names demonstrating that men have been in the position of writing history, hence history not herstory. The
knowledge and reasoning has historically been a masculine realm and only the male ways of knowing have been considered to be legitimate. Newness and progress, which were associated with masculinity, were valued and the goal of research was to arrive at the “real” reality presumed to exist out there through objective scientific methods. This tradition of positivism has long been maintained as the norm in the research tradition and the involvement of the researcher in the research process was considered as contaminating and interfering (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p.176).

However, the dualism of subject and object was problematized to bring the arrival of the age of relativism and the realization of the myth of “value-free knowledge” and “theory-free observation” (J. K. Smith & Deemer, 2000, p.877). This has turned many researchers’ attention to the newly evolved notion of “crisis of representation” and the importance of language (linguistic turn). Among them were feminist researchers who suggested alternative ways of knowing, focusing their argument on the value of women’s ways of knowing. Donna Haraway was one of the first who noted the “partialness” of the knowing self (Haraway, 1991a, p.22) and argued for the “situated knowledge” through the “epistemologies of location, positioning, and situating, where partiality and not universality is the condition of being heard to make rational knowledge claims” (Haraway, 1991b, p.195). Based on this, Sandra Harding went on to criticize the traditional criteria of scientific objectivity for its “elimination of all social values and interests from the research process and the results of research.” (Harding, 1993b, p.71) and claimed the employment of “stronger objectivity” with the use of “stronger methods” (Harding, 1993a), urging researchers to start acknowledging the fact that “bias is where
the research starts” and reflexively naming their own bias instead of pretending as if it does not exist or matter.

2.2.3.3 {Technology ~ Language} Language, in this paper, is viewed as systems of representation with which we communicate our ideas to our listeners/readers. Technology, on the other hand, is defined as culturally embedded ways of seeing the world. Along with this logic comes the idea of “technology as language” because access to a certain type of technology opens new possibilities for us to do things and “these options function rather like words in a language. ... you (we) must use what tools and techniques are available in any attempt to carry out a particular action” (Benston, 1988, p.18). When used as a medium of communication, therefore, the characteristics of and/or access to the particular medium will function as constraints to delimit the language its users can produce.

One strand of studies connecting technology and language looked at the shifts in language uses across communities formed by different types of technology (Benston, 1988; Cohn, 1996; Crystal, 2001; Danet & Herring, 2003; Kramarae, 1988; Spender, 1995; Zamierowski, 1994), focusing their attention on the social and cultural effects of such technologies on the choice of words, discourse styles, or patterns of interactions. An interesting point to note from reviewing these studies is that many studies take into account gender, alluding to the interrelationship among three constructs: technology, gender, and language. Male dominance of technology seems to be transferred into language usage in various technological contexts according to these studies. Considering the genderedness of technology discussed in the previous section, the giveness of gender
within culture, and the close relationship between language and gender (the theme of the next section), the overlap of technology, gender, and language seems to be only natural.

Another implication of the relationship between technology and language that speaks to my topic is the issue of non-native speakers of English in cyberspace because the people in my research need to cross the border of two different languages, from Korean to English. English being its language, the Internet is regarded either as providing new possibilities for non-native speakers (Warschauer, 2000a, 2000b) or as another form of linguistic imperialism in the age of electronic communication (Joe Lockard, 2000; Murray, 2000b). Many researchers in the field of foreign and second language education provide a body of research looking at linguistic characteristics of language learners’ writing in cyberspace in relation to issues in language teaching and learning (Blake, 2000; Davis & Thiede, 2000; Hegelheimer & Tower, 2004; Kung, 2004; Li, 2000; Murray, 1995; Sotillo, 2000; Sullivan & Pratt, 1996; Torii-Williams, 2004; Warschauer, 1996a; Zamierowski, 1994).  

Informed by a review of literature discussed in this section, questions to be raised in my study in relation to \{Technology \sim Language\} will include: How is being non-native speakers of English perceived by Korean women in their CMC?; What is the result of those perceptions?; How does their language use in face-to-face interactions in classroom settings shift when they move into cyberspace?; And does the computer as a communication medium enhance or diminish their opportunities in representing their ideas?
2.2.3.4 {Gender ~ Language} Language, being a human invention, has been gendered since its origin, according to Dale Spender’s feminist analysis of the history of English language (Spender, 1980). Starting from the understanding that “Language is our means of classifying and ordering the world: our means of manipulating reality” (p. 2), she examines the male-oriented assumptions of the science of linguistics, specifically the premise of “female deficiency” predominant in earlier research to demonstrate the androcentric construction of the English language: its social context, vocabulary, syntax, history, and usage. Some other studies also noted on the genderedness of language use (Butler, 2000; Carlton, 1994; Riley, 2000; Schulz, 2000), mostly attending to the derogation of woman. The male dominance of language does not end with the sexist use of language. Instead, the acceptance of male-as-norm and the endorsement of masculine language perpetuates the patriarchal power structure of the already gendered culture, resulting in muted women and subsequently disdaining women’s knowledge to create “gendered” discourse and women’s ways of speaking (Spender, 1985).

One of the first who identified and wrote about this genderedness in ways of language use was Robin Lakoff, who argued that “women experience linguistic discrimination in two ways: in the way they are taught to use language, and in the way general language use treats them” (Lakoff, 1975, p. 4). Based on Lakoff’s identification of social and cultural power functioning upon our language use, comes other studies ascertaining male dominance in inter-gender interactions (Edelsky, 1993; James & Clarke, 1993; James & Drakich, 1993; Tannen, 1993a, 1993b). In the mean time, as mentioned in the previous section {Technology ~ Language}, the gendered discourse
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4 For detailed discussion of studies in this strand, please refer to section 2.3 Review of CMC studies in the
seems to maintain its characteristics across borders between different communication media – spoken/written language to CMC; Women in cyberspace are as silenced as they are in real life situations and linguistic violence against women does not disappear in cyberspace or is even aggravated by the facelessness of CMC (Ebben & Kramarae, 1993; Kramarae & Taylor, 1993; Nardi & O'Day, 1999b; Turkle, 1998).

The interrelationship between gender and language revealed in the form of genderedness in language use discussed in this section was for English language used by native speakers of English. For the Korean women participating in my study, who are native speakers of Korean and non-native speakers of English, two layers of such interrelationships are possible: {Gender ~ Language} for Korean language and another for English. In communicating in English, they might exercise, experience, or negotiate the genderedness in one or both languages, depending on the choice of linguistic identity. For example, if one chooses to conceive herself as a Korean female and exercises Korean female ways of speaking/writing, she is bringing genderedness of Korean language as she uses English, which is also gendered in its own right. Considering the gendered nature of Korean culture discussed in 2.1 (Korean women: Who are we (they)?) , the research participants in this study bring with them Korean cultural and gender identity, which is reflected in their language use as well as their thoughts and behavior. In this study, therefore, one of the questions regarding gender and language in Korean women’s CMC will be: how much of the genderedness of Korea language will (or will not be) transferred into their CMC in English? And if it is transferred, how do the genderedness of English and that of Korean affect the discourse of their CMC in English?

field of foreign and second language education.
2.2.3.5 {Gender ~ Culture} Because genderedness is given within culture (Hopkins, 1998) and language is a culturally dependent system of representation (Hall, 1997) gender and culture are inseparable from each other. In this study, the investigation of the interrelationship between gender and culture will be on Korean women, focusing on the implication of gender in Korean context, looking at how Korean women are situated in Korean culture and how it has been shaping their lives in Korean society. These questions were answered in the previous section, 2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)?, where I reported a review of literature on Korean women. Some of the important themes identified in the section include: the adoption of Confucianism into Korean society (C. Choi, 1998; Duncan, 1998; S. Moon, 1998), its exorbitant influence in education, society, and politics (K. W. Cho, 1994; O.-j. Lee, 1996; Palley, 1994), different roles and status at different stages of Korean women’s lives (daughter, wife, and mother) (Gelb & Palley, 1994; J. M. Kim, 1995; O. Moon, 1990), and the meaning of marriage and family for Korean women (E. Choi, 1994; Clark, 2000b; Y. H. Kim & Han, 1996).

Insights gained from reading these studies helped me in answering questions like: Are Korean women conscious of their being Korean and being women when engaged in CMC? How do they negotiate this in their CMC with others of different gender and/or from different cultures; And, how does it interact with genderedness of U.S. academic culture and/or genderedness of CMC?
Language and culture have long been intertwined and researchers across different disciplines have discussed the close and intricate relationship between them (Boas, 2000; Fanon, 2000; Sapir, 2000). These studies noted that learning a different language simultaneously involves learning the culture of that language, a new way of life. Following on this comes the notion of the difficulties of translation and the incommensurability of cultural difference. Malinowski argues that “the study of any language, spoken by a people who live under conditions different from our own and possess a different culture, must be carried out in conjunction with the study of their culture and of their environment” (Malinowski, 2000, p. 390) because meaning is dependent upon the context of situation and therefore, any attempt to understand utterances in a different culture simply on the basis of word-for-word translation is doomed to failure.

The interplay of language and culture in Korean women’s CMC pertains to the combination of distances between two languages and cultures, \(\{L1-L2\} + \{C1-C2\}\), and how their CMC is different when crossing the borders between languages \(\{L1-L2\}\) and cultures \(\{C1-C2\}\). This has been a focus of various sociocultural studies of Second Language Acquisition viewing language learners within their social and cultural contexts. According to Norton, language learners’ utterances are not intended solely for information exchange with their listeners. Rather, within the process of producing those utterances, they constantly organize and reorganize their senses of who they are and how they relate to the social world surrounding them by engaging in “identity construction
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5 Since the topic of being Korean women was covered in detail in a previous section (2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)?), only a brief summary is provided here to avoid repetition.
and negotiation” (Norton, 1997, p. 410). In an attempt to answer questions like “Under what social and cultural conditions do language learners speak?” and “How is a learner’s changing identity related to the process of language learning?,” Norton understands identity construction with reference to relations of power between language learners and target language speakers in her longitudinal case study of immigrant women in Canada (Norton, 2000).

McMahill studied how female Japanese learners of English display different identity across language and culture (McMahill, 1997). For one woman, learning English was an empowering experience because she was able to express her convictions, which otherwise might not have been possible if spoken in Japanese. In a study of 100 Hmong students in U.S. post secondary institutions, Bosher found how language learners changed their identity across language and culture by showing that newcomers were able to develop bicultural identities by adapting to the host culture without giving up their native culture or ethnic affiliation (Bosher, 1997).

In my study, therefore, issues worthwhile for closer examination in relation to \{Language ~ Culture\} will include: cases of misunderstanding caused by the collision of different languages and cultures in Korean women’s CMC if any; how do they deal with those misunderstandings; how would their linguistic proficiency and cultural proficiency (the level of knowledge and acquaintance with U.S. culture) help or hinder in the process; and how do they perceive these misunderstandings.

\[\text{L1 refers to first language or Korean and L2 refers to second language or English; C1 refers to first culture or Korean culture and C2 refers to second culture or culture of the second language – U.S. culture in my study.}\]
2.2.4 Arriving at my positionality

2.2.4.1 Korean women’s CMC in relation to \{Technology \~ Culture \~ Gender \~ Language\}

In an attempt to develop my positionality on my research topic, CMC and \{Technology \~ Culture \~ Gender \~ Language\}, I have thus far examined the six pair-wise interrelationships among the four constructs. The intricate structure of interrelationships among the four areas has been overwhelming throughout my readings on this topic. As I have noted along the way, there are many overlaps among them and it sometimes seemed inappropriate to divide my discussion into separate sections; \{Gender \~ Language\} and \{Technology \~ Language\} seemed so intertwined with each other and so did \{Gender \~ Culture\} and \{Language \~ Culture\}. For my positionality on \{Technology \~ Culture \~ Gender \~ Language\}, then, I could have simply claimed it to be some kind of combination of the six interrelationship that I have discussed so far, pointing to the fact that each of the six analyses is a piece of the whole picture of Korean women’s CMC.

However, I was in need of a metaphor to capture the complexity of CMC by Korean women entailing all of the six interrelationships. One such metaphor that I have found to be suitable in describing my positionality is the notion of “contact zone” by Mary Louise Pratt. In her discussion of crossculturalness in academic communication communities, she defined contact zones as “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many part of the world today” (Pratt, 1998, p.173). She challenged an assumption behind modern views of language as code and competence that says “a unified and homogeneous social world in
which language exists as a shared patrimony – as a device, precisely, for imagining community” (Pratt, 1998, p. 180) and noted the existence of one party assuming authority over another in many cross-cultural communication situations, sites of contact zones.

Applying this notion to my own study, I am comparing Korean women’s CMC in English to a type of contact zone, where Korean women, carrying their beings of Korean (culture), female (gender), non-native speakers of English (language) into cyberspace, to meet people from different culture, gender, and linguistic background. When engaged in CMC in English, people represent themselves, in their CMC writings, by negotiating their own culture, gender, and language. People sitting at different nodes of the network, then, read those writings based on their own culture, gender, and language, and sometimes, using their perceptions of the others’ culture, gender, and language. In the process, different cultures, genders, or languages meet, clash, or grapple with each other in cyberspace, enabled by technology.

The complex process of Korean women’s CMC involves making conscious or unconscious decisions in an attempt to convey their ideas properly into writing in English in cyberspace, standing at the border of technology, culture, gender, and language. It is when the results of this process, Korean women’s CMC writings, are posted in cyberspace and read by others that a contact zone of technology, culture, gender, and language formed among Korean women and others engaged in CMC. The prototypical manifestation of language being generally assumed as “speech of individual adult native speakers face-to-face in monolingual, even monodialectical situations” (Pratt, 1998, p. 180-181), CMC in English by Korean, female, non-native speakers of English engender
struggles, conflicts, or problems as different levels of tensions and interplays among the
four constructs are present and constantly evolving at the contact zone.

2.2.4.2 Where do I stand? Claiming my positionality as a researcher

Another attempt to arrive at my positionality comes from the review of current studies on
CMC and their limitations in addressing the relationship among the four constructs,
{Technology ~ Culture ~ Gender ~ Language}. Some of the studies cited in {Technology
~ Culture} shed light on how CMC reflects technology as culture, an integral part of our
lives (K. T. Anderson, McClard, & Larkin, 1994; Bromberg, 1996; Bruckman, 1998;
Haynes & Holmevik, 1998; B. Kolko, 1998) and several other studies investigated the
intersection of {Technology ~ Gender} (Arizpe, 1999; Ebben & Kramarae, 1993; B. E.
Kolko, 2000; Silver, 2000). However, these studies usually deal with native speakers of
English engaged in CMC using their first language.

Sherry Turkle, a scholar in social studies of technology, discusses how computers
(re)shape our lives and our selves. She sees the self as “a multiple, distributed system”
(Turkle, 1996) and views each of us playing different selves in computer screens
simultaneously when we have more than one programs running at our computers. When
people are engaged in MOO (Multi-User Domain Object Oriented), Turkle says, they
“become authors not only of text but of themselves, constructing new selves through
social interaction” (Turkle, 1995, p. 12). For non-native speakers of English, however, it
is not easy to “author” different selves in cyberspace when the CMC happens across
language and culture. On the other hand, as discussed earlier in sections {Technology ~
Language} and {Technology ~ Culture}, CMC studies offered by researchers in the field
of foreign and second language education (Biesenbach-Lucas & Weasenforth, 2001; Blake, 2000; Lam, 2000; Li, 2000; Sotillo, 2000; Sullivan & Pratt, 1996; Warschauer, 1996b) often fail to take account of the cultural and social aspects of CMC.

As shown above, there have been a lot of CMC studies conducted by researchers from different discipline areas; interplays between {Technology ~ Culture}, {Technology ~ Gender}, and {Technology ~ Language} were examined in cultural/social studies of technology, feminist studies of technology, and foreign and second language education, respectively. However, not many studies provide perspectives from the cross section of {Technology ~ Culture ~ Gender ~ Language}. The dearth of such studies on CMC makes it difficult to conduct my research since the existing CMC studies do not provide me with sufficient guidelines to follow.

However, this is also where I claim my unique positionality as a researcher to study Korean women’s CMC, based on my academic background coupled with my own being, a Korean woman studying in a U.S. academic context. As noted in the beginning of this chapter, the four constructs were initially identified by reflecting upon my own CMC in English. Put it another way, I am oscillating at the cross sections of {Technology ~ Culture ~ Gender ~ Language}, internally experiencing the four constructs being negotiated in my mind as I write in cyberspace. More importantly, I believe that my own journey across different academic fields – computer science to language education and finally arriving at cultural studies of technology – is of great benefit to me in developing a more balanced perspective on Korean women’s CMC in English. Having been in the gendered realm of technology (computer science), having been living in the heavily gendered Korean culture as a woman, and being a non-native speaker of English still
struggling with the distance between Korean and English, I believe that I am at the right position to study Korean women’s CMC, my dissertation topic.

While I am confident about my positionality, I do recognize the fact that my unique position standing at the intersection of {Technology ~ Culture ~ Gender ~ Language} cannot be a sufficient condition for a good research. Drawing upon the feminist standpoint epistemology, reflecting upon the partialness of knowing self and situatedness of knowledge (Haraway, 1991b) will become an important task throughout the research process. In addition, the issue of insider/outsider will be problematized in an effort to monitor and name my own bias as a Korean female researcher studying Korean women. 7

2.3 Review of CMC studies in the field of foreign and second language education

This age of globalization and technological development has informed many researchers in the field of TESOL (Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages) to direct their attention to the use of information technology to help the learners of English become confident and active communicators in today’s world. Many TESOL professionals agree on the introduction of technology into language classrooms in the current era of electronic communication. However, there are various questions and issues to be discussed: What kind of technology should be introduced?; When and in what way should technology be used?; What could we expect from the use of technology?; And, what are its effects on Second Language Acquisition (SLA)? Many studies have asked different sets of questions and provided different answers and
perspectives. In the midst of this plethora of studies, one needs a critical review of the literature from different perspectives in order to make educated decisions on the use of technology for language teaching and learning.

In an effort to contextualize the emergence of CMC in the field of foreign and second language education, this section will begin with a brief of historical review of technology use in language teaching and learning and a brief survey of current trend of information technology in Korea. Followed by this will be a review of CMC studies from four different perspectives: variables/constructs considered; modes of analysis and/or research methods employed; CMC in relation to SLA theories and issues; and general perspectives offered by TESOL professionals. As it might be the case for any literature review, reading a number of studies can yield a large set of themes and issues, forming complex links among various strands. I also have noticed many overlaps among different themes and perspectives surfacing from the CMC studies discussed in this paper. However, I have organized this section into four subsections for the sake of discussion. While many of the studies could fall into a few different sections simultaneously, I have tried to place each study in the most relevant section in an attempt to make the review both concise and streamlined. At the end of the section I summarized the review and discussed some of the limitations I noticed.

2.3.1 A brief history of technology in language classrooms

The history of educational technology reveals the endeavors that educators made to introduce various types of technology into classrooms. Kern & Warschauer, (2000)
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7 Further discussion on the issues of insider/outsider and objectivity/subjectivity will be made in section 3.2
and Salaberry (1996) provide historical reviews of some pedagogical claims of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) in relation to SLA research. These studies suggest that the perspectives on language teaching and learning have been shaped by the prevailing learning theories of the time. When there was a prevailing learning theory in a certain period of time, that theory became an interest of many SLA researchers of that time; the findings of studies by those researchers have subsequently informed the teaching practices of language teachers. Followed by the popularity of certain instruction methods, there has been a development of corresponding CALL applications, within the scope of available technology of the time.

From the 1920s through 1950s, behavioristic approaches to teaching in general education informed people in the field of language education to view language as an “autonomous structural system.” This viewpoint subsequently gave birth to teaching methods drawing upon that theory of language learning to propose methods like Grammar-Translation Method or Audio-lingual Method by researchers in the field of SLA. People in the field of CALL then adopted this trend in their designing practices to produce some of the earliest CALL programs (the computer-as-tutor model), which were designed to provide immediate positive or negative feedback to learners based upon the formal accuracy of their responses. In addition, these programs were designed to run on mainframe computers, the level of technology in the 1960s and 1970s. Beginning in the late 1970s, the advent of micro computing, of hypermedia technology, and of telecommunications (Internet and World Wide Web) made the implementation of
sociocultural approaches to language learning possible through computer mediated communication (CMC).

An interesting point to note here is that the length of time period between the emergence of SLA theories and the development of CALL application programs seems to be shortened by the rapid development of technology. While the development of drill-and-practice type CALL programs in the 1960s emerged about 10 to 20 years after the advent of structural perspective on language learning and teaching of the 1940s and 1950s, the discussion of the effects of CMC on language learning seems to be happening about the same time as the sociocultural perspectives on language learning and teaching is getting popular. Several studies that revealed their focus on sociocultural theory in reporting the effects of computer use include: Bonk, Medury, & Reynolds (1994), Kumpulainen & Mutanen (1998), Ortega (1997), and Warschauer (1998), and more recently, Chen (2003), Danet & Herring (2003), and Freiermuth (2001). I view this phenomenon to be very positive because the balanced development between SLA theories and CALL applications could provide helpful practical information for language teachers in a timely manner. In return, language teachers could provide valuable feedbacks for the researchers in the field of both SLA and CALL.

2.3.2 The trend of informational technology in Korea

Korea is said to be one of the fastest growing countries in the world in terms of information and communication technologies, or so is it claimed in many Korean news reports. E-mail has become an additional mode of communication for many people in Korea and the use of mobile communication has been rapidly increasing for the last
several years. With a population of fifty million, the number of Internet users has reached ten million at the end of year 1999, around 20% of the population. According to the most recent report, the proportion of Internet users jumped to 60% in the year of 2002 (Rhee & Kim, 2004). According to an analysis by Korea Network Information Center, a combination of four aspects contributes to this sharp increase: socio-cultural changes toward informational technology, government policies encouraging technological development, upgraded information infrastructure, and increased investment in IT related business (KNIC, 2001).

The use of technology in educational settings has also seen a dramatic increase for the last few years. According to Eastmond & Kim (2000), under nationwide projects intended for more democratic and open education, Korea moved quickly to implement the information infrastructure and to raise computer literacy of students and teachers. The establishment of cyber universities, proposed by Korea Educational Reform Committee in August 1996, triggered the production of about 700 on-line courses since the beginning of 1999 (p. 107-108). Not only educational institutes, but commercial organizations are also offering various on-line courses. As of the end of year 2000, dozens of on-line English learning coursers became available (Joongang-Ilbo, 2000a) and by March 2001, the number of cyber universities reached nine (Joongang-Ilbo, 2000b). Most recently, Korea announced the establishment of Internet access at every primary and second classroom as of April 20th, 2001 (Joongang-Ilbo, 2001a). This availability of technology in school settings opens up increased possibilities for technology use in classrooms of various subject areas as well as language classrooms.
2.3.3 Variable and/or constructs considered

2.3.3.1 Changes in characteristics of learners’ linguistic output

As the initial aim for introducing computers into language classrooms was to enhance language learners’ performance in their target languages, many studies of CMC focused their attention on the examination of changes in learners’ language output as a result of technology use. Since the CMC enabled by the current level of communication technology is usually text-based, a lot of studies looked into the linguistic changes in language learners’ writing. While Biesenbach-Lucas & Weasenforth (2001) did not find obvious difference when ESL (English as a Second Language) learners’ writings in e-mail and those in word processing were compared, other studies reported increases in syntactic complexity, lexical complexity, and grammatical accuracy in language learners’ CMC (Li, 2000; Pellettieri, 2000; Stockwell & Harrington, 2003; Warschauer, 1996a). Focusing on CMC’s potential for inducing more interactions both inside and outside the classrooms, some studies investigated the benefits of asynchronous CMC and found that language learners produce more sentences in CMC, which consequently increased their confidence level of interactive competence (D. Chun, 1994; R. Kern, 1995; Kung, 2004; Linda Lee, 2002).

2.3.3.2 Focus on medium

Another strand of studies focused on technical aspects of various types of communication technology available to suggest their possible benefits when applied for language teaching and learning. Some studies found potential for learners’ self-reflection, more equal opportunities for student participation, and increased collaboration among learners in the asynchronous communication and
networked-based learning environment (Lamy & Goodfellow, 1999; Meskill & Ranglova, 2000; Torii-Williams, 2004; Warschauer, 1996a). Chun & Plass (2000) and Zähner, Fauverge, & Wong (2000) on the other hand, looked at the benefits of networked multimedia in diversifying the mode of delivery in language teaching. The recent move toward the use of MOO (Multi-User Domain Object Oriented) drew many language educators’ attention for its capacity to provide a very different learning environment where student-centeredness and more collaboration can be achieved (Bonvallet & de Luce, 2001; Der Emde, Schneider, & Kotter, 2001; Schwienhorst, 2004).

Der Emde et al. (2001) appears to stand at the extreme in their study of a language course designed for students learning German at an American college and students learning English at a German university were connected via MOO; they identified five pedagogical benefits: authentic communication and content, autonomous learning and peer teaching in a student-centered classroom, individualized learning, encouragement of experimentation and play triggering students’ creativity, and students becoming researchers of their target language and its culture. Most recently, the unique potential of using Internet-based real time communication technology was noted by Wang & Sun (2001) as helping students improve their listening and speaking skills, which was not possible with technologies used in previous studies.

2.3.3.3 Change in learners’ characteristics

As technological developments change our view of our lives and world (Ihde, 1993), the use of technology in language classrooms brings change in learners’ attitudes toward language learning and/or their learning environments. Some studies showed the possibility of electronic communication
in language classroom in making students become more active participants and bear more authorship of their language output (Kramsch, A’Ness, & Lam, 2000; Magrath, 2001). Other empirical studies expand these possibilities by showing increased motivation (R. Kern, 1995; Liaw & Johnson, 2001; Warschauer, 1996b), positive attitudes toward language learning (Kamhi-Stein, 2000; L. Lee, 1998), or greater empowerment displayed by language learners (Warschauer, Turbee, & Roberts, 1996).

2.3.3.4 Consideration of gender, culture, and so forth The development of electronic communication technology has brought the possibility for language learners to go beyond the four walls of traditional language classroom settings, adding a new dimension to language teaching – overcoming the distance to the target culture. The use of electronic communication technology enables teachers to deliver cultural information on a timely basis and opportunities of cross-cultural communication help students with their cross-cultural literacy, which is a crucial part of language learning (Furstenberg, Levet, English, & Maillet, 2001; L. Lee, 1998; Liaw & Johnson, 2001). As the increased number of studies on this topic shows (Itakura, 2004; Kanno & Norton, 2003; O'Dowd, 2003; Throne, 2003), cross-cultural communication has become an important part of language teaching and learning in recent years.

Murray includes gender as an issue to note in her discussion of characteristics of CMC and says that “a male discourse style – characterized by debate, freedom from rules, and adversarial argumentation – currently dominates the Internet” (Murray, 2000b, p. 412). However, gender does not seem to attract many TESOL researchers’ attention and Liaw (1998) is one of the few who discuss the effect of gender in interaction
dynamics. In a case study designed to investigate the efficacy of integrating e-mail writing into two EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms to explore the dynamics involved in the process of e-mail exchanges, Liaw reported that “The pairs of the same sex exchanged information and focused on getting meaning across. However, the pairs of different sexes constantly made attempts to elicit responses from each other and demonstrated greater sensitivity toward each other's feelings” (Liaw, 1998, p. 344).

2.3.4 Modes of analysis and/or research methods

Research methods employed in CMC studies in TESOL are closely related to the focus of those studies. Most of the studies examining the linguistic characteristics of CMC reviewed at the beginning of the previous section provided quantitative comparison of learners’ linguistic outputs based on different media used (Biesenbach-Lucas & Weasenforth, 2001; R. Kern, 1995; Li, 2000; Liaw, 1998; Torii-Williams, 2004; Warschauer, 1996a): numbers of interactions, numbers of words in writings for lexical complexity, or measurements of syntactic complexity. A more holistic mode of analysis is used by another set of studies where discourse or conversation level was the unit of analysis (Davis & Thiede, 2000; Negretti, 1999; Sotillo, 2000).

Survey and experimental study seem to be among the most commonly used research methods to determine the effectiveness of technology use. Questionnaires are distributed to students in an effort to examine learners’ attitudes toward the technology-enhanced language instruction, changed level of motivation toward language learning itself, or learners’ level of satisfaction with those courses themselves compared to traditional language classrooms (Furstenberg et al., 2001; L. Lee, 1998; Liaw, 1998;
Torii-Williams, 2004; Warschauer, 1996b). A few other studies used experimental
design, in which the comparison between treatment group (use of technology) and control
group (traditional language instruction) is made to support their arguments (Abrams,
2003; Freiermuth, 2001; Kol & Schcolnik, 2000; Payne & Whitney, 2002; Stockwell &
Harrington, 2003).

While quantitative methodology is often used, some recent studies use a
combination of quantitative and qualitative data to provide more in-depth and balanced
analysis. Studies like Der Emde et al. (2001) and Magrath (2001) used the result of
interviews with learners to support their arguments, in addition to quantitative
measurement data. In the mean time, drawing on sociocultural perspectives of language
learning, some recent studies used qualitative research exclusively to study CMC. Lam
(2000) tried to look beneath the surface level of language learners’ output or attitudes and
discussed language learners’ identity or sense of self reflected in their CMC. She reports
a case study of a Chinese immigrant teenagers’ textual identity formation over one year.
Understanding literacy learning as a social process, she shows how her research
participant constructs different identity (the imaginative I, or textual self) on the Web and
suggests TESOL professionals reconsider the significance of identity formation in the
process of L2 literacy development when CMC is part of the language learning. On the
other hand, Warschauer (2000c) did an ethnographic study of four computer-intensive
language and writing classes in Hawaii, in which the majority of students were second
language learners. His study suggests that the particular implementation of network-
based teaching is highly dependent on sociocultural context, including, but not limited to,
the attitudes and beliefs of the teacher. He made a similar point in another ethnographic
study of an on-line ESL composition class at Miller College in Hawaii (Warschauer, 1998).

2.3.5 CMC in relation to SLA theories and issues

Another way to review CMC studies is to look at the SLA theories and issues being discussed in relation to the use of various technologies in those studies. As the phrase computer-mediated-communication implies, many studies discuss the result of employing CMC in language classrooms in terms of the interaction between and/or among learners and teachers. Blake (2000) anchors his discussion to the interaction hypothesis to support the use of CMC in Spanish classrooms and reports that CMC provides crucial conditions for language acquisition by increasing the opportunities for language learners to have meaningful negotiation with others. In Egbert & Hanson-Smith (1999), a book published by TESOL organization to provide theoretical and practical insights for CALL researchers, the potential of computers to increase interaction and subsequently increase linguistic production are examined (Peyton, 1999). Some of the studies reviewed in section 2.3.3.1 above (Changes in characteristics of learners’ linguistic output) ground their discussion on this perspective of interaction.

While interaction continues to be the theoretical focus of many studies on CMC by language learners, a shift seems to appear as the view on language learning changes. Influenced by the Vygotskian perspective of language and mind, language learners are starting to be viewed within social contexts surrounding them (Lantolf, 2000). This theoretical shift in the field of language teaching and learning produced many sociocultural studies of SLA and the shift is soon reflected in the various studies
examining CMC. Warschauer (1997) provided an introduction to a conceptual framework for understanding the role of computer-mediated interaction based on a sociocultural analysis of the relationship among text, talk, and learning by pointing out the limitations of input and output hypotheses in explaining how students use language-related collaboration. Harrington & Levy (2001) also noted the limitation of the simplistic account of interaction in many CMC/CALL studies, arguing that those studies can only provide a narrow view of CALL.

Drawing upon this, several CMC studies can be discussed here. Bonk et al., (1994) provides an analysis of the cognitive and social cognitive skills that may be developed with the use of collaborative writing and hypermedia / multimedia tools from Piagetian and Vygotskian perspectives, and Hoven proposes to ground the design of computer-assisted language learning environments in sociocultural theory where “learners take an active, goal-oriented role, negotiating and interpreting new experiences in terms of previous ones and in terms of models they have built up to reformulate their internal schemata” (Hoven, 1999, p, 92). Reevaluating the social nature of language acquisition, (Salaberry, 1996) emphasizes two important features in designing pedagogical tasks in CMC environments: the nature of interaction among humans and the roles of the learner in such interaction.

### 2.3.6 General perspective on CMC

As many researchers examine the result of technology employed in language teaching and learning, others take perspectives overlooking many of those studies to provide their thoughts and/or positions on the trend in the field of TESOL. Warschauer,
(2000a) provides an overall picture of the current trend of informational technology and globalized economy in relation to the teaching of English language. Interestingly, he sees the spread of English as an international language to have an empowering effect on nonnative speakers and their dialects. He also expects a change in the notion of literacy to emphasize the increased importance of computer literacy and English language skills in the current era and says that ESL speakers “use the language less as an object of foreign study and more as an additional language of their own to impact and change the world. They will use English, together with technology, to express their identity and make their voice heard.” A few other studies also discussed the changed notion of literacy in the age of electronic communication. Referring to her own book called “Knowledge machines: Language and information in a technological society” (Murray, 1995), Denise E. Murray (Murray, 2000a) notes commonly claimed effects of information technology on literacy practices and communities, which she does not agree with in terms of the direction of the effect. She argues instead that those changes should be examined by attending the mutual influences between social and technological factors.

Under the dominant trend of moving toward the use of computer technology in language classrooms, a few researchers express their concerns about blind acceptance of technology. In his study of on-line teacher training course, Nunan (1999) examined the types of interactional dynamics between instructor and students. According to the interview data, students involved in the study preferred face-to-face instruction to distance learning delivered in Web environment. Based on this result, Nunan (1999) cautions us not to be too enthusiastic about the use of technology noting that there is a danger for the technology to work against our expectation.
While WBI (Web-based instruction) facilitates collaborative and independent learning and is in harmony with a constructivist view of knowledge, and while it offers great potential for those who adhere to constructivist, student-centered, and collaborative approaches to learning, … It can also be used to support traditional, teacher-centered transmission-based programs and courses. In the end, it is the learning that matters, and the technology is simply a means to that end. (Nunan, 1999, p. 71)

2.3.7 Summary of review: How do these studies inform this study?

Based on the review of CMC studies in the field of foreign and second language education discussed so far, I would like to examine how these studies inform my own study, CMC by Korean female learners of English in relation to four constructs – technology, culture, gender, and language. To examine the contributions and/or limitations of these studies, I would like to revisit some the studies discussed in the previous section.

Most of the studies discussed in 2.3.3.1 (Changes in characteristics of learners’ linguistic output) do not seem to go beyond the examination of surface level changes in language learners’ linguistic output. Moreover, in many cases with the exception of Biesenbach-Lucas & Weasenforth (2001), the studies report only positive effects of CMC. However, as noted by sociocultural theory of SLA (Lantolf, 2000), language learning does not happen in a vacuum but within the social context in relation to other people. Therefore, examining learners’ linguistic output alone cannot provide a whole picture of language learners’ CMC, failing to properly inform my own study of CMC by Korean women. Rather, consideration of social, cultural, and situational factors should be included.
The utopian view of technology is being reflected in many of these studies (2.3.3.2 Focus on medium), where various benefits with the employment of different types of technology are being reported. While the relatively recent move toward the introduction of CMC into language classrooms might be accounted as one of the reasons, it is clear that technology, in these studies, is being viewed as a mere medium of communication that is neutral and unbiased. However, technology is anything but neutral; it is deeply embedded in culture and gender-biased in several regards.\(^8\) For this study, therefore, studies in this section will be considered as one side of the story to help me find other studies from different perspectives of technology. The discussion of culture provided by a few studies in the sub-section, 2.3.3.4 Consideration of gender, culture, and so forth, focused on the possibility of CMC enhancing learners’ knowledge of target culture, without taking account of the culture of language learners. In addition, as noted earlier, not many studies pay attention to how language learners’ gender plays in CMC.

Although the dominant trend of research methods used in CMC studies reviewed here seems to have been positivistic and quantitative, the emergence of sociocultural theory of SLA have made some changes to bring about increasing number of CMC studies involving qualitative examination of CMC in relation to the sociocultural contexts of language learning. This direction of current trend is very encouraging in terms of methodological positioning for my own dissertation study. Now that language learning is viewed in context, language learners’ CMC should also be considered in its context, namely, in cyberspace. In addition to the social and cultural situations of learners in real
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\(^8\) See section 2.2.2 Starting from Technology, moving onto Culture, Gender, and Language for a discussion of my perspectives on technology.
life classrooms, their movement into cyberspace should be looked in terms of the social and cultural meanings of being in cyberspace.

2.4 Rationalizing the study in the context of reviewed literature

To conclude this chapter, I will reiterate some of the concerns and issues raised above to suggest how the current study attempts to fill the gaps in the existing body of research literature on language learners’ CMC.

First, more thoughts should be given to the social, cultural, economic, and pedagogical implications of the technology used as a communication medium. When looking at the change in language learners’ language and/or interaction in CMC, not only the direct effect of technology, but more implicit and indirect effect of the communication medium should be considered. As discussed in 2.2.2.1 (My perspective on technology), the meaning of technology in this study will go beyond that of a neutral and unbiased medium. Therefore, rather than simply examining (or measuring) effects of technology use, this study will ask a different set of questions regarding the meaning of technology in language learners’ CMC: What is the meaning of the medium itself to the language learners and/or the language learning itself? How do the learners perceive it? Are they conscious of the change in the communication medium? How do their perceptions and consciousness affect their CMC?

Secondly, there is a need for more application of sociocultural perspectives on language learners CMC. Rather than focusing on the surface level changes in linguistic output when language learners are engaged in CMC, researchers should pay attention to where they are coming from. In my study, the literature on Korean women discussed in
section 2.1, a few sub sections under 2.2.3 (Interplays and/or tensions among four areas) will help understand the participants’ CMC in relation to gender, culture, and language. In addition, Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature that I have read as a Master’s student in the field of foreign and second language education will offer more insights into the study in understanding the complexity involved in language learners’ speaking, which is well described in Norton (1997).

every time language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with their interlocutors; they are also constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. They are, in other words, engaged in identity construction and negotiation. (p. 410)

For example, studies reporting the effects of gender on SLA (Bacon & Finnemann, 1992; Ehrlich, 1997; Morris, 1998; Rubin, 1995; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998) could help understanding the effect of gender in language learners’ CMC. On the other hand, SLA studies looking at the identity of language learners (Bosher, 1997; McMahill, 1997; Norton, 1997) could help in examining how language learners’ identity in cyberspace is similar to or different from that in real life.

The two points discussed above implies the need for interdisciplinary research in examining language learners’ CMC in social contexts while attending to the meaning of technology itself. I believe that the academic journey I went through – Computer Science and Statistics, Foreign and Second Language Education, and cultural studies of technology – has helped me develop a unique interdisciplinary perspective drawing upon those different fields in studying CMC by Korean female learners of English.

Lastly, the review of CMC studies in the previous section revealed an urgent need for qualitative research methodology. We now know and acknowledge the fact that
language learning should be seen in social context. We also know that technology is not innocent; it affects us to live our lives differently and view the worlds around us differently. To be able to capture the picture of language learners’ CMC, we need to examine their use of technology in social or cultural contexts instead of measuring changes in their linguistic outputs. The use of quantitative research methodology alone might not serve our purpose very well. Therefore, I am working from an interpretivist paradigm using qualitative research methodology, which will be discussed in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodological Framework

This study is intended to understand how Korean female learners of English represent themselves through CMC across culture, language, and technology. The construction of self-representation in textual form (English, in this case) is not something that can be measured using a quantitative instrument, nor can it be done out of the contexts where CMC takes place. For this reason, starting with a set of well-formed research questions or hypotheses or an a priori design is not only impossible but also unreasonable. Therefore, I am choosing to work from a postpositivist paradigm. Specifically, I am taking a position of interpretivist paradigm (Schwandt, 2000). Because there cannot be such a thing as one definitive answer to my questions, interaction with the research participants and making meanings out of what I see are important.

In addition to this, I am drawing upon feminist epistemology in general and the notion of situated knowledge in particular as a ground for my dissertation research in terms of methodology. Looking at Korean women’s CMC through quantitative and positivistic lenses using survey instruments, for instance, necessitates a certain degree of
distance between the researcher and the researched (or, subjects). To be able to listen to their voices more closely, the researcher has to move closer to the participants. This is why I, as a researcher, should become a part of the CMC to look at how these women are engaged in their CMC. This involves reflecting upon my own identity to recognize its non-unifying, non-fixable characteristics and the infinite layers of “I” (Trinh, 1986-1987, p.27) and unlearn my privilege as the researcher/speaker/writer of Korean women which Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak suggests we do when writing in an attempt to “give voice” to others (Landry & MacLean, 1996, p.4-5).

3.2 Troubling the position of the researcher

3.2.1 Why women, but not men?

Why do I have to talk to Korean women, but not Korean men? Answering this question traces back to the time when I was first conceptualizing my dissertation topic, computer-mediated communication (CMC) by Korean women in relation to technology, culture, gender, and language. As I was situating myself within the actual doing of my research on CMC, I found myself developing a feeling of discomfort with the idea of talking to Korean men as a part of my research. A Korean female researcher asking questions of Korean male students about their experiences of CMC? It did not seem normal, workable, or even readily acceptable. This was initially an intuitive response. But a few seconds of thought revealed that it was actually an inevitable result of my lived experience as a Korean woman. Picturing myself talking to Korean male students, I was immediately reminded of the intricate structure of interrelationship between sexes and
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9 I have previously discussed this in section 2.2.3 Interplays and/or tensions among four fields – 2.2.3.2
how much gender matters in Korean culture. I was not sure if I could talk to them without being unduly concerned about the awkwardness of the situation, and I was equally not sure how my position of being a female researcher would affect their description of CMC experiences. When I turned to the literatures of technology, culture, and language, I found gender being closely related to each of them\textsuperscript{10}; gender was becoming a lot bigger than I originally thought it to be in my dissertation research.

This line of thought basically brought me to arrive at the decision that I need to study Korean women, but not Korean men. However, there came another issue as soon as I made this decision. A series of questions sprang up: If I feel discomfort about studying Korean men, am I confident with studying Korean women? Does being a Korean woman guarantee that I could study Korean women well? Who do I think I am to claim such an authority? And most basically, how much do I know about being Korean women? Where do I stand in relation to them? I was witnessing a whole spectrum of issues for me to struggle with being unfolded in front of me.

To be able to address some of the questions raised above as I began my research, I needed to enrich my knowledge of Korean women learned from lived experiences with readings of academic literature on Korean women. Some of the major themes that I have found from this reading were discussed in the previous chapter (2.1 Korean women, who are we (they)?). In addition to this, as a way to develop my positionality as a Korean female researcher looking at Korean women, another strand of literature on qualitative research with particular focus on the issues of objectivity/subjectivity and insider/outsider

\textsuperscript{10} The interrelationships between gender and three other areas in my topic (technology, culture, and language) were discussed in section 2.2.3 Interplays and/or tensions among four areas.
were reviewed and are discussed in the next section. In the subsequent section, I communicate how I wrestle with these issues as I, a Korean female researcher, study/talk to/write about CMC by Korean female students at a large U.S. Midwestern university. This section is divided into three subsections of the research process: As I begin, While listening, and How do I write. This division, however, is by no means an indication of viewing research as a linearly sequenced set of different processes. Rather, I honor the ecological, multidirectional, and evolving nature of qualitative research, in which multiple processes can overlap with each other at a certain point of time.

3.2.2 Insider and/or outsider? Objectivity or subjectivity?

The history of qualitative research methods in the social and human sciences began with the interests of Westerners in understanding the “other,” assuming a mission of “the analysis and understanding of the patterned conduct and social processes of society” (Vidich & Lyman, 2000, p. 37) by observing the world objectively, detached from the particular values of the researcher. The postmodern challenge in ethnography, however, began to acknowledge the situatedness of the researchers’ position in a world and as a result, both the researcher’s standpoint and that of the people being researched became problematic. In the meantime, in the 60s and 70s, the ethnographic “methodological training” of apprenticeships (learning a way of doing by doing) started to be viewed as too methodologically driven, departing from its original mission of “an ongoing attempt to place specific encounters, events, and understanding into a fuller, more meaningful content” (Tedlock, 2000, p.455) to produce representations of human group life.
One strand of response to these issues argues that only natives (insiders) can study natives (insiders) (Swisher, 1998), which was a part of my initial rationale for choosing to study Korean women, but not Korean men. However, there surfaces another question of whether natives’ perspectives are necessarily true, right, or valid -- one of my own struggles in studying Korean women as a Korean woman. The same issue was raised by a few others. Barbara Tedlock appears to be directing her argument to me when she says, “Just as being born female does not automatically result in ‘feminist’ consciousness, being born an ethnic minority does not automatically result in ‘native’ consciousness” (Tedlock, 2000, p. 466); and Britzman also noted that “‘being there’ does not guarantee access to truth” (Britzman, 1995, p. 232).

How, then, do I negotiate and claim my position in my research? Tedlock shows me a clue by stating that “women’s binary view or ‘dual consciousness’ -- similar to the double consciousness attributed to blacks and other racial minorities -- gives women a certain advantage in understanding oppressed peoples worldwide” (Tedlock, 2000, p. 466). Connected to this, Patricia Hill Collins’ notion of “Outsider Within” seems to be useful in naming my position in relation to the Korean women in my study (Collins, 1986, 2000). Collins finds a special potential of the marginality of Black female intellectuals (their outsider within status), which can provide “Black feminist thought that reflects a special standpoint of self, family, and society” (Collins, 1986, p.S14). Opening a possibility for other individuals (other than Black women) to learn from the Black women’s experiences as outsiders within, Collins (1986) suggests that they should occupy a special place, where “they become different people, and their difference sensitizes them to patterns that may be more difficult for established sociological insiders
to see” (p.S29), through which they can develop new ways of seeing the experienced reality and to discover anomalies within it.

Closely related to the issue of insider/outsider, another very important issue that I have been struggling with is the issue of objectivity/subjectivity of my perspective of viewing Korean women’s CMC. Having been influenced by the longstanding dualism of subject and object (Lincoln & Guba, 2000) and awakened now by the realization of the bias underneath so-called scientific discoveries (Begley, 1997; Bower, 1998), I see myself standing beyond the debate between objectivity and subjectivity. I agree with Sandra Harding in seeing the “elimination of all social values and interest from the research process that the results of research” (Harding, 1993b, p. 71) as not only undesirable but also impossible. Beyond the question of scientific objectivity, my new struggle becomes the question of reflexivity, starting from naming my own bias. Harding calls this “strong objectivity” and says, “Strong objectivity requires that the subject of knowledge be placed on the same critical, causal plane as the objects of knowledge. Thus, strong objectivity requires what we can think of as strong reflexivity” (Harding, 1993b, p. 69).

3.2.3 Methodological positioning

1) As I begin: Epistemological assumption

The initial struggle with the issues discussed in the previous section, Insider/Outsider and Objectivity/Subjectivity, originated from my discomfort with the “God’s eye view” of the researcher. Once paralyzed with the realization of the “partialness of the knowing self” (Haraway, 1991a, p.22), the same notion now provides me with a new possibility of the “situated
knowledge” and “epistemologies of location, positioning, and situating, where partiality and not universality is the condition of being heard to make rational knowledge claims” (Haraway, 1991b, p. 195). Also problematized here is the relationship between the researcher and the researched, which, in case of my dissertation topic, becomes largely the issue of Insider/ Outsider. As I mentioned earlier, I turn to Collins (1986) and her idea of “outsider within” status for this matter. Further consideration of this notion of “outsider within,” however, uncovered another layer of my position in my research.

While Collins (2000) was discussing the benefits of this status for studying African-American women within the U.S. context, my study of Korean women in the U.S. academic culture seems to be a different scenario. When I stand on the same side (being Koreans) with the Korean women in my study in relation to the others we meet in classrooms and/or cyberspace, I am an “outsider within” and so are all the Korean women I am studying. However, if I consider the relationship between myself and these Korean women, I think I become rather an “insider at border”; while sharing gender, culture, and language with them (an insider), being a researcher asking questions about their experiences and being conscious of the underlying implication of technology, culture, gender and language in their CMC, I might be seen as someone at border, if not outside, for the Korean women participating in my research. I would like to add here that this is not to claim any authority as the researcher, but to identify the multiple layers of myself being revealed in the research process.

Therefore, I am an “outsider within” and an “insider at border” at the same time. To answer the question of when I will become which, I refer to “the enactment of hybridity” of Narayan (1997). In her own struggle with her status as a native
anthropologist, she showed how her inherently multiple identity, having American mother and Indian father, is regarded differently at different times in varied contexts during her research in India. Arguing against the dichotomous distinction between outsider and insider or between observer and observed, she proposed to “view each anthropologist in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations” (Narayan, 1997, p. 23).

2) While listening to, talking to, and looking at Korean women

The nature of my dissertation topic, Korean women’s CMC in English, calls for getting closer to the actual CMC experiences of Korean women negotiating their culture, gender, and language as they communicate in cyberspace in English. The answers to my dissertation questions, therefore, come from their stories, their texts in CMC, and/or their behaviors within classrooms and/or cyberspace. Considering the idea that people communicate meaning through telling stories, I try to be careful to ‘invite’ stories, rather than reports by relinquishing the responsibility for the talk to them (S. E. Chase, 1995). This also entails the recognition that “interviews are … negotiated accomplishments of both interviewers and respondents that are shaped by the contexts and situations in which they take place” (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p.663).

Underlying all this is respecting the value of Korean women’s voices in my study and giving them the same weight as mine throughout the research process (Christians, 2000). While sharing experiences of trying to negotiate our cultures, genders, and languages in CMC in English being at the same status of “outsiders within,” a careful
negotiation of my being an “insider at border” is required so as not to give an impression of an intellectual tourist.

3) How do I write Korean women’s CMC

As I try to write the stories of Korean women about their CMC experiences, I am starting with the consciousness about meaning of the act of writing someone else’s experiences and the inevitable mediation at my end in the process, rejecting the unthinking viewpoint of seeing writing as “an unproblematic activity, a transparent report about the world studied” (Richardson, 2000, p.923). When I consider Usher & Edwards (1994) who call research “a textual practice of representation through which certain things essential to research in the ‘objective’ mode are achieved,” (p. 149) the notion that writing can never be innocent makes me cautious; the words I put forth in my writing will matter for the readers of my writing, engendering linguistic, cultural and political connotations (Denzin, 2000).

In my dissertation research, limitation in the textual representation comes not only from the partialness of my knowing self (Haraway, 1991a) in talking to and listening to Korean women, but from the slippage of the meaning as Korean women try to represent themselves, their ideas and thoughts in their CMC and narratives in classroom and during interviews in English and/or Korean. Since the interviews were in Korean (except for a few with Elena), I also have to wrestle with the problem of translation. Malinowski (2000) called for the consideration of “the context of situation” (p.392) when translating utterances into different languages. In my study, therefore, I pay close attention to a few different sites of translation, which includes: consideration of the situational context of the Korean women’s utterances in Korean during interviews; the internal translation
process that they go through as they speak and write in English; and careful translation of my findings into the U.S. academic writing culture.

3.2.4 Reflexivity, an answer to ethics and politics of research

This research went through the process of human subject review to meet the university’s requirement for all research activities involving the use of human beings as research subjects to be reviewed and approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), unless the research falls into one or more of the categories of exemption established by federal regulation. I filed an application called ‘Application for Exemption from Review by the Institutional Review Board’ on the basis that this study falls into two of the exemption categories: 1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices; 2) Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior. The university’s Office of Research determined this study to be exempt and assigned a research protocol number, 02E0028.

As for the university, the act of assigning a protocol number based on its review of my research proposal could be the final stage of human subject review process. To me, however, this is yet a starting point of addressing ethics and politics of my research involving eight Korean women. In this section, I am documenting how I have problematized and wrestled with these issues along the research process.

Remembering my initial discomfort with the idea of studying Korean women and the issue of Insider/Outsider, I see myself having been concerned with the ethics and politics of doing research with people. Having developed a new critical insight into the
traditional process of producing knowledge, which I have been considering to be the unbiased truth, I have come to realize the power of a researcher. I am now conscious of a danger involved in the power that I, as a researcher, could use within the context of the research. While everything about conducting a research had once seemed clear and absolute, the scene has now changed forever. As every move I would make seems dangerous and nothing seems innocent, I find myself becoming paralyzed standing at the starting line asking several questions. Who do I think am I announcing to study Korean women? How could I claim my right to tell the story of these women? Where do I stand in relation to these women? How do I learn about their experiences of CMC from where I stand? And most basically, for whom am I doing this research and what level of responsibility am I ready to take (Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wong, 2000)?

I have tried to find answers for some of these questions through reading and writing around the topic of Korean women and the issues of Insider/Outsider and Objectivity/Subjectivity and tried to communicate some of my struggles earlier in this chapter. Among some of the answers I managed to arrive at so far, the idea of **reflexivity** appears to be the most useful and righteous in claiming my methodological positionality. I have encountered the issue of reflexivity being addressed in a lot of writings around various issues at different stages of qualitative research. Using a metaphor of choreographer for the qualitative research design process, Janesick (2000) suggested the practice of writing a critical reflective journal at the beginning of the study through which “the qualitative researcher identifies his or her own biases and articulates the ideology or conceptual frame for the study” (p.385). In terms of my research, this entails reflexively
re-examining my being a Korean woman and the biases I am bringing into my looking at experiences of other Korean women.

Enactment of reflexivity while listening to the research participants was noted by Fontana & Frey (2000, p.666) and Zavella (1997) made a similar point when she argued that researchers “must self-consciously reflect upon their status within the field site, examine how they are situated within social and power relations” (p.45). The need for me to dynamically shift among different places, including “outsider within” and “insider at border” was a part of my reflexivity at each stage of data collection and analysis. As I arrive at time of writing my research, I now remind myself of the saying “my own telling is partial and governed by the discourse of my time and place” (Britzman, 1995, p.232) and try to foreground “the textuality of the research and the reflexivity inherent in this textual staging of knowledge” (Usher & Edwards, 1994, p.152). In the mean time, I also try to be reflective about my act of writing as a method of inquiry to “investigate how we construct the world, ourselves, and others, and how standard objectifying practices of social science unnecessarily limit us and social science” (Richardson, 2000, p.924).

Finally, as I endeavor to self-evaluate my own research process, I keep asking myself the question “What do you give back?” and look for elements like “negotiation, reciprocity, or empowerment” that Lather (1986b) called for in praxis-oriented research. As I turn to reflexivity as a way to evaluate of my research, I think I have come to a full circle to arrive at my initial struggle, the issue of ethics and politics of research.

Such turns are about the ‘ruins’ of validity, the end of transcendent claims of validity, the end of grand narratives of validity: validity under erasure. In such a place of thought, evaluation is seen as a social question rather than a device of measurement. What is at stake is no longer the nature of value but its function. Questions of accountability and responsibility are ethical and social. (Lather, 2001, p.242).
3.3 Description of Research Site and Participants

The participants in this study were eight Korean female students who were studying at a large U.S. Midwestern university. The rationale for choosing Korean female students comes from my consciousness of myself, a Korean woman, being a researcher. In studying the self-representation of non-native speakers of English engaged in CMC, it seemed crucial to share the first language (Korean) with the respondents. Only in their first language could they express their feelings without being constrained by level of their English proficiency. In addition, when the gendered culture of Korean society was considered, studying female students seemed more appropriate for my study. As a female researcher considering interviewing Korean male students, I did not feel comfortable about it. More importantly, I was concerned about the truthfulness I would achieve from their words, which might be contaminated by the breakdown of presumed gender roles and/or hierarchy in Korean culture.

Research sites for this study were three courses offered during winter and spring quarters of 2002 at the studied university (January 2002 – June 2002), all of which involved the use of CMC (listserv or WebCT) and had Korean female students enrolled. Instructors of the courses where Korean female students were expected to enroll were contacted in advance; the research purposes and objectives were communicated in order to get permission from them to study a few Korean female student volunteers from their
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11 The entire dissertation research process is shown in Appendix E. Dissertation timeline.
12 Please refer to sections 2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)? and 3.2 Troubling the position of the researcher for further information and discussion.
courses. Below are descriptions of the three courses from which the participants are drawn:

- **Course A**: A course on academic writing in English as a Second Language designed for new undergraduate international students. Students read both nonliterary and literary texts and used them in the writing of a series of academic papers and for online discussion. Listservs were set up for four topics (e.g., online education, cloning) and students were to choose a topic, subscribe to the listserv for the specific topic, and exchange their thoughts and opinions. Students were required to post seven messages throughout the quarter. At the end of the quarter, students were supposed to write a long paper on the topic of their choice. There were a total of four sections of this course and twelve to fifteen students per section. A total of six participants (Eunji, Gunjeung, Seoyoung, Sookie, Sunghae, and Yuseon) from four different sections joined the research in winter 2002 from this course.

- **Course B**: A graduate level course offered in spring 2002 in department of Human Development and Family Science. WebCT was used for students to post comments on readings or class discussion each week. The WebCT was organized per weekly topic and specific due dates per each posting assignment were posted in advance. There were six students (all female) in the class. Jiyoungh was from this course.

- **Course C**: Another graduate level course offered in spring 2002 in department of Human Development and Family Science. WebCT was used for students
to comment on weekly readings and to share thoughts on the readings and class discussions. There were three students (all female) in the class and Elena was from this course.

- **Course D:** An English composition course designed for all freshmen at the university, in which WebCT was set up for students to share their thoughts on readings. Gunjeung and Seoyoung took this course during summer 2002. Although this course was not a part of research site, both Gunjeung and Seoyoung compared their experiences in this course with those in Course A.

For the participants in Course A, copies of an invitation letter (Appendix A) and letter of recruitment (Appendix B) were distributed by the course instructors in class. The letter included a brief introduction of the study both in English and in Korean. Here, caution was used not to give an impression that I am an “intellectual tourist” (Crichlow, 1993) but to help them feel that I am researching “with” them. One week after the letters were distributed, I visited the classes and met with several Korean female students in person to further explain the research and myself. For recruiting participants from Course B and Course C, personal acquaintance with Jiyoung helped. During personal conversation with her, I invited her to participate in my research and she recommended Elena as another possible participant. All the participants, both students and instructors, were asked to sign a written consent form (Appendix C) upon their verbal agreement on participation in the research.
A brief description of each participant is presented below in a table format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Time in US education</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eunji</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Sophomore</td>
<td>1 year (including ESL)</td>
<td>6 months’ ESL language course at another U.S. university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunjeung</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Sophomore</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Learned English from an American friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoyoung</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Sophomore</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Married, 2 years' work experience in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sookie</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Sophomore</td>
<td>2 years 3 months</td>
<td>2 years at another U.S. university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunghae</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Sophomore</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Went to high school in Indonesia (English was used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuseon</td>
<td>Course A, Listserv</td>
<td>Undergraduate, Senior</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>PhD candidate from Korea, Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiyoungh</td>
<td>Course B, Web-CT</td>
<td>Doctoral, 1st year</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Korean-American, Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Course C, Web-CT</td>
<td>Master, 2nd year</td>
<td>14 years (went to US grade school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Description of participants

Names of the participants listed in this table are not pseudonyms. When asked if they wanted to use pseudonyms to appear in my dissertation and offered to choose a name, all of them refused. They all chose to use their own names, some of them claiming, “These are my words, not someone else’s. Why would I want to use a different name next to my own words? I would rather want my name appear.”
3.4 Data Gathering Procedures

In an effort to achieve trustworthiness of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), multiple methods were incorporated (triangulation of sources and methods) in this study.

1) Observation of CMC     I observed CMC among students in three selected courses (listserv for Course A and WebCT for Courses B & C), focusing on the postings by the research participants to see how they represented themselves in CMC (if differently than in classroom settings) and collected their CMC records. With a few participants, personal synchronous CMC (MSN chatting) was done and copies of those exchanges were also recorded. The participants’ CMC postings were documented and analyzed throughout the data collection period by asking questions such as: when and how often do they post messages; what kinds of responses (or non-responses) do they get from other students; and how do they react to the kinds of responses they get from their classmates. The result of this analysis was then incorporated into interviews with the participants where they related their CMC experiences from course listserv or WebCT to discuss their thoughts and feelings on how technology, language, culture, and gender played in their CMC in English.

2) Classroom observation     In addition to research participants’ CMC, observations of their classroom interactions were made by visiting their classes three to seven times during the quarter. During the observation, notes were taken regarding the participants’ interaction patterns and behavior as well as the classroom culture and atmosphere. I focused on the utterances of the participants, what triggers them to speak (in response to or voluntary remarks), or the nature of the utterances (agreement, posing questions, etc). In addition to recording what I saw from the observation in my field
notes, I also made notes and questions in terms of how their being Korean female non-native speakers of English was being represented or not represented in the ways they speak, behave, or interact. Field notes were revisited after each observation to add further descriptions and analytical notes. The result of this exercise was also incorporated in subsequent interviews with the participants where I brought up some of the incidents from the observation to talk about how language, culture, and gender played in the way they spoke or behaved during class.

3) Interview in Korean Working from an interpretivist paradigm, trying to understand “the experiences of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (Seidman, 1998, p.3) was a major part of my study. The participants were interviewed once every other week to talk about their CMC and classroom interactions. A total of five to seven interviews were done per participant and each interview lasted thirty to ninety minutes. Every interview was tape recorded for transcription. A sample of interview questions is shown in Appendix D. With the exception of Elena (bilingual Korean-American), with whom both English and Korean were used, all the interviews were conducted in Korean for a few reasons: to elicit more stories, to ensure the validity of their stories by eliminating an additional step of translating their ideas into English, and to lessen linguistic anxiety for the research participants.

As noted above, interviews with the participants were the integral part of the data in this study since the results from CMC observations and classroom observations were incorporated into the discussion during the interviews. In addition to asking questions regarding their general thoughts on different types of communication across language and technology, they were asked to reflect upon recent experiences of their CMC in English
(L2CS) or their classroom interactions (L2RL), which I have observed. Before each interview, I re-read observation field notes and CMC print outs of the particular participant and brought them with me to the interview. Questions and issues that surfaced from the analyses of the observations were presented by asking why do they think they spoke, acted, or wrote in the ways they did in listserv (WebCT) or class on a specific date or class.

I chose to transcribe the interviews myself. Despite the tremendous amount of time it took and the delay it caused in completing this study, I believe that transcribing my own data helped me stay closer to my data. Had I not done that, I do not think that every word I read from interview transcript would be reminiscent of the very moment and the exact words I exchanged with my participants. The interview data was transcribed and analyzed in Korean to prevent any potential distortion and/or gap resulting from translation. After the analysis was done, the final report was written in English in Chapters 4 and 5, together with other data gathered in English (transcripts of CMC for example). When direct quotations were included in this dissertation, the participants’ words in Korean were presented with English translation. Each translation was reviewed by at least one other Korean to ensure the correctness and appropriateness of my translation in conveying the participants’ thoughts and intention.

4) Interview with instructors  In an effort to understand how the participants’ representations in cyberspace and real life are conceived of, I have interviewed course instructors of the participants. All of the instructors interviewed were native speakers of English; instructors from Course A were female and instructors from Courses B and Course C were male. Questions asked during these interviews included: how do the
instructors view the participants’ classroom behavior and how do they evaluate the behavior to be in terms of the students’ linguistic and/or cultural backgrounds; how do they view the participants’ performance in cyberspace to be different from classroom behavior; and to what do they attribute the differences, if any.

3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

3.5.1 Multiple layers of data analysis

Analysis of data was done simultaneously with data collection so that the study stays focused and shaped as data was being collected (Glesne, 1999, p.130). Data analysis was done in three layers – description, analysis, and interpretation – in the sequence of reading, coding, and re-reading/coding. While listening to, transcribing, and after transcribing interviews with the participants, I was constantly trying to picture the moments when things were said to help myself stay close to the data and to describe the data. For data analysis, I did reading and re-reading of an interview transcript for “the identification of key factors in the study and the relationship among them” (Glesne, 1999, p.150). Informed by description and analysis of data, interpretation was made to answer the question of ‘what do the findings mean?’ by making connections among data, analysis of data, theory, and personal insights gained through the research process.

Transcripts of five to seven interviews per participant became more than five hundred pages single-spaced Microsoft Word document. In addition, there were about the equal amount of CMC records (participants’ postings to listservs, WebCT, or MSN messenger messages) to be analyzed. Printing out a few interview transcripts and trying out paper-and-pencil coding soon proved to be beyond manageable task. To facilitate the
data analysis process, QSR NVivo program was chosen to help create, manage, and explore ideas and categories from the data.

3.5.2 Developing a pre-codebook

How do Korean female learners of English represent themselves in CMC using English? How does the combination of technology, culture, gender, and language work together behind this? These were some of the questions that initiated this research. To answer these questions, I asked my participants if these four constructs matter as they communicate in cyberspace and if so, how. While my questions were in a relatively simple format (e.g. ‘How does being a Korean woman matter when you write messages to your course listserv?’), my participants’ answers were a lot more complex. Their answers were not in a simple format such as ‘technology matters while gender does not.’ Rather, they were often in the format of ‘how much of what (technology, for example) matters, and in what ways.’ In addition, my participants often made connections between/among two or more constructs and talked about how those multiple constructs work together in their CMC in English. Although this was not something unexpected, the various combinations of different constructs, or interactions between/among constructs contributed much complexity to the research data.

Complexity in research data might be something to welcome for qualitative researchers because the very complexity may eventually induce richer description of one’s experiences with multiple layers. However, to a novice researcher who was about to begin data analysis, this complexity meant a huge challenge as I was trying to get a handle on the data set. And this challenge was clear as early as I was doing the first
reading of the interview transcripts in an effort to generate a pre-codebook, a set of codes for a researcher to use to initiate the coding process. Reading a passage like the following where Seoyoung talks about being conscious of language, technology, culture, and audience all at the same time, I was immediately at a loss as to what name(s) (code/node) I should give to this passage. Here she is remembering how she was concerned with her writing quality and her native speaker classmates’ reaction as she wrote in WebCT for an English composition class she was taking,

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview5)
216: 서영: 근데 그게 되게 스트레스가 쌓이는게 어, 스트레스는 아니든 그냥 예전에는 또 미국애들이 왜 제가 지난학기에 말씀드릴 때 미국애들하- 보는데는 빨고 틀리두 멀 부담스럽다고 했잖아요. 근데 이번에는 그게 수업이어서 그런지 모르겠는데 막 재끼가 읽으면서 이거 무슨 소리하는 거야? ‘-widget하러 제는 이런 수업들은거야?’ 뭐, 그런 반응이 너무

216: Seoyoung: . . . . I am afraid that they (native speaker classmates) might think ‘what is she talking about here?’ or ‘how can she be sitting here to take this class with that level of English?’ as they read my postings. . . . .

After several different versions of pre-codebooks and coding and re-coding of the same interview transcript several times, the following is the codebook that I have arrived for analyzing my data.
### Table 3.2 Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For ...</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 4 panes (situations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) L1 in Real Life</td>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>Communicating in Korean in real life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) L2 in Real Life</td>
<td>L2RL</td>
<td>Communicating in English in real life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) L1 in Cyberspace</td>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>Communicating in Korean in cyberspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) L2 in Cyberspace</td>
<td>L2CS</td>
<td>Communicating in English in cyberspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 4 constructs and more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Culture</td>
<td>CultY</td>
<td>Culture (being a Korean) does matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CultN</td>
<td>Culture does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Gender</td>
<td>GendY</td>
<td>Gender does matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GenN</td>
<td>Gender does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Language</td>
<td>LangY</td>
<td>Language (being a non-native speaker of English) does matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LangN</td>
<td>Language does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Technology</td>
<td>TechY</td>
<td>Technology (communication medium) does matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TechN</td>
<td>Technology does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Audience</td>
<td>AudiY</td>
<td>The person whom you are talking to and/or its characteristics matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AudiN</td>
<td>Audience does not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Situation, Context (academic or non-), personality, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the four constructs, technology, language, culture, and gender, two new important codes grew out of data in the process of coding: audience and other. Various characteristics of the audience, people who are listening to or reading the participants speaking (L2RL) or writing (L2CS, CMC), were mentioned frequently to be affecting the participants’ performance in English. Some of the characteristics included: cultural background, gender, or the attitude of the audience. [Other] was used as an umbrella code to refer to several themes such as context/setting of CMC, personality, or other miscellaneous themes.
3.5.3 Rationale for counting characters

During the tedious and time consuming process of initial coding, I was constantly reminding myself of the purpose of data analysis being ‘data reduction,’ and looked forward to seeing something concrete, something tidy, or something of more manageable form, upon the completion of coding; I was expecting a certain level of reduction in the amount and complexity of data through coding/labeling/categorization. However, even after the coding was done, I was not sure if I made data reduction because my data looked as complex as it was before.

In the face of sheer quantity and complexity of my data after initial coding, I was at a loss for some time to decide on how to analyze, reduce, and present my data in a format acceptable to the research community. As a researcher working in qualitative research paradigm, the idea of summarizing (thus reducing) qualitative data to numbers appeared to have a certain negative connotation to it. It felt like it was something to avoid as if it would be synonymous to the betrayal of my research participants’ words. As I was exploring the search function by clicking on the nodes (codes) to perform matrix search in QSR NVivo, I was simply trying out yet another attempt to come up with a way to present my data as a whole by examining how much of what was said by my participants throughout the study. I found Gibbs (2002) and Coffey & Atkinson (1996), who said that this kind search can be utilized to visualize qualitative data when it is used with caution.

If an issue was talked about more or by more people, this might suggest that it had more importance or salience. It can also indicate whether an issue was a majority view or a minority one. However, counts of this kind in qualitative work need to be treated with caution. ... In qualitative research what is left unsaid can be as significant as what is said.
Nevertheless such numbers can be used to check hunches about correlations and causal relationships. (Gibbs, 2002, p. 198)

Given the inherently unpredictable structure of qualitative data, co-occurrence or proximity does not necessarily imply an analytically significant relationship among categories. It is as shaky an assumption as one that assumes greater significance of commonly occurring codes. Analytic significance is nor guaranteed by frequency, nor is a relationship guaranteed by proximity. Nevertheless, a general heuristic value may be found for such methods for checking out ideas and data, as part of the constant interplay between the two as the research process unfolds. (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p.181)

With assurance of Gibbs (2002) and caution by Coffey & Atkinson (1996), I turned to my coded data and performed two matrix searches as described below. The resulting statistics, in the number of characters for each matrix intersection, will be used in the next chapter to discuss the big picture of the data.

1) M0 searches the whole data for texts coded at each intersection of a matrix with two dimensions, \{L2CS, L2RL, L1CS, L1RL\} by \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\}. This search was intended to examine how much each construct (factor) was mentioned per each communication mode.

2) M1 limits its search scope to texts coded at L2CS and searches for texts coded at each intersection of \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\} by \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\}. The results of this search showed how much each pair-wise combination of the constructs (factors) co-occurred in participants’ remarks on L2CS.

In using quantitative measures (numbers) to discuss nonnumeric qualitative data, I was aware of the meaning of the numbers (a number of characters coded at a certain
node) in the context of my research data. The size of a number simply means the number of characters used for a passage coded at a certain node, which translates roughly into how many words participants used to talk about something. Therefore, the face value of the number is not a direct (precise) representation of how much one factor matters. For this reason, when two numbers are relatively close to each other, the difference between the two cannot be used to support a claim that the factor with the larger number has a bigger effect (or is more important) than the other. With the word ‘nevertheless’ in my head, just like Gibbs (2002) and Coffey & Atkinson (1996) did in their discussion, I decided to use the numbers as guiding lights to describe ‘the general’ and ‘the big,’ and ‘the rough’ sketch of my data as a whole. In the process, I was constantly reminding myself of the possible ‘shakiness’ and ‘insignificance’ of my interpretation of the numbers.

3.6 Establishing trustworthiness

Working from an interpretivist paradigm, the criteria traditionally used in the previous era (positivist paradigm) -- checklist-like criteria, consisted of proper procedures to apply for arriving at an objective truth -- do not work in examining the quality of my study. As Lincoln & Guba (2000) said, “it is not merely method that promises to deliver on some set of local or context-grounded truths, it is also the processes of interpretation” (p. 178). In search of alternative criteria for the evaluation of qualitative research, many kinds of validity were suggested along with the proliferation of postpositivist paradigms. Some of the examples include: the trustworthiness criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985),
authenticity criteria (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), catalytic validity (Lather, 1986a), and parody of transgressive validity (Lather, 1993).

Among them, the trustworthiness criteria established by Lincoln & Guba (1985) is regarded as the foundation, which was applied in this study as below.

- **Prolonged engagement and persistent observation**: There was a series of meetings with each research participant for at least two consecutive 11-week-long academic quarters. Research participants were first contacted during the quarter the CMC-involved courses were offered, which was the major part of data gathering period. When the quarter was over, there also were follow-up interviews for a few subsequent months. Through this extended time of engagement with the participants, the focus of my attention remained on recording their CMC and their stories behind it.

- **Triangulation of methods and sources** was achieved through the use of multiple methods and sources as described in section 3.4.

- **Peer review and debriefing**: Conversations with colleagues in different discipline areas as well as those in similar areas helped me reflect upon the research methods in various stages. Especially, sharing some of the interpretations of data with other Korean female researchers provided me with external reflection and input on my work.

- **Negative case analysis**: Although the topic of this research has a connotation of the existence of relationship between Korean women’s CMC with technology, language, culture, and gender, there also was conscious search for cases of the lack of such relationships from the research participants’ CMC and interviews.
• **Member checking**: As one of the purposes of this study was to understand CMC by Korean female students through observation of their behavior (CMC and classroom interactions) and conversations with them, the notion of collective/collaborative interpretation and analysis was crucial in making meanings out of the data collected (field notes of observation and interview transcripts). Since my interpretation the data will inevitably be partial, the research participants were invited to the interpretations of data through member checking and follow-up interviews by starting each interview with clarification of any confusing remarks from the previous interview.

• **Rich and thick description for transferability**: When developing field notes for observation or transcribing interviews, every effort was made to describe as much detail as possible (thick description) so the readers of my study could see what went on in the lives of the participants in both classrooms and cyberspace. In fact, the majority of the interviews were transcribed word by word, so as not to lose the contextual information of where the words were spoken.

• **Reflexive journal**: As noted in previous sections, reflexivity plays an important part in my study: identification of the topic of this study and the selection of research participants (Korean women) were related to this. Throughout the research process, reflexive journal was kept to record changes in my reactions or reflections and also to monitor my own bias as a Korean female researcher. As noted in 3.2.4 Reflexivity, an answer to ethics and politics of research, reflexivity

---

13 This notion was discussed in sections 3.1 Methodological framework and 2.2.3 Interplays and/or tensions among four areas – 2.2.3.2 ‘Technology ~ Gender’.
has also been used as an effort to address my ethical, social, and political responsibility for the eight Korean women who participated in this study.

14 See section 3.2 Troubling the position of the researcher and section 3.2.4 Reflexivity as an answer to ethics and politics of research, in particular.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS – OVERALL PICTURE

As discussed in the previous chapter (3.5.3 Rationale for counting characters), the large amount of research data and the complexities within it coupled with the necessity of linearity in the dissertation presentation format drove me into employment of quantitative measurements. While I was not expecting much from the following matrix intersection searches in QSR NVivo, they provided me with guidance and directions to present the result of data analysis in a manageable format.

1) M0 searches the whole data for texts coded at each intersection of a matrix with two dimensions, \{L2CS, L2RL, L1CS, L1RL\} by \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\}. This search was intended to examine how much each construct (factor) was mentioned per each communication mode.

2) M1 limits its search scope to texts coded at L2CS and searches for texts coded at each intersection of \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\} by \{Technology, Language, Gender, Culture, Audience, Other\}. The results of this search showed how much each pair-wise
combination of the constructs (factors) co-occurred in participants’ remarks on L2CS.

In this chapter, the results of these matrix intersection searches will be presented in three sections to describe the overall picture of the data as a whole (4.1 First level of analysis), per participant (4.2 Typical picture for each participant), followed by a big picture of L2CS (4.3 A closer look at L2CS). The actual words of the participants about their experiences of CMC in English (L2CS) will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, Chapter 5 L2CS in their own words.

4.1 First level of analysis, the big picture of the data as a whole

The result of the first matrix intersection search (M0, Panes by factors) is shown below in Table 4.15, which will be used to discuss the big picture of the research data in terms of “how much of what (factor, construct) was said for which case (pane)” in this section. The numbers in this table denote the numbers of characters for each pair of intersection. For example, the number 124837 in the first cell means that there were 124,837 characters coded with both L2CS and TechY. In other words, the participants used 124,837 characters to talk about how technology mattered (TechY) in their CMC in English (L2CS).

15 For the description of the codes (nodes), please refer to Table 3.2 Codebook.
Matrix Intersection Search (M0), Panes by Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Nodes</th>
<th>L2CS</th>
<th>L2RL</th>
<th>L1CS</th>
<th>L1RL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TechY</td>
<td>124837</td>
<td>7806</td>
<td>85879</td>
<td>2662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechN</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LangY</td>
<td>127233</td>
<td>144282</td>
<td>21571</td>
<td>9079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LangN</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>9057</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GendY</td>
<td>5302</td>
<td>33635</td>
<td>6650</td>
<td>130955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GendN</td>
<td>14403</td>
<td>21476</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>30641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CultY</td>
<td>64512</td>
<td>159717</td>
<td>34661</td>
<td>154909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CultN</td>
<td>11915</td>
<td>66486</td>
<td>7702</td>
<td>14562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AudiY</td>
<td>41940</td>
<td>51779</td>
<td>22060</td>
<td>6531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AudiN</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28382</td>
<td>55365</td>
<td>8777</td>
<td>10216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Matrix intersection search result (M0), panes by factors

Before getting into more structured discussions of which construct (factor) was mentioned more for which communication type (pane) by the participants, I would like to present a few possible sketches of my data as a whole by simply glancing at the numbers in Table 4.1. Here, I am trying to put myself in the shoes of the first time readers of this research, who, without previous knowledge of what to expect in the following sections, would look at the numbers in Table 4.1 and try to make sense out of them.

First, by looking at the sizes of numbers in each column, it would appear that the participants talked a lot more about communicating in English (L2CS or L2RL) than they did about communicating in Korean (L1CS or L1RL). This might have resulted from the focus of my research, the participants’ communication in English in cyberspace.
(L2CS).\textsuperscript{16} Because the focal interest was on eliciting their thoughts on their experiences of CMC in English, topics of my conversations with the participants were primarily focused on L2CS. In the mean time, the participants often compared their L2CS with L2RL to talk about similarities and/or differences across medium (cyberspace and real life) and sometimes with L1CS or L1RL.

Secondly, when the numbers are examined by row, the numbers in TechY (technology does matter), LangY (language does matter), and CultY (culture does matter) appear to be higher than the numbers in other rows. What this could imply is that the participants were very much concerned with these three factors – technology, language, and culture – while not so much was talked about other factors (gender or audience) and many fewer words were used to describe how the factors did not matter in their communication (lower numbers for TechN, LangN, etc.).

Lastly, looking at the numbers in each column, a couple of factors with higher numbers are noticed per pane: TechY and LangY for L2CS; LangY and CultY for L2RL; TechY for L1CS; and GendY and CultY for L1RL. What one can speculate from this is that the factors with higher numbers could be the ones that the participants were concerned about the most for each communication mode, although it does not necessarily imply that these factors are of greater importance over other factors.

As I discussed in the previous chapter regarding the use of numbers (character counting) in analyzing qualitative data, three speculations made above are by no means intended to direct the interpretation of the data in any direction. Rather, this is yet to be examined more closely in the following sections of this chapter to offer the analysis of

\textsuperscript{16} Or, #4 Representation of Self in L2 in Cyberspace shown in Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework.
data in a more organized fashion from multiple perspectives. Moreover, in Chapter 5, where the participants’ own words and voices are presented, the readers of this research will have an opportunity to have a closer look at the raw data, hear the participants, and examine whether the analysis and interpretation documented here are truthful to the words of the participants.

To present the numbers in Table 4.1 in a more meaningful way, the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1) and research questions were revisited. Three different perspectives emerged from this, from which the numbers in Table 4.1 will be discussed in the remainder of this section: a) to examine each type of communication individually to see which factors are mentioned more; b) to compare four cases across borders of language and technology (from Figure 1.1) to examine the effects of change in language or medium; and c) to examine the influence of each factor in different types of communication. In the remainder of this chapter, numbers in Table 4.1 will be reported from these three perspectives in the following three sub sections.

### 4.1.1. Looking at each individual pane (L2CS, L2RL, L1CS, and L1RL)

As a way to help visualize how much of each factor was mentioned for each case (pane), four pie charts were generated based on the numbers from Table 4.1. Each pie chart displays the distribution of the number of characters for each factor to the total number of characters for each pane (case). For example, in case of L2CS, TechY took
29% of the total number of characters coded for L2CS, which was the sum of numbers in L2CS column, 426291.\footnote{Since each pie chart was generated independently, direct comparison of the sizes of pies across panes are not intended. For example, although TechY in L1CS and CultY in L1RL are of similar size with 44% and 42%, there is a big difference in the actual numbers of characters: 85879 and 154909, respectively.}
In L2CS (using English in cyberspace), TechY (124,837 characters) and LangY (127,233 characters) had the largest number of characters accounting for similar percentages, 29% and 30%, respectively, followed by CultY (64,512 characters, 15%) and AudiY (41,940 characters, 10%).\(^\text{18}\) In other words, when communicating in English in cyberspace, the participants were more concerned with technology and language than they were with culture or audience. An interesting point to note here is that the number of characters for GendN (14,403, 3%) is higher than that of GendY (5,302, 1%), which was not the case for the other three panes. Also, CultY in L2CS (64,512 characters) is a lot lower than in L2RL (159,717 characters) or L1RL (154,909 characters). What this might imply is that moving into cyberspace (TechY) and switching language into English (LangY), separately or in combination, provide the participants with some level of relief from cultural and gender constraints. In case of gender, in particular, this relief seems greater to the point that the participants mentioned more about how gender did not matter (GendN) than how it mattered in their L2CS (GendY).

In L2RL (using English in real life), CultY (159,717 characters, 30%) was mentioned the most, but only slightly more than LangY (144,282 characters, 26%). Although this does not mean that culture matters more than language in L2RL, it does indicate that culture matters as much as language in L2RL. It is also notable that the number of characters coded at [L2RL-CultY, 159,717] is almost as high as that of [L1RL-CultY, 154,909], which means that the participants were conscious of being

\(^\text{18}\) For the description of the codes, please refer to the code book in Table 3.2.
Korean women when communicating in English (L2) as much as they were when using Korean (L1).

In L1CS (using Korean in cyberspace), TechY (85,879 characters, 44%) was mentioned the most, though less than in L2CS (L2CS-TechY, 124,837 characters) and the number of characters coded for other factors were relatively low: CultY (34,661 characters) and the others with lower than 25,000 characters. When compared with L1RL, it appears that being in cyberspace (TechY) safeguards the participants from cultural constraints (CultY or GendY).

In L1RL (using Korean in real life), on the other hand, CultY (154,909 characters) was mentioned the most, followed by GendY (130,955 characters) and all the other factors had relatively low number of characters coded, implying higher level of concerns with cultural and gender constraints by the participants. When compared to the other three panes, the number of characters coded for GendY in L1RL seems particularly higher. In other words, for the participants, gender matters much more when speaking in Korean in real life situations than in L1CS, L2RL, or L2CS.

4.1.2. Comparison across borders of Language and Technology

In the conceptual map that framed this research (Figure 1.1), I used two barriers (borders) that non-native speakers of English have to cross as they try to participate in computer-mediated communication in English: language as they switch from their first language (L1, Korean) to second language (L2, English) and technology as they move from real life settings into cyberspace using computer as communication medium. After having listened to eight research participants talk about how they dealt with these barriers,
I would like to go back to the conceptual framework and discuss what and how much of what was actually said by examining a line chart below, showing four panes based on the result of matrix intersection search M0 (panes by factors).

![Figure 4.2 Matrix intersection search M0 (panes by factors), a line chart](image-url)

Figure 4.2 Matrix intersection search M0 (panes by factors), a line chart
To examine how the participants communicate differently as they cross the border of language, lines for L1 (L1RL and L1CS) were compared with lines for L2 (L2RL and L2CS). In addition to the large number of remarks on how language matters (LangY) when using L2 (L2RL and L2CS), which is not surprising, the change in the numbers of characters coded for culture and gender across languages could be addressed here. It appears that the amount of text coded for how culture matters (CultY) did not change much as they cross the language border especially in real life, as shown with a short distance between L1RL and L2RL. However, the number of characters for how gender matters (GendY) shows a drastic decrease from L1RL to L2RL (130,955 to 33,635). It can be interpreted that the participants carry their cultural self (Korean) as they cross borders between L1 and L2, while their consciousness of their gender (being women) decreases to some extent as they move into L2. When in cyberspace, on the other hand, the effect of language switch did not appear to make much difference in participants’ concerns with culture or gender as the chart shows with relatively close distance between L1CS and L2CS for both CultY and GendY.

Examination of how the participants’ communication differ across the border of technology can be discussed by comparing lines for real life [L1RL and L2RL] and lines for cyberspace [L1CS and L2CS]. While the effect of technology (TechY) in cyberspace (L1CS or L2CS) is something that was expected, the changes in the numbers of characters coded for culture and gender between real life and cyberspace (across technology) is something notable here. For both L1 and L2, the occurrence of culture (CultY) appears to drop very drastically as they move from real life into cyberspace: from 154,909 to 34,661 for L1 and from 159,717 to 64,512 for L2. Although the change is not
as drastic as culture, gender (GendY) is also mentioned less when in cyberspace. This appears to suggest that the participants are less conscious of culture or gender as they leave real life to enter cyberspace and the drop was bigger in the case of culture.

Based on the discussion above, an interesting interpretation can be made in terms of how the effects of culture and gender change across language and technology borders. As for consciousness of culture, crossing the language border by switching from Korean (L1) to English (L2) did not seem to change the participants’ consciousness very much. Especially in real life settings, the numbers of characters for culture (CultY) were similar for both using Korean (L1RL) and English (L2RL). The change in communication medium made a big difference, though, to show a lot less consciousness of culture when in cyberspace. In the case of gender, the participants become much less conscious of being women when crossing language border to use English (L2) than using Korean (L1), especially in real life. Crossing the border of technology also seemed to relieve the participants from being conscious of their being women, especially when using Korean.

4.1.3. Looking at each individual factor across panes:

In this section, each factor is examined individually to discuss how its effect changes across four panes (L1RL, L1CS, L2RL, and L2CS) using the same line chart in Figure 4.2, by comparing four points for each factor on the x-axis of the chart. The discussion for each of the five factors (technology, language, culture, gender, and audience) will remain brief in this section and more detailed discussion will be presented in Chapter 5, together with the participants’ words, actual data.
**Technology:** L1CS and L2CS are two panes where technology is obviously relevant. The comparison between these two panes indicates that technology matters more when using English (L2CS-TechY, 120942) than when using their first language (L1CS-TechY, 85879).

**Language:** Language, a code used in this search, was defined as “if one’s linguistic proficiency (or deficiency) or being a non-native speaker of English matters in one’s performance in L2.” When L2RL and L2CS are compared, the results indicate that language matters somewhat more in real life (L2RL-LangY, 144063) than in cyberspace (L2CS-LangY, 119721).

These two (technology and language) could be explained by the co-occurrence of the two factors (TechY & LangY): CMC is written discourse rather than spoken (TechY) and most participants are more confident in their L2 writing than L2 speaking (LangY). Therefore, by going into cyberspace, since it is now writing, language becomes less of an issue, co-occurrence of TechY and LangY. The flip side of this can also explain why technology matters more in L2CS than in L1CS. In terms of performance, both in quantity and quality, technology makes more difference (or more help) in cyberspace when using L2 (English) than using L1 (Korean).

**Culture:** According to the search result, the participants appear to think that culture matters a lot more in real life (L1RL and L2RL) than in cyberspace (L2CS and L1CS). High number of characters of CultY in L1RL was something that was expected. Living as a Korean woman in Korean culture, cultural norm is something one (woman)

---

19 Most participants in this study said that they were more confident with their L2 writing than speaking. This seems to be related to the English teaching practice in Korea, being grammar-translation method, where grammar or reading is more emphasized than communicative skills.
cannot avoid. However, getting almost the same number of characters coded for CultY in L2RL (slightly more for L2RL than L1RL, in fact) was interesting. In fact, CultY turned out to be the most mentioned factor both in L1RL and L2RL. This means that when crossing the border of L1-L2, participants carry their being Korean with them. While speaking in L2, participants either continued to be conscious of Korean cultural norm (C1, senior-junior relationship, for example) which is very much embedded within Korean language itself, or sometimes even tried to exercise those norms as they use English (L2RL). Interestingly, however, as they move into cyberspace, this cultural consciousness CultY seems to diminish drastically, with a bigger drop size for L1.

This could be explained as the combination effect of technology and language. By moving into cyberspace, where one cannot see each other, participants appear to feel free from the Korean cultural (C1) norms. The more drastic drop in L1 (from 154909 in L1RL to 34661 in L1CS, drop of 78%) than the change in L2 (from 159717 in L2RL to 64512 in L2CS, drop of 60%) seen in the line chart in Figure 4.2 seems to be linked to the relatively higher level of cultural oppression that the participants feel in L1 than in L2. When using L1 (Korean), a Korean woman is trapped within its cultural norm (C1), telling her how to speak, behave, or think. However, when using L2 (English), if she wishes, it might be possible for her to hide behind her second language (L2) to possibly try out acting (speaking/writing) non-Korean (or, less-Korean). In other words, as she enters cyberspace, leaving the real, the visible, or the actual (C1 cultural norm) behind, she appears to feel freer from Korean culture (C1).

**Gender:** The number of characters devoted to talk about how gender matters was the highest in L1RL (130,955 characters), much higher than the other three panes. The
chart shows a very sudden drop when switching from L1 to L2. Moreover, the drop from real life to cyberspace appears much more evident in L1, but not as much in L2. This might mean that the decrease in GendY is mostly an effect of change in language (from Korean to English) rather than that of change in technology (from real life to cyberspace). Comparing numbers of characters coded for GendY and GendN shows another interesting point. While the number for GendY is higher than for GendN in L1RL, L1CS, and L2RL, the number of characters for GendN is higher in L2CS, using English in cyberspace. It can be said that technology, when combined with language, not only acts to decrease the effect of GendY but seems to negate its effect to the point that the amount of passages involving how gender does not matter (GendN) to surface. The difference between GendY and GendN is the biggest for L1RL, from 130,955 characters to 30,641. An explanation for this would be somewhat similar to the case of culture; While technology (cyberspace) offers some relief in terms of gender consciousness, the participants seems to feel freer as they switch languages, from L1 to L2.

**Audience**: Examination of the numbers of characters coded for AudiY in each communication setting shows that crossing the language border is related to the change in participants’ level of concerns with the factor of audience (who the audience is, the nature of participants’ relationship with the audience, or the attitude of the listener/reader). As the drop from 51,779 characters in L2RL and 41,940 in L2CS to 22,060 in L1CS and 6,531 in L1RL shows, the participants talked more about how the audience mattered when using English (L2) than using Korean (L1). It appears that being non-native speakers of English, they become more concerned with how their interlocutors respond to their talking/writing when they communicate using their second language.
4.2 Typical picture for each participant

Eight participants I talked to had some commonalities: Koreans, women, and non-native speakers of English (with the exception of Elena, bilingual). However, the more I talked to them, the more I realized how each of them was different from each other; each of the eight participants had her own story to tell. While the big picture of what the whole body of data tells was important (discussed in the previous section) to guide the data analysis, it seems also important to draw a typical picture of each participant.

To do this, I turned to my data and asked questions in terms of ‘who said (or didn’t say) what, and how much of it?’ Some of the questions I asked included: Who was the most conscious of language, or technology? Who mentioned all the factors? Who mentioned the least number of factors? To answer these questions, I ran a series of matrix intersection searches (panes by factors) for each set of interviews per each participant. For each participant, Table 4.2 shows the result of matrix intersection search in terms of “how much of what was said per pane.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TechY</th>
<th>TechN</th>
<th>LangY</th>
<th>LangN</th>
<th>GendY</th>
<th>GendN</th>
<th>CultY</th>
<th>CultN</th>
<th>AudiY</th>
<th>AudiN</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eunji</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9634</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>6326</td>
<td>7361</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>3834</td>
<td>3840</td>
<td>5675</td>
<td>4312</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunjeung</td>
<td>11283</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>12129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5683</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>4045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8271</td>
<td>2498</td>
<td>4749</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>21353</td>
<td>6666</td>
<td>12079</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>16007</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>8450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3576</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13603</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>13916</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoyoung</td>
<td>10066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>10594</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>11755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sookie</td>
<td>25478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>15879</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>15758</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11064</td>
<td>5936</td>
<td>16231</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>10307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>11295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>3589</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7618</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>4277</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunghae</td>
<td>11295</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24596</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>17865</td>
<td>8025</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>10865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8743</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23891</td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>19930</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuseon</td>
<td>12355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24596</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>17865</td>
<td>8025</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>10865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8743</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23891</td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>19930</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiyoung</td>
<td>12355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>8350</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24596</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>17865</td>
<td>8025</td>
<td>3752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>10865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8743</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23891</td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>19930</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>10550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3985</td>
<td>15757</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>4344</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44278</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>4890</td>
<td>27008</td>
<td>10538</td>
<td>8289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>9029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>4725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10604</td>
<td>6348</td>
<td>10247</td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30169</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>7384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>13405</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>30391</td>
<td>8746</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1CS</td>
<td>10970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1RL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35543</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>64689</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Result of matrix intersection search (panes by factors) per participant

Using the numbers from this table, eight line charts (Figures 4.3 through 4.10) were generated to help visualize particularities per participant. In the following, a few of such particularities for each participant are briefly discussed.
For Eunji, language (LangY) is the biggest issue in L2RL, while it drastically decreased in L2CS. It appears that technology affects her CMC in a positive way to relieve her from linguistic difficulties. Higher number of characters for CultN than for CultY in L2RL and similar numbers of characters for GendY and GendN in L1RL seem to be related to her personality being not so much concerned with what others think of her behavior, free from gender or culture norms both in L1 and L2.
One thing that stands out in Gunjeung’s chart is the numbers of characters coded for LangY in L2RL and L2CS. Not only is the difference between the two small, LangY in L2CS shows a higher number than in L2RL, meaning she is more concerned with language as she writes in English in cyberspace than when she is speaking in real life. As it will be shown in the next chapter, this seems to be related to lower level of confidence in her written English than in spoken English. It is also noted that Gunjeung talked a lot about how she is concerned with culture (CultY) in both L2RL and L1RL, more in L2RL.
than in L1RL. In her interviews, she talked about making conscious efforts to take U.S. cultural norms into consideration when talking to native speakers, while the cultural norms is limited to her own understanding of U.S. culture (C2).

Figure 4.5 Line chart per participant 3. Seoyoung

I remember Seoyoung as a person who was very much concerned with every factor in all four panes. She was the person who first mentioned how the attitude of the interlocutor affects her own linguistic performance (both in L2RL and L2CS). According
to the chart, she appears to be very much concerned with her linguistic deficiency both in L2RL and L2CS, with a small decrease when in L2CS (cyberspace). High number of characters for TechY in L2CS was partly from her awareness of cyberspace being ‘public space’ as well as how it affects other factors, LangY, AudiY, CultY, or GendY.

Figure 4.6 Line chart per participant 4. Sookie

It appears that Sookie mentioned as much of TechY as she mentioned LangY in L2CS, meaning technology matters as much as language does as she communicates in
English in cyberspace. Like Gunjeung, the number of characters coded for LangY is a lot higher in L2CS and than in L2RL. This might be related to her relatively high confidence in spoken English, while she tries very hard to write ‘well’ in L2CS.

![Sunghae line chart]

Figure 4.7 Line chart per participant 5. Sunghae

The decrease of LangY from L2RL to L2CS suggests the help of technology for Sunghae’s CMC. One thing to note in her chart is that the numbers of characters coded for GendY. It shows that she was very concerned with gender in L1RL, but very little in
the other three cases, L2RL, L1CS, and L2CS. As she indicated in her interviews, switching languages and moving into cyberspace relieved her from gender constraints. For culture, on the other hand, she appears to be conscious of it both in L2RL and L1RL with similar degree, while she is more concerned in L2RL.

Language remains the highest concern for Yuseon for both in L2RL and L2CS. She compared her CMC writings with those of native speakers and talked about non-

Figure 4.8 Line chart per participant 6. Yuseon
native speakers’ linguistic inability to perform as well as native speakers do in cyberspace. Like Sunghae, Yuseon seems to be concerned with gender (GendY) only in L1RL but not in the other three panes. With culture (CultY), she was equally concerned in L1 and L2 (L1RL = L2RL, L1CS = L2CS) with less numbers in cyberspace than in real life. This could mean that Yuseon’s consciousness of gender and culture diminishes as she enters cyberspace and switches language into L2.

Figure 4.9 Line chart per participant 7. Jiyoung
Higher numbers of characters for LangY for both in L2RL and L2CS than any other factors is notable in Jiyoung’s case. Compared to relatively high confidence in her written English, Jiyoung was particularly conscious of her linguistic deficiency in her spoken English and expressed frustration with her inability to display her content knowledge due to linguistic barrier. With the help of higher confidence in written English, she becomes less concerned when communicating in cyberspace (L2CS). She was conscious of culture when using English (L2) and related language proficiency with the level of cultural awareness one can exercise in her writing or speaking.

Figure 4.10 Line chart per participant 8. Elena
The level of consciousness that Elena displays toward culture and gender (CultY and GendY) appears to be high in real life (L1RL and L2RL) and it decreased in cyberspace (L1CS and L2CS). Being a bilingual, language is not an issue for her (low numbers for LangY in L2RL and L2CS). Instead, she expressed language difficulties in L1RL and L1CS.

4.3 A closer look at L2CS

The major purpose of this research was to understand how Korean female learners of English represent themselves in their computer-mediated communication using English. In other words, this research was to look at how technology, language, culture, and gender work in Korean women’s L2CS. The conceptual framework shown in chapter 1 (Figure 1.1), where the combination of technology and language divides communication into four types (panes), was used to illustrate how four constructs can be present in four different types of communication. When talking with eight research participants, in an effort to get at their CMC in English (L2CS), we often compared it with other types of communication, L2RL, L1CS, or L1RL, to talk about how four constructs mattered differently in different panes. In the two previous sections of this chapter, I have presented the overall picture of what the participants talked about when discussing how four constructs mattered in all four types of communication. In this section, I am turning my attention to the participants’ CMC in English and closely examine their L2CS.
From the results of the first matrix intersection search (M0, panes by factors) shown in Table 4.1, the numbers of characters for each factor for the participants’ CMC in English were obtained: 127,233 characters for LangY, followed by TechY (124,837 characters), CultY (64,512 characters), and so on with the least number of characters for LangN (480 characters). Although these numbers can tell how much the participants said about each construct matter in their L2CS, they leave out an important aspect of their words, the complexities I heard from them. One of the most important results in this research was found where two or more constructs co-occurred, interacted, or counteracted each other, to make interesting effects on the participants’ CMC in English. My participants often mentioned a few constructs simultaneously to talk about how those constructs, in combination, increased, decreased, or counterbalanced one another’s effect. These co-occurrences of multiple constructs are not readily noticeable in the first matrix intersection search result discussed in the previous sections.

In an effort to find out the amount of these co-occurrences in my research data, I ran another matrix intersection search (M1) for each pair of factors to count numbers of characters at each intersection by limiting the search scope to passages coded for L2CS. The result of this search is shown below:

20 Co-occurrence is defined in this study as multiple factors being mentioned in the same remarks by participants. (See 4.1 Definition of key terms.)
### Matrix Intersection Search M1: Factors by factors for L2CS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Nodes</th>
<th>TechY</th>
<th>TechN</th>
<th>LangY</th>
<th>LangN</th>
<th>GendY</th>
<th>GendN</th>
<th>CultY</th>
<th>CultN</th>
<th>AudiY</th>
<th>AudiN</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TechY</td>
<td>124837</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>65028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>4154</td>
<td>19389</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>12250</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>8676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechN</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LangY</td>
<td>65028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>33056</td>
<td>6692</td>
<td>21300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LangN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GendY</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5302</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GendN</td>
<td>4154</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>14403</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>2545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CultY</td>
<td>19389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>64512</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>15715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CultN</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6692</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>11915</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AudiY</td>
<td>12250</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>21300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4393</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>15715</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>41940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AudiN</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8676</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>10089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>2545</td>
<td>8878</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>28382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Matrix intersection search result (M1), factors by factors for L2CS

Each cell in this table shows the number of characters coded at two factors, that is, how often two factors co-occurred or interacted with each other. By browsing the sizes of the numbers in this table, some of the biggest co-occurrences can be identified. It appears that TechY and LangY co-occurred the most with 65,028 characters, followed by LangY and CultY with 33,056 characters, LangY and AudiY with 21,300 characters, TechY and CultY with 19,389 characters, and CultY and AudiY with 15,715 characters. This becomes more easily visible by displaying the data in a line chart (Figure 4.11), which plots the size of each co-occurrence.
Figure 4.11 Co-occurrences in L2CS, a line chart

This chart clearly shows where the biggest co-occurrence happens (TechY and LangY) and its relative size to other co-occurrences like [LangY & CultY], the next biggest co-occurrence, or [LangY & AudiY]. In other words, when the participants talked about how technology mattered in their L2CS (TechY, 124,837 characters), they mostly likely related it with language for more than half of the time (65,028 characters or 52%). A typical example of this co-occurrence is how CMC, because it is writing instead of speaking, is felt linguistically less challenging for the participants. The fact that participants’ remarks on TechY overlap with their words on LangY the most might also mean that TechY is the most closely related with LangY. In the following radar chart
(Figure 4.12), the closeness of relationship between TechY and other factors are represented as the distance from the center (TechY) to each construct, denoted by a diamond shape. The more a construct co-occur with TechY, the closer it is plotted to the center. Since TechY and LangY has the biggest co-occurrence in L2CS, the diamond on LangY axis is placed the most closely to the center, followed by CultY, AudiY, and so forth.

![L2CS: Co-occurrences with TechY](image)
Another type of chart based on the matrix intersection search M1 result (Table 4.3) is presented below (Figure 4.13). This stacked column chart displays the cumulative amount of co-occurrences per each factor (construct) to show how much each construct co-occurs with all other constructs. Compared to Figure 4.11, which displayed the size of each pair-wise co-occurrence and showed where the biggest co-occurrence happens, Figure 4.13 shows per each factor, the total amount of co-occurrences between a given factor and all other factors depicted by the height of each stacked column.

![Co-occurrences in L2CS, Stacked Column Chart](image)

Figure 4.13 Co-occurrences in L2CS, a stacked column chart
It appears that LangY, with its highest stacked column, has the most co-occurrences with other factors, followed by TechY, CultY, and AudiY. This means that LangY was related with other factors the most when the participants talked about how various factors mattered in their CMC in English. When talking about how language affected their L2CS, the participants most likely brought one or more other factors into the discussion. The height of stacked column, or the sum of co-occurrences between a factor and all other factors could also be thought of the size of a cluster that other factors form around a given factor. Since LangY has the highest stacked column, the size of cluster of various factors around LangY will be the largest, followed by the size of cluster around TechY, CultY, and AudiY. As non-native speakers of English, the participants considered language as the biggest barrier in communicating in English, both in real life and in cyberspace. For this reason, even when the participants talked about other factors affecting their L2CS, language was usually an additional factor they mentioned.

In this chapter, the results of matrix intersection searches were used to discuss: the big picture of how the participants talked about how different constructs mattered in four different types of communication across language and technology; some of the particularities for each participant; and, how different constructs interacted with each other in participants’ discussion of CMC in English (L2CS). The tables and charts presented in this section hinted at some of the complex relationships or interactions between or among two or more constructs in the participants’ remarks on their CMC in
English. It is in the next chapter where I unfold these complexities and speculations made in this chapter by reporting the analysis of the actual words of the participants.

While the use of QSR NVivo search results in the form of character counts in reporting qualitative research was rationalized earlier in Chapter 3 (3.5.3 Rationale for counting characters), I would like to revisit this issue to identify some of the limitations involved here. First of all, I would like to emphasize that this exercise of ‘temporary’ quantification of qualitative data was the initial part of my data analysis. What these numbers and the tables/figures generated by those numbers offered me and this study was the courage and tenacity to remain close to my data, the participants’ words, to continue the data analysis by reading and re-reading the interview transcripts, whose results are reported in Chapter 5.

It took quite some time to arrive at the decision to try out this quantification exercise as a part of the data analysis. By the time I performed the matrix searches (M0 and M1) in QSR NVivo, I had gone through a few prior trials at getting a handle on my data including: reading some of the interview transcripts a few times, coding a few interview transcripts several times in the course of revising the pre-codebook, and of course, moving away from the data due to difficulties involved in qualitative data analysis. It has been the time of my own struggle between the messiness of qualitative data and the neatness of quantitative. While I am keenly aware of the value and beauty of messiness in qualitative data, I was wrestling with my still positivist being longing for structured, organized, and neat ways of presenting the data. Having been exposed to both qualitative and quantitative methodology, I found myself standing ‘at border’ again. Hearing two very different, often times opposing, views on data analysis, I was at a loss
as to what to do with my qualitative data as a being standing somewhere between two methodological frameworks.

Trying QSR NVivo search was one of the attempts I made in the course of all these struggles in the early data analysis stage. The results of the matrix searches appeared to show me one possible way to initiate analysis of my data by confirming some of the hunches I developed through transcribing all the interviews by myself and reading the transcripts afterwards. Once I had decided to use this as a part of reporting my findings, I have quickly visualized the numbers into figures and put the previous hunches I had with my data into words by referring to the numbers and figures, which became thirty pages including three tables and thirteen figures. This was however by no means an attempt to reduce my data into numbers and I am not arguing for any ‘hunches’ I have discussed in this chapter, until I discuss it in Chapter 5. Being aware of the danger that something from my data might get lost through this temporary quantification, I have tried to incorporate as much as possible in the course of further analysis and reports I documented in Chapter 5.

Right after drafting this chapter, I went back to my data and spent a lot more time to write Chapter 5 through the cycles of: reading, re-reading, and re-coding of data and writing and re-writing of the chapter. I began listing every theme I noticed from this analysis and the list grew as I read more interview transcripts of more participants and as I identified the complexities and multiplicities of the numerous themes, sub-themes, and sub-themes of the sub-themes. Writing the results of this analysis necessitated sequencing, re-sequencing, organizing, and re-organizing of the themes and sub-themes as well as merging and/or splitting multiple themes. It is the result of this long data analysis process
that is presented in Chapter 5, where the actual words of the participants are presented and discussed to show ‘how’ and ‘in what ways’ did the constructs mattered, not mattered, or co-occurred to influence the participants CMC in English differently.
CHAPTER 5

L2CS IN THEIR OWN WORDS

In Chapter 4, results from QSR NVivo matrix intersection searches in numbers of characters were used to describe the big picture of the data. As discussed a few times in previous chapters, the numbers were used only for the sake of sketching the shape of the data as a whole. Without reading what was actually said by the participants, however, there exists an obvious distance between the data analysis reported in Chapter 4 and the actual data. This chapter, therefore, will include excerpts from interviews with the participants to show the readers the data itself. In so doing, I am referring to Gibbs (2002) who suggested using quotations as one way to “persuade the reader of the trustworthiness and credibility” (p. 231) of the research. The actual words of the research participants will be reported in this chapter in regards to which construct affects their CMC in what ways followed by how a certain construct co-occurs with other constructs.

When I first drafted this chapter, it was almost 100 pages long (not including translation of the interview excerpts). I had to come up with a way to shorten it, drastically. I confess here that it was one of the most painful struggles I went through in writing the dissertation. I was in a dilemma where I had to shorten it when I do not want to lose any of the excerpts because for me, it was already very much shortened by
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deleting a lot of the words of the participants. Simply deleting the excerpts from my dissertation felt like betraying my participants who told me all those words to answer my questions. I had to find a way to honor their voices. One way I came up with after a long struggle was the use of an appendix. For those excerpts that were ‘temporarily’ deleted from the following section were copied in Appendix F with a heading of “Excerpt #nn,” so that a) I would not lose any of the excerpts I wanted to include in my dissertation; b) readers will have the actual voices of the participants when they wish; and more practically, c) to shorten the length of the dissertation.

As shown in the result of the first matrix intersection search (Table 4.1), when the participants were asked to talk about their CMC in English (L2CS), they talked about technology and language the most with similar numbers of characters, 124,837 characters of TechY, 127,233 characters for LangY, respectively, followed by culture (CultY, 64,512 characters), and so forth. Although the size of these numbers are not a direct indication of the level of importance of each construct, it will be used as a way to organize this chapter; the construct with the most numbers, which is TechY, will be discussed first, followed by LangY, CultY, and so forth. From the result of the second matrix intersection search (Table 4.3), it was noted that multiple constructs often occur together (co-occur); rather than talking about the effect of one construct, the participants often related it with one or more constructs to talk about how the combination of those factors affected their L2CS. Discussion of these co-occurrences will be interleaved between the discussions of each construct, to show how those constructs, in combination, were mentioned to work in participants’ CMC in English (L2CS).
5.1 How technology matters in L2CS

The result of the first matrix intersection search (M0: Panes by Factors) in Table 4.1 shows that a total of 124,837 characters were coded at the intersection of L2CS and TechY, where the participants talked about how being in cyberspace matters (TechY) as they communicate in English in cyberspace (L2CS). Examination of the data shows all of the eight participants talked about this. While TechY often co-occurred with other factors in participants’ remarks on their L2CS as seen in Table 4.3, there were also some cases where the participants talked about how technology by itself affects their CMC in English, or CMC in general. Several aspects of CMC were mentioned ranging from purely technical aspects of CMC (change in communication medium to computer), symbolic aspect (communicating in cyberspace), and the participants’ attitude towards CMC in academic settings and/or CMC in general.

5.1.1 Technical aspect of CMC

The most obvious effect of technology in one’s CMC would come from the use of computers to communicate. Using computers to communicate involves skills such as handling computer hardware, typing at keyboard, or knowing how to use different types of CMC. When one does not feel confident with these technical aspects of CMC, technology becomes visible and works as a burden or an obstacle in communication. A few participants related this purely technical aspect of CMC to their CMC experiences.

To Elena, due to her lack of skillfulness in typing (both Korean and English), CMC is felt like ‘work.’
In relation to this, Elena said a few times that she prefers face-to-face communication or phone conversation to CMC. She said that she could talk for an hour over the phone but her e-mails tend to be a lot shorter. Probably because she is bilingual and language is not her concern in terms of communicating her ideas, Elena said that she even prefers ‘talking in person’ to professors, which was not the case for other participants. (Excerpt #1) To Gunjeung, unfamiliarity with the specific CMC tool used in her course listserv appears to have lessened her engagement in L2CS. While she checks her personal e-mail on a daily basis, she does not check the e-mail used for the course listserv because it involves a few ‘extra’ steps more than her usual personal e-mail. (Excerpt #2)

While the change of the communication medium is sometimes felt as an ‘added burden’ to some participants, the actual ‘doing’ of the CMC, the idea of typing to communicate itself, did not seem to bother most participants. When Yuseon said that she writes directly at computer for listserv postings or e-mails, she sounded as if she does not feel anything unnatural about typing to communicate at all. (Excerpt #3) As hinted here,

---

21 Interview excerpts that are briefly mentioned but not included in this chapter are documented in Appendix F. Interview excerpts omitted from Chapter 5, arranged in the order of their appearances in the chapter.
writing at computers to communicate does not appear to be problematic for most of the participants. Other than Elena, no one else expressed concerns with ‘having to type’ at computers as an issue in CMC. In fact, for most of them, e-mail or chatting (in Korean) was being used as a major communication medium, at least for personal communication. In other words, medium itself was not problematic for them. Sunghae even once said that MSN messenger acts like a cellular phone among her friends since everyone keeps it open all day long and uses it to communicate with each other.

A few participants expressed concerns with the unavailability of immediate response/feedback in case of asynchronous CMC. Elena said that this makes conversation in CMC less smooth especially when back-and-forth conversation is needed because asking follow-up questions is not readily possible when using e-mail. (Excerpt #4) Eunji also pointed out this aspect of CMC (lack of immediate feedback and/or contextual reaction), but with slightly different words. She uses the word ‘just throw it out there’ to describe the act of writing in cyberspace.

(Document: Eunji_Interview1)
87: Face-to-face의 경우 표정 등으로 feedback을 받으니깐 거기에 따라 다음 말을 할 수 있다.
88: Listserv는, feedback이 없고, 그냥 던져버리니깐,
89: 그렇게 다른 것 같아요.

87: In case of f2f communication, you get feedback from facial expressions and you can respond to it.
88: But in Listserv, you have no feedback. You are just throwing it out there.
89: That’s different.

In terms of the quality of conversation or resulting relationship, some participants clearly differentiated CMC from face-to-face communication. Elena separated CMC (chatting) from conversation in real life and viewed technology as a ‘barrier’ in
communication, making relationship through CMC as very superficial, not suitable for
talking to close friends. (Excerpt #5) Sookie made similar comments and said that
compared to face-to-face communication, emotion is not conveyed very well in
cyberspace and emoticons are not a sufficient tool to serve this purpose. (Excerpt #6) In
this case, the medium of communication, computer, appears to become clearly visible,
not transparent to them.

5.1.2 Being in cyberspace

Being in cyberspace would be another big part of the technology factor (TechY)
in CMC. The participants were very much conscious of being in cyberspace as opposed
to in real life settings. They pointed out how various aspects of being in cyberspace affect
their CMC in various ways. Some participants clearly viewed cyberspace as ‘public’
space and were very aware of CMC being stored (recorded) somewhere and this
consciousness affected what they would say (write) in their CMC. Considering the recent
trend of expressing one’s opinion on various types of message boards in Korean web
sites\(^{22}\) and relatively active on-line activities of the participants, this was a little
unexpected.

Seoyoung said that when writing in cyberspace, she would not reveal her feelings
and/or emotions 100%, especially her bad feelings. She would try to write with courtesy
even when she is mad because she is aware of her CMC writings being stored somewhere.
“Evidence” (증거, in Korean) was the exact word Seoyoung used. Since they (CMC

\(^{22}\) In many Korean web sites (news or television program sites, especially), it is common nowadays to see a
series of replies popping up in response to a certain news article or television program, where people
express their opinions, sometimes with strong voice.
writings) remain saved and thus will be available for retrieval, Seoyoung was also concerned that someone might re-read her writings and re-interpret them, possibly differently from the first time.

...
word, evidence, as she talked about how she would not make negative comments towards the interlocutor when using CMC. (Excerpt #8)

To elicit comments on various aspects of CMC, CMC was often compared with face-to-face communication. Unlike face-to-communication, where interlocutors are present in the same space, communicating with a person sitting on the other side of the network had a few different meanings to the participants. For some non-native speakers of English, confronting interlocutors face-to-face can be anxiety provoking. For this reason, CMC, having an invisible interlocutor and not having to confront him/her, could make one less nervous. Jiyoung says here that with L2CS, she does not have to worry about her face turning red, which sometimes is the case in L2RL.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)

602: 지영: 앞에서는 영어로 말할 때 약간 얼굴 발게지거든요, 빨개지거든요, 이렇게 긴장하고 당황하고 막 이러면. 근데 여기서 (cyberspace) 만약에 왔다갔다하면 내가 만약에 늘다. 만약에 예를 들어서 chatting을 한다고 해도, 그럴리라는 없지만, 아무래도 당황은 하지 않겠죠, 얼굴이 막 벌게지거나 이러지는 않겠죠. 그니까 덜 당황하겠죠.

602: Jiyoung: When speaking face-to-face in English, my face sometimes turns red if I am nervous and embarrassed. But here (cyberspace), even if I am late in responding in chatting, for example, I might not get as embarrassed as I would in face-to-face communication.

But being in cyberspace and having an invisible audience was experienced as a double-edged sword. While talking to an invisible audience would make L2CS easier, free of concerns with audience characteristics, Gunjeung was concerned with possible flaming in anonymous CMC. She said that while it could be easier to initiate conversation in anonymous CMC, it would hurt her feelings more if someone makes negative comments, disregarding or attacking her. (Excerpt #9)
Another aspect of communication in cyberspace is the loss of contextuality or real-lifeness, which sometimes causes misunderstanding among interlocutors. Gunjeung said that the loss of real-life feeling in CMC leaves the interpretation of the CMC to the discretion of the receiver, who could misunderstand the writer’s intention or feelings. She talked about a seemingly offending e-mail she once received from her Japanese classmate, which turned out not to be the writer’s intention. (Excerpt #10) Related to this, a few participants talked about how they become conscious of their manners when talking in cyberspace, especially in asynchronous CMC, where immediate response for explanation or feedback is not available. Gunjeung said that she makes conscious effort to write politely when sending e-mails in English. Moreover, she added that she would rather not use e-mails in situations where negative comments (refusal, for example) should be made because refusal in CMC would sound more impolite than in face-to-face. (Excerpt #11) Talking from her own experience, Sunghae also said that she uses extra caution when engaged in CMC to avoid possible misunderstanding.

While some participants said that they become more courteous in cyberspace, there were a few others who said the opposite, becoming less courteous in CMC. Sookie said that in CMC, especially in asynchronous CMC, she tends to focus more on expressing her own thoughts rather than listening to (reading) others, which sometimes makes her CMC become more emotional, direct, or offensive, without paying much attention to others’ reaction because it is not readily visible. (Excerpt #12) In synchronous CMC (chatting), on the other hand, she becomes more candid in expressing her thoughts because the audience is invisible and there is less time to think. (Excerpt #13)
5.1.3 Attitude towards and comments on the use of CMC

In some cases, a certain degree of unwillingness (or resistance) to accept CMC as an alternative to face-to-face communication was evident. Most of the participants did not seem to be very excited with the use of CMC as a part of their course requirements. All of them said that they participated in CMC (listserv or WebCT) largely because it was a course requirement. Gunjeung said that she did it just because it was a course requirement and this made her CMC experience (WebCT and listserv) less interesting, both for her and her classmates. (Excerpt #14) Sookie also said that her postings in her course listserv were mainly for meeting course requirements and she did not care to participate actively in discussion. She added that this was more so since it was in cyberspace. If it was in L2RL, she said, that she would have tried to redirect the discussion if the discussion appeared to flow into a wrong direction. (Excerpt #15) This was the case even for Elena, a bilingual, who did not have linguistic constraints of the other participants.

(Document: Elena_Interview1)

306: Elena: 근데 저도, 이게, voluntarily 로 이거를 이거를 하겠다는 생각은 안하거든요. . . . .
308: Elena: 예, 그냥 하라 그러니까 하는거고, 그다음에 또, 그다음에 또 교수님하고 학생들하고 일주일에 한번씩은 그래도 보게 되잖아요.
그래서 뭐, 보니까, 그냥 일주일에, 그냥 수업에 그냥 보면 되지, 이것까지 꼭 할 필요가 있나.

306: Elena: And I, too, ... do not want to do this (WebCT) voluntarily. . . . .
308: Elena: Yes, I do it because I am told to do. And, we do meet in class once a week. So, ... just, (I wonder) isn’t meeting in class enough? Or, is this (WebCT) really necessary? ...

This appears to be somewhat related to the nature of Korean academic culture, especially in K-12 classrooms. Students are so interested in their grades but nothing else,
so they are interested in classroom activities only if they are reflected in their grades.

Moreover, in most classrooms, since it is very much teacher-centered, students’ voluntary participation in class discussion is not encouraged. More discussion together with excerpts from interviews will be provided in section 5.4, where various effects of culture will be addressed.

Based on their own experiences, some participants made comments on the idea of employing CMC in academic settings in terms of what works and what does not. These comments offer some insights as to how CMC could be incorporated into classroom in terms of organization and/or management such as what makes students participate or how much intervention by instructors should be used. The majority of participants used the listserv for Course A, which was designed for non-native speakers of English. In most cases, the participants did not find their experiences with the listserv very interesting. Sookie said that her course listserv did not generate good discussion and criticized others’ listserv postings as being illogical and emotional, not appropriate for academic discussion. (Excerpt #16) Not only students, but also one of the instructors of this course, expressed similar response towards the listserv.

(Document: Sunghae_Teacher)
80: SH-Teacher: … Yeah, … um, … and I think the listserv is a great idea, but, … I think, I think, … probably if I were in charge of the course, I would require them to post along the way.
82: SH-Teacher: And not … not say you can do it until Friday at noon, you know. … I don’t, …
Mikyung: And even, … one comment that I heard from a student was like, … maybe you could set a topic, maybe broadly, … per week, or … for two weeks, … . . . .
SH-Teacher: Right, … right, … That’s a good idea.
Mikyung: So, it doesn’t like, I mean, ‘communicate each other.’ So listserv is like, they just post everything, throw their postings away into listserv, … so, it’s not like communicating, …
Elena makes a comment on the use of CMC based on her experiences with CMC in a couple of courses. She thinks that CMC can become a useful medium when used well and that it requires careful planning and some practice (instructor and students alike) for CMC in classrooms to succeed.

(Document: Elena_Interview5)
641: Elena: .... So ... I think the WebCT is good, ... but then at the same time this is also very much of beginning ... media. ... Uh, ... and ... maybe language and culture does have something to do with ... with how much ... we write or how much we, we feel familiar with the WebCT, but also at the same time I think this is awkward for many, for many people ... not just for me. ... But uh ...

... 653: Elena: 예, 귀찮긴 했지만, 귀찮긴 하지만 (Yes, although it was troublesome) um it WAS good. And it was better the second time around. That I do, that I do acknowledge.

... 719: Elena: [laugh] ... I think, I think it is a good ... medium. ... And I think ... that if you can, if you can get better at it with experience, you can really benefit from it. It's gonna be hard the first time, ... but you do it twice, if you do it three times, ... you can only get better with it. ... And, I think, um ... professors also need to be clear about their expectations. Don't just say 'comment on it’. ... I mean, ... 

As discussed so far, when the participants talked about the effects of change in communication medium, most of the effects were negative. But in a few instances, positive aspects of communicating in cyberspace were mentioned. This was more prominent with Elena, a bilingual Korean-American, who was able to fully participate in discussion in L2CS since she was free from language constraints. She said that while doing of CMC was not very enjoyable because of time and effort involved, she thinks that it helped her academically, providing her opportunities to review her thoughts on course reading and to compensate for lack of classroom discussions. (Excerpt #17)
5.1.4 When technology does not matter

So far, the discussion in this section has been on ways technology matters (TechY) when participants are engaged in CMC in English. As seen in the matrix intersection search result (M0: panes by factors) in Table 4.1, however, the participants also talked about how technology does not matter in their L2CS (L2CS & TechN). Although the number of characters (4,266 characters) was a lot smaller than that of [L2CS & TechY] with 124,827 characters23, this is an important part of the picture.

A couple of participants (Elena and Gunjeung) mentioned cases where they did not feel technology mattered in their L2CS. Elena here indicates that for her the specificity of CMC setting, especially for academic CMCs, delimits the topics or relationships and this makes technology transparent across L2RL and L2CS. This appears to have been possible since Elena is bilingual, free from language constraint.

(Document: Elena_Interview3)

460: Elena: 저는 그린거는 빌린거 같지가 않아요, (I don’t think I am different between L2RL and L2CS) at least now. Um, the four students in the class, … we don’t know each other very well, … um … so … and when we DO talk to each other, we talk about class,

465: Elena: we, we rarely talk about anything else, … um … … and, and for the posting that we put on the WebCT, they are all about class as well. So, I don’t think the relationship is very much different. If you are asking ‘are we closer in class?’ or ‘do we, do we seem closer on the WebCT?’ I would say the answer is no. … I think, I think the relationship is basically the same. …

---

23 One reason I speculate for the small number of characters for [L2CS & TechN] is the fact that the participants usually talked more about constructs that mattered than about constructs that did not. When a certain construct did not matter, not many words were used to talk about it. The same reason might explain relatively small numbers of characters for LangN, CultN, AudiN, and GendN.
To Gunjeung, writing in cyberspace is not of much concern since she is not very concerned with the public nature of her CMC postings, at least for those in her course listserv (academic discourse). She also adds that entering into cyberspace does not necessarily allow her to become more active and her remarks in L2RL and L2CS would not differ in terms of the level of feelings or strength of her arguments. This might have been the case because she was talking about CMC used in academic settings. (Excerpt #18)

5.2 How language matters in L2CS

With 127,233 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and LangY (see Table 4.1), language appears to be as big a part as technology in the participants’ L2CS. As in the previous section, the effect of language by itself is discussed here and co-occurrences of language with other constructs will be discussed in later sections. All participants except for Elena (bilingual Korean-American) talked about how being non-native speakers of English affected their performance in their CMC in English. The major aspect of their comments regarding LangY was their perceived level of linguistic proficiency in English and how this affected their performance in L2CS in a few different ways.

5.2.1 Language is the biggest barrier

Most participants found the idea of translating their thoughts into English to be very daunting, let alone concern about conveying their thoughts correctly. With the exception of Elena, a bilingual Korean-American, all of the participants shared difficulties and frustrations they experienced when participating in CMC in English.
Without enough confidence in their English proficiency, language was felt to be the biggest and foremost factor in the participants’ L2CS among four constructs -- technology, language, culture, and gender.

Confessing that her English is not very good, Eunji said that language matters a lot both in her L2RL and L2CS. (Excerpt #19) For Gunjeung, who is not very confident with English grammar, since it is writing instead of speaking, CMC becomes even more challenging. She added later that language is the biggest factor (barrier) both in L2RL and L2CS and this is the root of all those frustrations she gets from using English, both in real life and in cyberspace. (Excerpt #20) Sookie also thought of language as the biggest obstacle in her L2CS. Compared to her L1CS, which is often considered leisure, when Sookie is involved in L2CS, even if it is used for small talk, she said that she becomes more conscious of her writing in terms of linguistic features such as grammar or organization of the writing. (Excerpt #21) Sunghae also conveyed her frustration with her linguistic deficiency as she talked about how difficult it is to participate in listserv due to her linguistic incompetence to convey her thoughts into English. (Excerpt #22)

Jiyoung was particularly frustrated with how language works against her in L2CS. Being a Ph. D. candidate from Korea, she had enough content knowledge. So, not being able to display her knowledge in English must have added more emotional distress for her. Jiyoung says here that while L2CS might be easier than L2RL because it is reading/writing instead of listening/speaking, it is still difficult due to her level of English proficiency, which handicaps her from conveying her ideas and thoughts. She shares here her emotional distress as she has to devote much effort and time to be able to ‘at least’
convey her thoughts into English. In a very candid display of her frustration, she calls her WebCT activity ‘painful.’

(Document: Jiyoung Interview1)
711: 미경: 근데 왜 싫어, 그림? WebCT 가 더 좋지, 그림?
712: 지영: 근데 WebCT 는 너무 고통스럽다니까?

. . .
718: 지영: 대충하면 글이 안된다니까. 글을 일단 잘 못 만드는 편이고, 그게 잘 안돼. 그니까 너무 고통스러워. 목요일 맛 밤에 맛, 그, 금요일날 아침까지 posting 할라고, 맛 새벽에 맛 계속 없어있으면 맛, 오, 마음이 답답하면서,
719: 미경: 너무 많아. 너무 많이 해.
720: 지영: 너무 많아. 술직히 개발하고 나는 물리지. 나는 그거 하나 올 때마다 얼마나 힘든데요. 게들은 수업 끝마치고, 수업 후 소감, 몇 줄 적으면 되지만, 난 또 다 찾아봐야해. 뭐라 comment 하지? 얼마나 괴로운데, 그리고 술직히 class comment 에 별로 애들 보니까 중요한 말도 안쓴데, . . . .

711: Mikyung: (if you are better at writing) Isn’t WebCT better for you, then (than classroom discussion)?
712: Jiyoung: But doing WebCT is so painful.

. . .
718: Jiyoung: I just can’t write with ease. First of all, I don’t write very well, ... it’s just not easily done and it’s so painful. ... Every Thursday night, to post by Friday morning, I would stay up all night until early Friday morning, ... you know, it’s so frustrating, ... 719: Mikyung: Right, it’s too much, ... a lot of work.
720: Jiyoung: It’s too much. As a matter of fact, I am different from them (native speaker classmates). They can just write briefly about their thoughts after class, but for me, ... I have to look it up, ... ‘what do I write?’ ... it’s just painful, ...

Jiyoung’s dissatisfaction with her CMC continued as she said that her writing quality is not good enough compared to those of her native speaker classmates. She said that WebCT was an opportunity to compensate for her in-class performance (or lack of it) to show/display what she knows and this was confirmed with the instructor’s positive evaluation of her WebCT postings. Nevertheless, she appeared to be frustrated with the fact that her linguistic deficiency hinders her from performing better. Her lack of confidence with her writings was revealed in a later interview when she said that she...
feel ‘I guess (or I am glad/relieved) that I am on the right track.’ upon receiving positive comments from her classmates in WebCT. (Excerpt #23)

5.2.2 Characteristics of the participants’ CMC

Linguistic deficiency not only lowered the participants’ level of confidence in their performance in L2CS and caused emotional distress, it also made the participants’ CMC writings different than those of native speakers’, characterized by simpler, more direct, or more academic. Based on her own experience, Gunjeung said that non-native speakers’ writings, because of their linguistic deficiency, often sound more direct regardless of writers’ intentions. (Excerpt #24) Sookie said that her linguistic deficiency hinders her from conveying/expressing her ideas and/or emotions 100% and restricts the range of expressions, making her CMC very direct and candid, even if she does not want it to be. (Excerpt #25)

In case of Jiyoung, linguistic deficiency makes her WebCT postings very academic because it is the only discourse style she is familiar with. She says here that she cannot write non-academically even if she wanted to.
조금이나마 조금 더 가지고 있는 건 academic 한 거 밖에 없잖아요.

1014: Mikyung: ... JY-Teacher (the instructor) said that your WebCT writing is very good, academic and professional, ...  
1024: Jiyoung: You know, I cannot but writing academically. [laugh] because I cannot write non-academically.  
1026: Jiyoung: See, being academic (content knowledge and writing) is the only thing that I am at least comparable or a little bit better than my (native speaker) classmates.  

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview5)  
89: 미경: 내가 보니까, (Jiyoung’s WebCT postings) 그야말로 정말 academic 한 거 같애. 자기가 쓴게. 아주 문어체고,  
95: 지영: 구어체는 내가 못 쓰잖아.  
99: 지영: 그러니까, 주변 말을 못하니까  
89: Mikyung: Your WebCT postings look very academic ... very literary style ...  
95: Jiyoung: I can’t write in colloquial style.

5.2.3 Greater burden than native speaker classmates

In the course of sharing their difficulties and frustrations caused by linguistic deficiency, a few participants compared their CMC practices with those of their native speaker classmates and talked about how they need to devote a lot more time and effort than native speakers to meet the same CMC course requirements. Gunjeung compared two of her CMC experiences, listserv for Course A (a writing course designed for non-native speakers of English) and WebCT for Course D (a freshman composition course open to all freshmen, native and non-native speakers)\textsuperscript{24}. She said that writing for Course D WebCT was more challenging linguistically and that she had to put much more effort and time than her classmates did.

(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)  
219: 근정: 별로 성의도 없는 것 같고 애들이, [웃음]

\textsuperscript{24} More detailed description for courses can be found in section 3.3 Description of research site and participants.
As for the greater burden for non-native speakers than for native speakers, Jiyoung agrees and shares her emotional feelings here. She sounds very frustrated with her level of English proficiency, which disables her from conveying her ideas and thoughts despite of her content knowledge. Jiyoung also says that she puts a lot effort and time to merely convey her thoughts into English, while her classmates would only spend twenty minutes and write simple comments, but with better linguistic quality than hers. To me, Jiyoung almost sounded as if she was shouting ‘This is not fair!’ as she says that she cannot argue as much as she would due to linguistic difficulties.
Reflecting upon the time when I was listening to them talk about linguistic difficulties involved in CMC in English, the participants sounded the most excited and I feel that this was probably the most bonding moment with the participants. Although it was their choice to come to another country to study, and although they do understand that they are the ones to try harder to fit in a U.S. academic setting, they sometimes seem to feel that it is unfair for them to be regarded as ‘not so smart’ when in fact they might have been proud of themselves as smart students back home, smart enough to even dream about studying abroad. I could fully sympathize with them as an international student myself, having gone through, and still going through the same emotional difficulties as they do. We shared ‘the sense of lost status,’ finding ourselves become ‘nobody’s’ due to...
English while we all thought of ourselves as ‘somebodies’ back home. This was truly the moment where I was the “insider at border.”

5.3 Co-occurrences: Technology and language

As discussed in the previous chapter (section 4.3), the co-occurrence of TechY and LangY was the biggest co-occurrence in L2CS with 65,028 characters. To the participants, when thinking of the word ‘CMC in English’ (L2CS), it was first and foremost ‘communication in English, L2’ before it was either in cyberspace or real life. For them, conveying their thoughts into English was the major aspect in accomplishing its goal, communication. Therefore, in many cases, the participants commented on how being in cyberspace as they communicate in English made their communication either easier or harder. On the other hand, it was noted that Elena, being a bilingual, did not relate LangY or LangN with TechY. In other words, she did not feel that being in cyberspace helped (or hindered) her output in L2CS in terms of language (English).

5.3.1 Limited scope of CMC in this study

Communication in cyberspace (L2CS and L1CS) in this research was assumed to be written discourse (reading/writing) as opposed to communication in real life (L2RL and L1RL), which was assumed to be spoken discourse (listening/speaking). So, some of the arguments being made here, especially as for the co-occurrences of technology and language (TechY & LangY) in L2CS, might not apply for audio CMC or video CMC, which will become more popular in a few years. Nevertheless, this study could offer

---

25 This term ‘insider at border’ was used in 3.2.3 Methodological positioning, to describe my position as a Korean female researcher in relation to the eight Korean female participants in my study.
some thoughts (or hypotheses) for future studies looking at audiovisual CMC. For example, in case of video L2CS, some of the linguistic relief that non-native speakers feel in written L2CS might not happen, making L2CS as linguistically challenging as L2RL. On the other hand, with video CMC, they might get the benefit of some of the real-lifeness (contextual help) that was not available in written CMC.

5.3.2 Written CMC discourse, less linguistic burden

Largely due to the common English teaching practice of grammar-translation method26 in Korean educational settings, Korean learners of English are usually more proficient in written English (reading/writing) than in spoken English (listening/speaking). L2CS being reading/writing as opposed to L2RL being listening/speaking, most Korean learners of English would feel more confident with their L2CS than their L2RL when the linguistic quality of the output (CMC postings vs. speaking in real life settings) is compared, as was true for my research participants. This might be related to the grammar-based English instruction in Korea, making most Korean learners of English relatively confident in grammar and writing, but not listening or pronunciation.

Jiyoung here says very clearly that she is better at writing in English than in speaking. For this reason, she says that she feels more comfortable with L2CS than with L2RL.

26 This method usually focuses on teaching of grammatical rules and practicing in translation of written passages from one language to another practice. As a result, learners might develop a detailed knowledge of the language, but not necessarily an ability to use the language to communicate.
Jiyoung: Yes, I like it (L2CS) better than class discussion. ... I can write more explanation and write longer if I want to.

Jiyoung: Yeah, right. I am better at writing than speaking. ... much better. ...

(Document: Jiyoung Interview3)

Jiyoung: See, you don’t have to worry about pronunciation since it’s writing. For most Koreans, speaking is very different (much more difficult/demanding than) from writing. . . .

so crossing this (from real life to cyberspace; L2RL > L2CS), it would feel more comfortable.

Jiyoung’s confidence in written English and how it helps her L2CS was evident to the instructor, who was also her academic advisor. He says here how her capability in content knowledge combined with high proficiency in writing enabled Jiyoung to benefit a lot from WebCT. (Excerpt #26) Sookie also pointed out that being free of pronunciation when writing in cyberspace (L2CS) is helpful for her in addition to allowing more time to think and edit. (Excerpt #27) Sunghae made similar comments when she said that CMC, being reading/writing instead of listening/speaking, greatly relieves her from linguistic burdens. (Excerpt #28) Higher confidence in L2 writing than in L2 speaking was often linked to the preference of using e-mails (L2CS) to face-to-face communication (L2RL) when asking questions to instructors as Jiyoung and Seoyoung said. (Excerpt #29)

Although the participants mostly noted the ‘written’ discourse of CMC and related it to their relatively higher proficiency in L2 writing, a few exceptions were also
found. For Gunjeung, who is more confident with her spoken English, it was different. She said that L2CS is very stressful for her because of her grammatical and spelling errors, especially for asynchronous CMC. This might be explained with Gunjeung’s special English learning experience. She learned English while making friends with an American when she was a 7th grader in Korea. She linked the lack of contextual information in cyberspace to this. She felt that she needs to write better in order to make herself clearer, which requires better writing skills. (Excerpt #30)

Yuseon was another exception to the co-occurrence of technology and language in CMC benefiting non-native speakers of English. She said that conversation in cyberspace (L2CS) requires higher linguistic proficiency than talking in real life settings (L2RL). She talked about a certain linguistic discourse found in native speakers’ CMC (e.g., using ‘nor-acture’ instead of ‘no lecture’) and noted added challenges for non-native speakers of English in participating CMC with native speakers. While other participants were mostly focused on conveying their thoughts in English, Yuseon appears to be interested in conversing with her native speaker interlocutors in cyberspace, preferably using similar linguistic styles with them. In this sense, she considered CMC discourse as ‘spoken’ where people talk with each other in colloquial style as they would do in real life settings. Thus relatively higher proficiency of non-native speakers in written English than in spoken English does not necessarily help them perform better in L2CS. (Excerpt #31)

While most participants mentioned how relative confidence in writing helps them in L2CS, Seoyoung pointed out how it is more of an issue of ‘listening versus reading’ than that of ‘speaking versus writing’ for her. Probably due to her personality (coded as
Other\textsuperscript{27}, she said that how well she understands what she reads/listens (input, others’ writing or utterance) greatly affects her level of confidence in what she writes/speaks (output, writing or speaking in response to the input) when communicating. Because she can read better than she can listen, she understands better in L2CS than in L2RL, which makes her respond with higher confidence and this confidence helps her perform (writing or speaking) better. In the mean time, she also noted that she writes better than she speaks, which is one of the benefits in L2CS. (Excerpt #32)

5.3.3 Asynchronous vs. synchronous CMC

Aside from the difference in proficiencies of different language performance, being in cyberspace (L2CS) seems to offer extra help for NNSs, giving more time to compensate for their linguistic deficiency in case of asynchronous CMC (e-mail, listserv, or WebCT postings). A few participants (Gunjeung, Jiyoung, and Sookie) point out how asynchronous L2CS gives them more time to think (process and organize their ideas), write, and edit as needed and thus it helps improve the quality of their linguistic output (CMC postings). Comparing L2CS (both synchronous and asynchronous CMC) with L2RL, Sookie said that she feels like she has to ‘rush herself’ to speak/write upon getting the interlocutor’s writing, often without having enough time to think. (Excerpt #33)

In synchronous CMC, on the other hand, language appears to become more of a burden for the participants due to its promptness and speed. Seoyoung said that the combination of synchronousness and speed of chatting (TechY) and difficulty in tracking (remembering) her thoughts in English (LangY) makes it even harder for her to

\textsuperscript{27} For descriptions of codes used in this study, please refer to Table 3.2 Codebook.
participate in chatting compared to asynchronous CMC such as WebCT threaded discussion or listserv. Seoyoung compared this to classroom discussion (L2RL), where the listeners would wait for her to finish her talking, and said that this cannot be expected in chatting. She also noted that this was actually contrary to her expectation. She thought that L2RL (talking) might be harder than CMC because it is writing, but she found chatting in English (synchronous CMC) even more challenging. (Excerpt #34)

On the other hand, the same synchronousness and speed in chatting could work positively in some cases. For Seoyoung, while chatting was linguistically more difficult to perform, it also relieved her from the obligation to finish her sentence, which is usually expected in face-to-face communication and can be very anxiety provoking. Sookie says that she would become less conscious of making linguistic mistakes because it disappears from the screen when the chatting is over (not unless one makes conscious effort to save the chatting record). (Excerpt #35)

5.3.4 Lack of contextual cues/hint/help

One of the most frequently mentioned aspect of L2CS in terms of the co-occurrence of technology and language (TechY & LangY) was the loss of real-lifeness and how it affects their CMC linguistically. Most of the respondents said that this makes CMC in English more challenging. Since there are no other contextual hints (e.g., interlocutor’s facial expression reacting to one’s talking) or physical help (contextual information, gesture, or drawing), they said that they have to put in more effort to convey their thoughts correctly in writing.
Eunji commented on how technology and language in combination affects her CMC both positively and negatively. She said that while L2CS gives more time to improve her postings linguistically, not being able to use non-linguistic devices to assist communication makes L2CS more difficult at the same time. When she fails to convey her thoughts in her first message, she noted, that she does not have a second chance to further explain; but in L2RL, she could do it using other medium such as gesture or drawings. (Excerpt #36) A few other participants made similar comments. Yuseon talked about how the loss of contextual cues adds difficulty in conveying her ideas in L2CS and how she prefers L2RL for this reason and tries to write in more detail in L2CS in an effort to compensate for this. Jiyoung agreed on this, saying that while L2CS might be better in terms of expressing her ideas, understanding the other person (interlocutor) is harder due to reduced contextual keys in cyberspace such as tone of voice or facial reaction. Sunghae briefly expressed similar concerns, although the benefit of writing in L2CS as opposed to speaking appeared to be greater for her. (Excerpt #37)

But for some participants, the same characteristics offered some level of comfort or excuse for possible mistakes. Eunji said that not being able to see the audience makes her feel more comfortable with possible linguistic errors in her CMC. This appears to reflect her personality being not so much concerned with others’ thoughts on her words or behaviors. Sookie also said that being in cyberspace sometimes shields her from embarrassment or nervousness when she makes linguistic mistakes. (Excerpt #38)
5.4 How culture matters in L2CS

There were 64,512 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and CultY\textsuperscript{28} (see Table 4.1). Within L2CS, 33,056, 19,389, and 15,715 characters were for co-occurrences of CultY with LangY, TechY, and AudiY, respectively, as seen in Table 4.3. All participants mentioned CultY except for Elena (bilingual Korean-American), who does not consider herself as a non-native speaker of English nor a Korean, at least as she participates in CMC with other native speakers, especially in academic settings.

5.4.1 Influences of Korean academic culture

All participants except for Elena, who got her K-12 education in the U.S., had more experiences with Korean educational culture and were in the process of transition to a new academic culture in the U.S. at the time of participating in this study. From their comments on CMC experiences in U.S. academic settings, there were signs of Korean academic culture, which can be characterized primarily by teacher-centeredness, lack of classroom discussion, extreme competition among students, and focus on grades.

It appears here that for Eunji, the idea of using listserv itself is foreign, something distant from Korean academic culture. She is not confident as to what she is supposed to do in listserv and she says that she does not understand the purpose and/or need of listserv in Course A. For this reason, Eunji feels that CMC requirement is something extra and even somewhat bothering. In the second excerpt, she says that she does not pay much attention to her listserv postings because her performance in listserv is not part of

\textsuperscript{28} [CultY] was used for “Being a Korean does matter.” More specifically, this was used for: 1) effect of Korean education: not being familiar/comfortable with the idea of classroom discussion; doing things only if they are required (or count towards grades), or 2) ‘typical’ characteristics of Korean ways of behavior or feelings.
her grade. She posts messages just because they are required and she is not interested in reading others’ postings.

70: It’s troublesome work. I don’t know why I have to do that (listserv).
73: They just tell me to ‘write’ and I don’t know what to do. I can say ‘I agree with on-line education (topic of her listserv).’ But what else should I write?

This clearly shows the influence of Korean academic culture, where students are so focused on their grades that they would do things only if they are linked to their grades but nothing else. There were several more comments similar to this made by a few other participants (Seoyoung, Sookie, Sunghae, and Yuseon). As seen in the excerpts, the participants were mainly interested in fulfilling the course requirements rather than sharing their thoughts with others, which they are not accustomed to. As a result, their CMC experiences were far from something enjoyable. (Excerpt #39)
As strangers to a new academic setting, the participants appeared to be striving to ‘survive’ rather than attempting to become a legitimate members of the new academic culture they belong to or to compete with others in their classes because they are not familiar with ‘what is going on’ and ‘what is expected’ in the new academic environment. It seemed apparent that they consider themselves minorities, mainly linguistically, and probably racially and/or culturally also.

For some participants who were very conscious of others’ reaction to their behavior and/or words, the idea of sharing opinions in cyberspace in English seems to be more anxiety provoking. To Seoyoung, not only is it hard to express her thoughts in English (LangY), it is also hard to write honestly or candidly in cyberspace because she is concerned with the reactions (criticism) she thinks she might/would get from her audience in terms of both the content and linguistic quality of her writing and this is more so since the audience is not visible to her (TechY). This reveals Seoyoung’s unfamiliarity or discomfort with the idea of sharing thoughts (discussion in academic and non-academic settings) because such things were not common in Korean educational settings (CultY). In addition, this also seems to show Seoyoung’s personality, being introverted and concerned with others’ thoughts and/or reactions to her words/behaviors (OtherY). In this case, Seoyoung is experiencing the combination effect of those four constructs at the same time, an example of co-occurrence of the four constructs (TechY & LangY & CultY & OtherY). (Excerpt #40)
5.4.2 Display of Korean culture in L2CS

In addition to the characteristics of Korean academic culture, Korean ways of thinking and/or doing were also mentioned as affecting the participants’ performances in L2CS. While the influence of Korean academic culture discussed above was for the participants’ general attitude toward the use of CMC as a part of course requirements, some participants discussed how their lived experiences of Korean culture affect how they participate in CMC in cyberspace with their non-Korean classmates.

Jiyoung said that she tends to remain ‘Korean’ and tries to avoid making harsh comments in WebCT and related this to Korean culture of discussion, where critiquing is often regarded as synonymous with criticizing. (Excerpt #41) For this reason, she added, when making comments in Korean culture, especially when the comments are not positive ones, one has to use much caution not to harm the other’s feeling or not to give the impression that there is any bad intention underneath. The comment that Jiyoung makes below exemplifies an aspect of Korean culture, where one considers relationship with the interlocutor; age difference (older/younger), nationality (Korean/non-Korean, Asian/non-Asian), and membership in the same department were some of the factors in deciding whether to make (negative, if any) comments or not. This indicates how she tries to stay within the boundary of so-called ‘Korean ways of behavior,’ where Confucianism is still rooted in personal relationships.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview1)
672: 미경: 응, 왜?
673: 지영: 어, 같은 과로, 나이가 많고, Cynthia 글은 가끔가다가 뭔 말하는 지, 뭐 이게 모르겠어.
677: Jiyoung: I don’t comment on Cynthia’s postings very often.
673: Jiyoung: Uh, she is in my department, older than I am, . . .
677: Jiyoung: . . . . But I did comment on her last week, and I said I disagreed.
682: Jiyoung: And I don’t usually do that.

(Document: Jiyoung Interview5)

374: Jiyoung: So for example, I wouldn’t really ‘attack’ (make negative comments) students like Cynthia, who is in the same group or department. I wouldn’t attach Asians or Koreans, either.

There were a few other cases where Korean ways of doing were surfaced by the participants. In CMC exchanges using English with me (e-mail and chatting), the participants always addressed me as ‘언니’ (pronounced as unni), meaning ‘older sister.’ Maybe this was because they were communicating with me, another Korean, but it was interesting to see how Korean cultural norm was still working in cyberspace when using English. On the other hand, the hierarchical ‘teacher-student’ relationship from Korean culture is noticed in L2CS from Jiyoung’s remarks where she said that the instructor’s short response to her long e-mail is readily excused since he is her ‘teacher’ and she
would rather e-mail the instructors instead of visiting them since she does not want to bother them.

5.4.3 Signs of becoming un-Korean

Although a lot less than the intersection of L2CS and CultY with 64,512 characters, there were total of 11,915 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and CultN found in Table 4.1. In the previous section, it was noted that the participants were often resistant to the idea of using CMC and/or classroom discussion partly because they were not familiar with the new U.S. academic culture. Here, some participants show signs of the acculturation, the process of adapting to a new culture. Standing on the continuum of \([C1 – C2]\) (C1 is Korean culture and C2 is U.S. culture), they sometimes show behaviors that are un-Korean as they try to act according to U.S. culture as they understand it.

Here, it is noticed that Seoyoung’s perception of U.S. academic culture, where one can ask questions whenever one wishes, makes her less hesitant to e-mail instructors with questions.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview3)

24: 서영: . . . . 한국에 있을 때는, 대학 다닐 때도 모르는 게 있어도, 질문하기가 되게 공란해서 못했던 거요. 못한 경우가 많았는데, 한국에 있을 때는, 대학 다닐 때도 모르는 게 있어도, 질문하기가 되게 공란해서 못했던 거요. 못한 경우가 많았는데, 여기는, ʻ모르는 게 있으면 언제든지 물어볼 수 있다ʼ라는 그 편안한 마음이 있거든요.

24: Seoyoung: . . . . When I was in Korea, even in my university years, I was very hesitant to ask questions. But here, ‘I can ask whenever I have questions’ ... so I feel a lot more comfortable about asking questions.
Sookie also admitted that she often finds herself being in the process of adapting to U.S. culture (C2). As she experiences more L2CS and L2RL, she feels that she is becoming more of American, which she characterizes as individualistic, business-like, or less formal, and in so doing, she feels like she is losing some of her Korean personality (C1). (Excerpt #42)

5.5 Co-occurrences: Language, culture, and more

In two of the previous sections, 5.2 How language matters in L2CS and 5.4 How culture matters in L2CS, the effects of language and culture on the participants’ L2CS were discussed separately. In this section, the focus will be on the co-occurrences of LangY and CultY in L2CS, where the participants relate the two constructs to talk about how do using English as a second language to communicate (LangY) and being Korean (CultY) affect their CMC in English. The number of characters for this co-occurrence was 33,056 characters according to the result of matrix intersection search M1, factors by factors for L2CS (Table 4.3).

5.5.1 Realizing cultural difference (C1-C2) in addition to language border (L1-L2)

Like many other international students coming to study at U.S. institutes, Korean students prepare themselves with a certain level of language proficiency and they also come expecting linguistic difficulties they will face. But, as they immerse themselves into everyday lives in the U.S., they quickly realize that language is not the only obstacle they have to deal with. In addition to the transition in language (from Korean to English, or from L1 to L2), they find themselves having made a transition in culture (from Korean
culture to U. S. culture, or from C1 to C2). It is a moment when they realize how culture and language are intertwined with each other and how culture is a big part of language.

A few participants shared this realization. Jiyoung felt that the cultural distance between Korean and American adds more difficulty in writing her WebCT postings. While some of her writings may sound interesting to her classmates, she thought that this was merely because of her ways thinking being ‘different,’ thus ‘new’ to her classmates. She was noticing the additional cultural distance (C1-C2) playing a detrimental role in her L2CS performance when she mentioned her inability to take real life examples her American classmates can relate to in her WebCT postings to convey her thoughts better. (Excerpt #43) It is also noticeable in this excerpt that Jiyoung calls herself ‘minority,’ as she talks about the cultural distance as an added burden for communicating in a second language.

Yuseon also realizes this additional barrier of culture as she writes in English in both real life and in cyberspace. She said that this cultural aspect of language makes it even more challenging for non-native speakers to convey their true feelings or thoughts in English. She talked about the processes she goes through to write in English and noted how difficult it is to translate her thoughts, which are in Korean, into English and how direct translation never works since the logical flow or metaphors have cultural underpinning rooted within them. For this reason, she added, that her Asian non-native speaker instructor tends to understand her writings without much difficulty, which otherwise (native speaker instructors) might not have been possible. (Excerpt #44)
5.5.2 How to go about [C1-C2] in addition to [L1-L2]

When asked about ways to deal with the additional distance in culture (C1-C2) on top of the switch in language (L1-L2), a few different types of answers were obtained. For some participants, crossing the language border by switching from Korean into English appears to relieve them, to a certain extent, from the cultural norms they are usually conscious of when they use their first language, Korean. A few participants (Yuseon, Sookie, and Gunjeung) noted linguistic differences between two languages in terms of the formality. They said that less formality in English language makes them less conscious of the Korean cultural norms.\(^\text{29}\) In Korean language, one uses different discourse styles and linguistic formats depending on the relationship between interlocutors such as age difference, level of acquaintance, or occupational hierarchy. For example, when writing e-mails to one’s professors to ask questions, not only would one has to write in proper format (respecting the professor since he/she is likely to be not only older than one but also someone with authority), one would not usually start with a question because it might sound rude or selfish. Rather, one would usually defer the question and would first start with asking how he/she has been. An example of this was found in an e-mail message Jiyoung sent to her advisor. (Excerpt #45) Not only does she begin with “How are you, professor?,” it is noticeable that she is addressing her advisor as ‘professor.’ This appears to be a direct transfer from how Jiyoung would write to her professor in Korea, where a student would never address a professor by first name, let alone ‘Dr. xxx.’

\(^{29}\) Although one might argue that there exist different writing styles in English for more formality, the participants who mentioned this point were either unaware of it or have not experienced communication where such formality is needed.
Yuseon feels that she does not necessarily write her e-mails in English (L2CS) differently depending on her relationship with the receiver of the messages. She said that the format of her messages to her instructors and friends are the same because English does not have specific format of speech for the elderly, which is different from Korean. She admitted that this sometimes influences her attitude when writing in English. When writing e-mails to her instructors in English, because there is no cultural norm to conform to, such as using proper format or writing with respect, she often finds herself thinking as if she is writing to her friend in Korean. Sookie felt similarly and said that she is more comfortable with writing in English because of the freedom from Korean cultural norms. Gunjeung said that when crossing the language border, the awareness of Korean culture diminishes and she tends to become more direct when compared to speaking in Korean. She added later that her linguistic proficiency is not enough to write according to cultural consideration. She said that she cannot write more/less politely even she wanted to because she does not know how. (Excerpt #46)

Sookie made an interesting point about the relationship between the interlocutors’ nationality and/or cultural background and the level of Korean cultural norm she employs in her CMC. She noticed a difference in her attitude toward a Chinese instructor and an American instructor and said that she tried to act/write/speak more politely to a Chinese instructor. In this case, the cultural proximity between Chinese and Korean culture, both being Asian culture, was the reason.
Jiyoung theorized that there is a relationship between one’s linguistic proficiency and the level of cultural consideration one can express using the graph shown below; I am referring this as “cultural awareness model.” She thinks that at first, one’s linguistic deficiency hinders one from writing/speaking/acting according to Korean cultural norm despite of one’s intention. With improvement in language proficiency, she adds, that one develops an ability to express according to Korean cultural norm in one’s communication. And as one develops enough linguistic and cultural proficiency through lived experiences in the U.S., one would eventually be able to conform to the U.S. cultural norm (C2), which, at the same time, losing awareness to Korean cultural norm (C1).

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)
440: 지영: (여기 real life 에서는,) … culture 도 있죠. … 좀 더 나이든 사람들한테는 좀 더 polite 하게 할려고, …
441: 미경: 미국 사람이라 할지라도?
443: 미경: still, 한국 사람의 그런 …
444: 지영: 응, 그렇니가 나이든 선생님이 말하는 경우에는 주로 듣는, 들고, 이렇게 이렇게 표현을, … 그니까 reaction 을 더 많이 하고, 그에 대해서 질문하고 (??), 친구들과끼리 말하, 좀 난랑 비슷한 동기가 말하는 거나 이리는 경우에는, … 조금이라도 촘촘들은 농담이나
5.5.3 Possible cultural clash in cross-cultural communication

In the previous section, a few different ways in which the participants deal with the cultural differences between Korean and U.S. culture were discussed. As they try to speak/write/behave according to the U.S. cultural norm, they do it based on their own personal understanding or perception of the U.S. culture. However, due to possible misunderstanding of another culture, there could be mismatches between understandings
of one another’s culture in communication among people from different cultures. While the participants employed their own understanding of U. S. culture (C2) in their performance in English, both in cyberspace (L2CS) and in real life (L2RL), they were sometimes perceived differently by their instructors. It was noticed that the instructors were employing their own understanding of Korean culture as they listen to (or read) the participants and in some cases, find the participants ‘un-Korean.’

Two instructors who had Jiyoung in their courses talked about how they were a bit surprised to see Jiyoung’s seemingly ‘un-Korean’ and ‘un-feminine’ behavior in class. When asked to comment on Elena’s performance in his course, her instructor said that Elena’s classroom behavior appeared to be un-Korean, or sometimes more American. Sunghae’s teacher even said, “The other thing about her which I think is cultural is, I felt a lot of the times she was very impolite,” which she finds annoying sometimes. (Excerpt #47) As they all admitted in their interviews, their perceptions of Korean students were developed from their previous experiences with other Korean students and they were exercising their own understanding of Korean (female) students as they interact with them in their classes.

Jiyoung, when I shared these comments with her, later called this ‘stereotype’ against Asian students usually being silent and inactive in class. (Excerpt #48) This offers an important implication for communication among people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, both in real life and in cyberspace. When listening to or reading each other, we have to be conscious of the cultural distance as well as linguistic difference and cautious not to misjudge one another by the exact words we listen/read.
Although it might not be easy to avoid the cultural clash between two different cultures completely, with both sides’ efforts, the cultural distance could be shortened.

5.6 Co-occurrences: Technology, language, culture, and more

In two previous sections (5.3 Co-occurrences: Technology and language and 5.5 Co-occurrences: Language and culture), co-occurrences of two constructs were discussed. In some cases, however, the participants related more than two constructs to be affecting their CMC in English and these co-occurrences will be discussed in this section. In addition to being in cyberspace for communication (TechY) using a second language (LangY), the participants in this section talk about how their being Koreans (CultY) adds another dimension to their L2CS.

5.6.1 L2CS can be empowering: TechY & LangY & CultY

Some participants stated that CMC in English can sometimes be empowering in terms of increased opportunities to voice their thoughts. The confidence that one can perform better linguistically in cyberspace (writing) than in real life (speaking) made one feel positive about CMC as a part of course requirements as Seoyoung and Jiyoung admitted. Seoyoung said that she uses L2CS to her advantage as an opportunity to compensate her inactiveness in classroom behavior, which originates from Korean academic culture (CultY) combined with her linguistic deficiency (LangY). Compared to her silent classroom behavior in Korea, she voluntarily asks questions through e-mail in her Course A, which appeared a lot more active. While she is still uncomfortable with talking in person, moving into cyberspace provided her a place to do what she otherwise
couldn’t or wouldn’t do in real life (TechY). (Excerpt #49) Jiyoung also said that WebCT provided an opportunity for her to compensate her in-class performance (or lack of it) and to show/display her content knowledge.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview4)

1099: 지영: 음, 나에 대한? 그런 in-class 보다는, 나 내가 알고 있는 걸 더 전달할 수 있어서 좋았어요. 만약에 in-class 면서 시험이 없었으면 분명히 나의 내가 갖고 있는 것만큼 평가를 못받아도요. 시험이 있으면 그거를 보상할 수 있어요. 왜냐하면 시험에서 정확하게 표현할 수 있으니까. 그러면 확실히 차이를 내. 그러니까 선생님이 강의를 들을 때 선생님이, 강의를 하는 사람이 시험을 치고 나면은 내가 누군지 알아요. 근데 그런에는 내가 누군지 몰라.

. . . .

1126: 지영: 그러니까 그런 의미에서 좀 writing 이 (WebCT 가) 이렇게 조금 나를 표현할 수 있는 기회를 (길을) 주지 않았을까

1099: Jiyoung: It (WebCT) was good to be able to convey my content knowledge better than in class. . . . .

1126: Jiyoung: In that regards, writing (WebCT) provided me opportunities to express myself.

Elena, a bilingual Korean-American, noted a similar aspect of CMC when she said that she was able to use CMC as an opportunity to speak out, an opportunity to be heard. She felt more comfortable (or freer) about discussing sensitive issues in cyberspace, issues on which she would otherwise (in real life classroom settings) remain silent, which could be an effect of Korean culture (CultY). She also felt that comments made in WebCT sound more legitimate, probably because they are writing not speaking. She clearly said that WebCT provided her with opportunities to express her personal viewpoints or experiences without much concern with others’ reaction. She said, “I think it was good that I was able to have this opportunity to get, to get my … uh … to get my comments out there.” (Excerpt #50)
5.6.2 Asynchronous CMC allows cultural appropriateness

Equipped with higher linguistic confidence in cyberspace (co-occurrence of technology and language), some participants said that they can afford to consider culture in their writing when in asynchronous CMC. This was largely because of the extra time they can use in asynchronous CMC, which was not possible in synchronous CMC or speaking in English in real life (L2RL) due to the expected speed in turn-taking.

For Sookie, compared to L2RL, where she is more focused on quickly translating her thoughts into English, asynchronous CMC gives her more time (TechY) to think and write in English. She said that this enables her not only to improve her writing but to write with cultural considerations (more politely depending on the interlocutor) or to think about the audience’s reaction to her writing as she writes. She contrasted this with her L2RL or synchronous CMC (chatting) where she cannot spare time and/or capability for cultural consideration in her writing since she is more focused on conveying her thoughts. As she pointed out, this (different awareness of culture) appears to be related to the types of CMC and the level of formality of discourses in different CMC (asynchronous CMC being more formal than synchronous). (Excerpt #51) For this reason, when engaged in asynchronous CMC, due to its format (writing or letter) she tends to bring Korean letter writing practice (although less than in L1RL), which is not the case in L2RL. It appears that moving into cyberspace provides her an opportunity to become more Korean than in real life.

An interesting thing to point out here is that Sookie makes conscious efforts to incorporate cultural considerations into her writing in cyberspace (bringing more culture into L2CS) even as she crosses the borders of medium and language instead of giving up
on it. This was actually noted by Jiyoung in her theory of correlation between language proficiency and cultural awareness discussed above (5.5.2 How to go about [C1-C2] in addition to [L1-L2]). As they become more proficient in English and gain more cultural knowledge through lived experiences, non-native speakers of English often try to speak or write according to the U. S. cultural norms as they understand it.

5.6.3 Presence of Korean audience: TechY, LangY, CultY, & AudiY

To some participants, the lack of confidence in their English writing (LangY) appeared to make them become disinclined to write in cyberspace, especially when there are Koreans in the audience. They were conscious of other Koreans sitting somewhere, reading their (imperfect) writings and making negative comments on their linguistic errors.30 Seoyoung talks about how she is concerned with the presence of Korean audience and how it makes her reluctant to express opposing opinion, which also appears to reflect the Korean educational culture, not very accustomed to constructive discussion.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview1)

73: Question: Why haven’t you posted any message to the listserv?
74: 서영: . . . . 문법같은거 놀리까봐, 특히 그걸 한국예들이 읽는다고 생각하니까 부담이 되서 . . . . 나는그런것 아니지만 한국예들이 내 걸 읽으면서 ‘에 이거 틀렸네, 이것도들봤네,’ 할까봐.
77: 미경: 그럼 class에서도 한국사람 있으면 영어하기가 좀 그렇겠네?
78: 서영: 네. 아예 미국들 같으면 말이 되든 안되든 상관안하고 막하는데, 한국예들을한테는 크게 안된다. . . . . 또, topic 이 cloning 인데, 난 찬성 쪽으로 essay 쓰고 있는데 거의 반대의견만 나오는것 같아서 설득력 찬성의견없다가 옮겨맞출것 같아서.

74: Seoyoung: . . . . I am afraid of making errors, grammatical. And especially because there are other Koreans reading it (my writing). . . . . Not that I would

30 The effect of audience [AudiY] will be discussed separately in section 5.8 How audience matters in L2CS.
do that, but I am afraid that they (Koreans) might say, “Oh, she made a mistake here.” ...
77: Mikyung: Then you wouldn’t like speaking in English in class when there are Koreans.
78: Seoyoung: Yes. If they are Americans, I think I would be just say things, regardless of making sense or not. But I can’t do that when there are Koreans.

Seoyoung’s remarks here exemplify a few aspects of Korean culture or Korean ways of speaking, especially in academic settings. Not only are they concerned with the existence of other Koreans, they are also concerned with the quality of their performance in English and potential reaction (possibly negative comments) by their Korean peers. This could be a sign of competitive nature inherited from Korean educational culture and a few other participants made similar comments. Sookie said that she makes an extra effort to improve her L2CS writing when there are Koreans among the audience like in Course A listserv. She also mentioned that she would read postings by other Koreans more carefully. Jiyoung and Yuseon also made such comments. Jiyoung even related this to her hesitance to write e-mails in English to other Koreans because she thinks that other Koreans would be the same, be more attentive to other Koreans’ writings. (Excerpt #52)

It was interesting to find that this consciousness of Korean audience was true toward me, the researcher. A few participants said that they were concerned with my presence in the cyberspace as they are involved in L2CS and my reading of their CMC postings. Jiyoung once added “내 글 보고 웃기 없기” “No laughing at my writing!” as she was sending me a copy of the first week’s WebCT postings. Gunjeung and Seoyoung also said that having me in the audience felt somewhat burdensome as they write in English in cyberspace. (Excerpt #53) This might have originated not only from their lack of confidence with their English but from the cultural characteristics of ‘saving faces,’ feeling uncomfortable with revealing their linguistic proficiency. This was a little
surprising reaction because, during the first meeting with each participant, I have explicitly explained the purpose of my research and emphasized that I was only interested in witnessing their CMC practices and not at all interested in examining their writings. In addition, methodologically positioning myself as an “insider at border”, sharing gender, culture, and language with the participants, I expected them not to consider me as an outsider. But for them, I might have been felt like another reader or possibly even an examiner of their L2 writings for them. While I considered myself as an “insider” at border, to them, I was more of an insider “at border” or even an “outsider within.”

5.6.4 Being non-native speakers of English

Another aspect of ‘being Korean’, the definition of CultY, involves being ‘a non-native speaker of English,’ in relation to native speakers they communicate with. As international students in U. S. academic settings, some participants were sensitive to their non-nativeness and stated how it affects their feelings as they interact in cyberspace in English. While the presence of Korean audience makes some participants feel uncomfortable to write in English in cyberspace, writing to native speakers seems equally difficult. In this case, the participants’ consciousness of being non-native speakers of English comes in to play.

From interviews with a few participants, a certain level of anxiety was noticed as they describe themselves as linguistic or cultural minority in their classrooms. When writing CMC in English, Sookie said that she sometimes worries if her writings might

---

31 I used the term ‘insider at border’ in 3.2.3 Methodological positioning, to describe my position as a Korean female researcher in relation to the eight Korean female participants in my study.

32 The description of codes used in this research is in Table 3.2 Codebook.
reveal her cultural/linguistic background (especially when writing to native speaker audience) due to her linguistic performance and/or her name. (Excerpt #54) Seoyoung compared two of her CMC experiences: listserv postings for Course A, whose audience was all non-native speakers of English, and WebCT postings for Course D33 (freshmen English composition course), a class with more native-speaker classmates. She found herself paying a lot more attention to her writing (grammar, etc.) with her WebCT postings, which was contrary to what she had thought. She thought that writing to native speakers would be less anxiety provoking, but she found it more anxiety provoking.

She explained that she was as much concerned with her writing quality (LangY) as she was with her (native speaker) classmates’ reaction to her (non-native speaker) writing. As she speaks in class (L2RL) or writes in WebCT (L2CS), she often imagined her classmates making comments such as: ‘이거 무슨 소리하는 거야?’ ‘what is she talking about here?’ or ‘도대체 이렇게 영어를 쓰면서 어떻게 이 수업에 앉아있나’ ‘how can she be sitting here to take this class with that level of English?’ (Excerpt #55) In this case, Seoyoung was being conscious of her being a non-native speaker of English (CultY & LangY) as opposed to her classmates’ being native speakers (AudiY) in addition to the technical aspect of CMC (not being able to see audience’s reaction to her writing, TechY) all at the same time.

In synchronous CMC, where cutting in is a natural part of the communication pattern, some participants often get the feeling of being disregarded. During one chatting session with her classmates in Course D, Seoyoung experienced that the combination of synchronousness (TechY) and conceived linguistic deficiency (LangY) made her feel like

33 Detailed description of courses involved in this study is in 3.3 Description of research site and participants.
she was being disregarded because she is a non-native speaker (CultY) when her posting was not readily acknowledged. This is related to the way Koreans talk in group discussion, where it is often considered rude when someone cuts in while another person is talking. When this conversation behavior is violated in synchronous CMC between non-native speakers and native speakers, a non-native speaker might feel disregarded and he/she could contribute it to his/her being a non-native speaker of English, a linguistic minor. (Excerpt #56)

Gunjeung made a similar point in regards to CMC messages with blunt expressions and said that it would feel more offending when they are from native speakers. Her explanation for this was related to the writers’ linguistic ability. For a message from a non-native speaker, she would take his/her language deficiency into consideration as she imagines the sender’s intention behind the message. But in case of a CMC message from a native speaker, since he/she has the linguistic capability to fully express his/her intention, Gunjeung thinks that native speakers’ negative comments reflect 100% of the senders’ intention, and are thus more offending. (Excerpt #57)

The remarks reported in this section offer an important implication for computer-mediated communication among people with various linguistic backgrounds. What the participants are telling us here is that as non-native speakers of English engage in CMC in English, even though their appearance is not visible in cyberspace, they are still conscious of their being linguistic minorities as they communicate with native-speakers of English, regardless of their native-speaking interlocutors’ consciousness of linguistic majority. Even before getting any adverse reactions from native speaker audience, non-
native speakers are already concerned with their NNSness (being non-native speakers) functioning as hindrance to their CMC.

While these participants displayed concerns with possible disadvantages of being non-native speakers of English in their classrooms, there were remarks that are somewhat self-contradicting. As much as Seoyoung was worried about being regarded as a non-native speaker (and being disregarded due to that), she sometimes expected the native speaker audience (instructors, in particular) to take her non-nativeness into consideration. This was a part of the reason why she felt more comfortable with CMC to instructors than to other Koreans. Yuseon made this expectation even more explicit and said that she specifically writes that she is a non-native speaker in her e-mails to the instructors.

(Excerpt #58) It appears that not only does being a non-native speaker matter in cyberspace, Seoyoung and Yuseon made conscious efforts to make their NNSness (being non-native speakers) visible to their native speaker audience.

5.7 How gender matters in L2CS

The participants’ answers to the question, “does being a woman matter when you write in cyberspace?” showed a somewhat unexpected result. The matrix intersection search result in Table 4.1 reads 14,403 characters for (L2CS & GendN)\textsuperscript{34} and 5,302 characters for (L2CS & GendY), almost three times higher count for GendN than for GendY. All participants said that gender does not matter (GendN) in their L2CS except for Elena. Being a bilingual, she did not seem to leave her gender behind when switching between languages, Korean and English. As for GendY, remarks of only two participants,

\textsuperscript{34} GendN was defined as ‘Gender (being a woman) does not matter.’ (Table 3.2 Codebook)
Elena and Seoyoung, were coded. In this section, comments coded with GendN, which had more characters, and its co-occurrences with other constructs will be discussed, followed by comments coded with GendY and its co-occurrences.

5.7.1 Reduced gender consciousness, GendN

The participants were quite positive that being female matters less when in cyberspace, where one cannot see each other. Gunjeung and Sookie said that when in cyberspace, they become less conscious of gender than they would be in real life. To Yuseon and Sunghae, gender is simply not an issue in all four cases (L2CS, L2RL, L1CS, and L1RL), which might be related to their personality. A few participants even said that gender ‘cannot’ matter in L2CS. The listserv Eunji subscribed was open for all students from several sub-sections of the same course, Course A. So, not only was it impossible to identify the gender of the students in the listserv, she would also not care about it (the audience’s gender) even if it was available. Thinking of Eunji’s remarks on other issues (and her interviews as a whole), this might also be related to her personality, not too much concerned with others’ reaction to her words. Jiyoung said that gender does not matter at all when using English (L2) and that she does not think of American men as male, especially because she is married. (Excerpt #59)

Even though the participants’ comments on how gender does not matter in their L2CS were quite obvious and consistent throughout the interviews, the number of characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and GendN does not seem very large (14,403 characters). One of the reasons might be that the participants’ comments on ‘how something does not matter’ tend to be a lot shorter than those on ‘how something...
matters.’ When the participants were asked if being female matters in their CMC in English, most of the participants said that it did not matter and their answers were usually very brief. They would just say ‘it (Gender) does not matter and I feel …’ and then would rush on to talk about other constructs that mattered. For this reason, cases of GendN were often found as a part of a passage where they talk about other factors.

This becomes more obvious with the examples of excerpts when the participants briefly mention GendN as they talk about other factors co-occurring with GendN. Gender often seems to disappear when writing in English in cyberspace as it co-occurs with two other constructs, technology and language, thus co-occurrence of [TechY & LangY & GendN]. For most participants, limited linguistic proficiency for differentiating their writings to different gender combined with moving into cyberspace appears to disable one from writing differently according to the gender of the audience. Seoyoung notes here that L2CS, especially in case of academic CMC, involves switching communication medium and language for the same content, which often is not relevant to gender issues and for this reason, gender does not (cannot) come in to play.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview4)

536: 서영: 근데 왜냐하면 listserv 나 그런 거에서는 그게 computer 를 통해서 영어를 쓴다는 거 뿐이지 거기서 내가 여자구 뭐 이런 생각을 지금 하는 거에서는 별로 생각을 안해요.

536: Seoyoung: Because, … listserv or things like that (CMC), that, to me, is just using English through computer, I don’t necessarily think of myself as a woman there,

Sookie said that being female does not matter at all, and it is more of CMC being writing that makes CMC easier, giving her more time to organize her thoughts. Sunghae and Jiyoung also made very clear that gender cannot matter when writing in English and it is more so when it is in cyberspace. (Excerpt #60) Although she is incapable of writing
differently according to the interlocutor’s gender, Jiyoung said in another interview that she is still conscious of the relationship with the audience and tries to write accordingly, with more courtesy for professors, for example, within the boundary of her linguistic proficiency. In this case, while she might not be able to consider gender, she is still exercising her Korean cultural norm in her L2CS, thus co-occurrence of [TechY & LangY & CultY & GendN].

5.7.2 When gender matters in L2CS

There were total of 5,302 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and GendY, mentioned by only two participants, Elena and Seoyoung. All of the comments co-
occurred with other constructs; 4,393 characters co-occurred with [AudiY] and there were no cases where the participants talked about gender as the only factor affecting their L2CS.

Here is an interesting case of how gender can matter in L2CS in the same way it matters in L1CS. Seoyoung said that she pays less attention to her writing when writing e-mails (L2CS) to female instructors and expects them to correct her linguistic errors. But for CMC to male instructors, she said that she makes more effort to make herself understood. She compared this with writing a memo in a public places (coffee shops, for example) in Korean; expecting potential presence of male readers of her memo, she would pay more attention to her memo, in terms of word choice or tone. It was later found that all of her instructors in writing courses were female and those in content courses were male, which could be another explanation for this. She might have felt more comfortable about exposing her linguistic deficiency to her writing teachers than toward her content course teachers. (Excerpt #61)

In case of Elena, gender of the audience could become a factor even in cyberspace. She says here that when her audience is all female she could make certain comments that she would not otherwise. This is especially true when the CMC content is gender-related; with the absence of men, she can make more direct comments without much discomfort.

(Document: Elena_Interview6)
16: Elena: ... Okay, ... for Web, in the WebCT, first of all, ... aside from the teacher, ... aside from the instructor, all of the students are female. ... Uh ... and I think if you listen to the classes, ... and if you read the WebCT close, ... you can see certain level of male-bashing. ... [laugh] ...
22: Elena: Yes. Exactly. So you can see certain level of male-bashing. Um ... and since there were no men in that class aside from the instructor, and, and, and he is a
very understanding instructor. Um, making such comments is
not really a big deal. ... ...  
23: Mikyung: 그렇지. (That’s right.)  
24: Elena: You know, like making certain gender like,
really gender-based comments like . . . . it’s okay to make
those types of comments, but, and, and when I ... when you
know, to a friend, and, my language can be even more ... um
... explicit. Like I can say something like 'All men are
dogs.' [laugh] ... But then when you chat, ... if you chat
with a friend, that’s okay. But if you are chatting with
someone ... uh ... in a on-line dating site, I can’t make
those kinds of comments.
... ... 
37: Elena: .... in the WebCT, I know this people. ... Uh ...
and because we are all woman, ... ah, we can make ... those
kinds of comments, and ... uh ... and we’ll be accepted.

5.8 How audience matters in L2CS

Audience was a new construct that grew out of data, which was not included in
the concept map (Figure 1.1. Conceptual framework - four constructs in four types of
communication) when I began interviewing the participants. In addition to technology,
language, gender, and culture, some participants pointed out how certain aspects of their
interlocutors (defined as audience in this study) affected their L2CS. These included
whom they are writing to, characteristics of the audience, the nature of relationship with
the audience, and so forth. There were total of 41,940 characters coded at the intersection
of L2CS and AudiY.

5.8.1 Need to know the audience

For a few participants, knowing the person they are communicating with (writing
to) affected their performance in L2CS. To Gunjeung, participating in WebCT for Course
D (freshmen English composition course) was more interesting because she was sending
messages to her classmates whom she met in person in her classroom. She also said that
she liked having opportunities to talk about the CMC messages from WebCT during class
discussion. (Excerpt #62) Elena clearly states here that she ‘needs to know who writes
what’ when writing in WebCT.

(Document: Elena Interview3)
474: Elena: I don’t know, I just see both (who writes
what). ⋯ Maybe it’s because it’s available. ⋯ Uh ⋯ you
know, you know who put the posting up ⋯ and I think
sometimes it’s good, I mean, you need to know that ⋯
because especially when you reply, if you know who you are
replying to, it’s better, it’s easier. ⋯ And also Dr. xxx
(course instructor) although ⋯ he does not post any
summaries, or he does not post any initial postings, he
does reply to them. ⋯ And I’d like to know when he is
replying, like, which responses are his. . . . .
476: Elena: I, I need to know who did it. ⋯

In case of Seoyoung, both anonymous and non-anonymous CMC appears to make
her conscious of her performance in L2CS. In case of anonymous CMC, the existence of
unknown (invisible) audience itself makes her conscious of her L2CS. In the mean time,
she also says that she would become more nervous in L2CS with known audience as she
might constantly think, “He/she, too, would read this (my writing).” (Excerpt #63) In
these remarks, the participants sound like seeking to maintain the personal, interactive,
and concrete feeling of communication (or conversation) in real life situations as they
communicate in cyberspace using computers. From Gunjeung’s preference of meeting
her CMC audience in classroom and Elena’s needs for knowing who says what to
Seoyoung’s reactions to anonymous/non-anonymous CMC, they were expressing
discomfort or uneasiness with the idea of talking with invisible interlocutors.

This preference of personally knowing the audience was also surfaced in a few
participants’ comments on how the level of acquaintance with their audience affects their
L2CS. Elena said that familiarity with the audience (the instructor and classmates, in case of academic settings) makes it easier because she knows what to expect from her audience in response to her writing. For Sunghae, the level of acquaintance with the audience makes her CMC different in length and/or quality. The closer she feels with the audience, the better and the longer the CMC with that person becomes. Just like with Korean friends, the more often she interacts with a friend, the more she would talk in CMC with him/her. Sookie made a very similar comment and said that language becomes less of an issue (burden) when engaged in CMC with close friends because she is less conscious of her linguistic performance. (Excerpt #64)

5.8.2 Relationship with the audience

Among a few other characteristics of the audience that the participants mentioned to matter in L2CS was their relationship with the audience. Sookie said that the content and purpose of her CMC changes depending on the nature of her relationship with the audience (professor or friends, in this excerpt) because she would represent herself differently for different audience. She said that communication with professors entails less of personality than in communication with friends. With professors, she would focus more on eliciting information she is seeking for (answers to questions), which is the sole purpose of the communication itself. But when talking to friends, her behavior and personality is a part of what is being communicated and therefore, she would watch how she represents herself. (Excerpt #65)

In Seoyoung’s case, while she tries to perform (write) better in L2CS due to the public nature of CMC writings once they are posted, she said that the construct of
audience (whom she is writing to) can add another layer in the process. When writing to an instructor, she would focus more on expressing/conveying her thoughts and sometimes strives to go beyond her linguistic proficiency. But when writing/speaking to her classmates, she would more focus on the quality of her performance (writing/speaking) within her linguistic ability because she is concerned with their reactions to the linguistic quality of her writing. Seoyoung also mentioned that the course content matters when writing to instructors; she pays more attention to her writing when sending e-mails to content course instructors than to English writing course instructors. To her, a certain level of English proficiency is regarded as default in the content-area courses. Since language deficiency can not be an excuse for inferior performance in those courses, Seoyoung tries even harder being apprehensive of the audience (native speaker instructors and classmates) pointing out her non-native speaker performance in her writing. (Excerpt #65)

5.8.3 Attitude of audience

This was an interesting theme in relation to audience found in Seoyoung’s words. When talking in English, she said that her performance is greatly affected by the attitude of her audience, or her perception of the attitude. She said that she tends to perform better when she finds her interlocutor appears to be ‘willing to listen or trying to understand what she says,’ which is sensed almost instantly after initiating conversation. As a non-native speaker of English, who is always uncertain of the correctness of her linguistic output, she constantly looks for the signs of success/failure in conveying her thoughts. When communicating in cyberspace (L2CS), where the signs are not readily visible,
Seoyoung assesses audience’s attitude based on her previous experiences of communicating with them in classroom settings. (Excerpt #66) Although other participants did not specifically talked about this aspect, similar feelings were noted in a few previous sections,\textsuperscript{35} in which they expressed the discomfort, uneasiness, fear, or frustration experienced in their L2CS or L2RL.

5.8.4 Disinterest in audience

There were total of 3,021 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and AudiN, where the participants said that audience did not matter in their CMC in English. Although they are coded the same, ways how audience does not matter were different among participants. In Eunji’s case, it was more of disinterest, where she says she ‘does not care’ whom she is communicating with. She appears to be quite opposite to Seoyoung, who was very conscious of her performance both in anonymous and non-anonymous CMC. Jiyoung on the other hand, was too focused on her own performance, or ability to meet the WebCT posting requirement to her satisfaction, to be concerned with her audience (her classmates); she might be interested in the content of their postings, but not necessarily in who posted what. (Excerpt #67)

5.9 Other things that matter in L2CS

In addition to technology, language, culture, gender, and audience, there were other miscellaneous factors which I collectively coded as [Other]. There were total of 28,382 characters coded at the intersection of L2CS and [Other] and a few of them are

\textsuperscript{35}Sections 5.2.1 Language is the biggest barrier, 5.2.3 Greater burden than native speaker classmates, and 5.6.4 Being non-native speakers of English
reported here. In most cases, [Other] co-occurred with other constructs: 10,089 characters with LangY, 8,878 characters with CultY, or 8,676 characters with TechY.

To a few participants, the specific context of CMC makes differences in the quality of their CMC. Eunji said that CMC discussion becomes alive when the issue/topic discussed is interesting to the CMC participants or when the discussion becomes heated and/or controversial. She also thinks that for academic CMC, how the CMC is set up and managed decides CMC quality. Eunji and Sookie agreed on this and they both pointed out that listserv for Course A was not successful in inducing quality discussion in this respect. This was also noted by one of the course instructors who said that she would ‘require them (students) to post along the way’ rather than assign total number of postings per quarter. [Other] was often used for passages related to one’s personality, which in most cases, co-occurred with other factors and discussed in previous sections.

In this chapter, findings of the study were reported using the actual words of the participants. Interview excerpts where the participants talked about their experiences of CMC in English (L2CS) were collected and analyzed to identify recurring themes. The themes identified were arranged per construct (technology, language, culture, gender, audience, and other) that the participants related with their L2CS. Starting with technology, which was mentioned the most, the effects of each construct by itself are discussed followed by its co-occurrences with other constructs. In Chapter 6, some of the important findings reported here will be highlighted with the discussion of their implications and related issues.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of the study

In the age of rapidly developing electronic communication technology, computer-mediated communication has become an important alternative to conventional means of communication in our lives, for both personal and non-personal communication. As members of a so-called global community, our communications often go beyond the physical space we dwell in, into the cyberspace where people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds express and share their ideas and thoughts through reading/writing or listening/speaking. The particularity of the English language being ‘the language of cyberspace’ (Murray, 2000a) or the ‘language of additional communication’ (Warschauer, 2000a) presents quite a challenge for non-native speakers of English in the process of translating their ideas into English comprehensible to listeners/readers across cyberspace.

It was in this context that this study originated with an intention to add insights to our understanding of how non-native speakers of English communicate in cyberspace in English across the borders of language and culture as the conceptual framework shown in Figure 1.1. In addition to the consideration of language, culture, and technology,
reflecting upon myself as a Korean female led to the decision to limit research participants to Korean females and incorporating gender as an additional aspect of Korean women’s CMC. Drawing upon an interpretivist paradigm, qualitative research methodology was used and eight Korean female learners of English at a large U.S. Midwestern university participated in the study. The participants were asked to talk about how their being Koreans (culture), being women (gender), being non-native speakers of English (language) work similarly or differently when they are engaged in communication in cyberspace (technology) in English. In addition to several interviews in Korean, their behavior in real life settings (in classrooms) and in cyberspace (CMC) were observed and recorded.a

6.2 Important findings and related issues

The research data were analyzed using QSR NVivo, a qualitative data analysis tool, and the results were reported at two different levels. In Chapter 4, results of character counting were used to describe the big picture of the data and in Chapter 5, the actual words of the participants were reported according to themes surfaced from the analysis. In this section, a few important findings discussed in two previous chapters will be highlighted in an effort to situate them in the context of related literature of which this study is a part.

a The language of classrooms and cyberspace observation was English.
6.2.1 Co-occurrences\textsuperscript{b} of multiple constructs in the participants’ L2CS

One of the most visible aspects of the findings of the study is the co-occurrences of multiple constructs in the participants’ remarks. As discussed in section 4.3 (A closer look at L2CS)\textsuperscript{c} and visualized in Figures 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13, the participants were conscious of multiple constructs as they talked about their experiences of CMC in English. While this was not something surprising or unanticipated, the existence and the size of the co-occurrences found makes apparent the intricacy and complexity of the participants’ CMC in English. Constantly being conscious of their being Korean, non-native speaking, female learners of English, the anxiety, insecurity and frustration involved in trying to convey their thoughts into English in cyberspace were mirrored in the form of co-occurrences. Awareness of their being non-native speakers of English led them to relate their linguistic deficiency/efficiency with various aspects of being in cyberspace; this accounted for the biggest co-occurrence in L2CS, between technology (TechY) and language (LangY). In addition, the cultural distance from their interlocutors with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds was often realized in the form of co-occurrence between language (LangY) and culture (CultY), the second biggest co-occurrence in L2CS.

The participants’ awareness of multiple constructs behind their CMC were anticipated in the conceptual framework of this study (Figure 1.1), which originated from my personal reflection on different types of communication across borders of language and technology. Drawing the diagram in its current form was in fact one of the most

\textsuperscript{b} In section 1.4 Definition of Key Terms, co-occurrence is defined as cases where participants mention two or more constructs (factors) together in their remarks.
\textsuperscript{c} Please refer to Table 3.2 Codebook for description of codes used in this study.
important steps of my study and it took a lot of time and hard work to come up with it after several earlier versions of similar kind. As I reflected upon various aspects of computer-mediated communication and looked at myself engaged in CMC in English, I was viewing myself, first and foremost, as a non-native speaker of English placed in cyberspace trying to make myself understood to others using English. This was why technology and language were drawn as two long shaded rectangles, denoting barriers to overcome. Then came my realization of my being Korean and my being female affecting my CMC in English in terms of how I (try to) represent myself, hence bringing culture and gender into the drawing.

Once identified, each of the four constructs -- technology, language, culture, and gender – became an essential part of individual language learners’ CMC in English as discussed in Chapter 1 and further rationalized in Chapter 2. The amount and complexity of co-occurrences of two or more constructs found in this study confirms the intricate structure of interrelationships among the constructs behind one’s L2CS, exactly where this study was initiated from. As much as I have always been, the eight Korean women who participated in this study were equally conscious of multiplicity and complexity involved in their CMC in English.

6.2.2 Bodily engagement with technology in praxis

A few comments by the participants on the technical aspects of using computers to communicate concerned negative aspects of CMC in English such as lack of familiarity with a specific CMC software or skillfulness with typing at keyboard. However, the research participants’ concerns with the change in communication medium
were mostly related with what they do with technology (CMC) and what CMC meant for them ‘in relation to’ their interlocutors. Some of the participants felt strongly that cyberspace is a ‘public’ space, where they can affect and can be affected by the invisible others they communicate with. Most of them expressed uneasiness or discomfort with talking to interlocutors sitting at another node of the network, not sharing the space with them. In addition to anxiety about losing contextuality or real-lifeness required in communication, they were worried that their CMC writings will be stored and available for others to read and to judge their personalities based on those writings. They were also worried about the possibilities of misrepresentation or misunderstanding involved in CMC.

It is clear from these comments that the participants’ conception of technology goes beyond a simplistic view of technology as a tool enabling a different type of communication. Instead, they were reflecting upon their acts of ‘communicating with others’ using computers and talked about various surrounding aspects involved in it. More than technical features of CMC, they were interested in knowing whom they talk to, how they are viewed by their interlocutors, or what changes their CMC brings to the nature of relationship with interlocutors. These concerns with their interlocutors’ led to another important finding of this study, the construct of ‘Audience.’ This construct was not part of the conceptual framework this study was based upon but surfaced from the words of the participants. In addition to the needs to know the audience for better communication, they talked about how the characteristics of their interlocutors or the nature of the relationship affected their own CMC in English.
These comments from the participants correspond to the discussion in 2.2.2.1 My perspective on technology, where the bodily engagement with technology *in praxis* was emphasized. Rather than focusing on the effect of technology as a medium, the participants confirmed my belief that technology should be viewed in terms of the human experiences with technology or the interplay between technology and human actions (Levinson, 1997). From this viewpoint might have come their positions on the use of CMC in academic settings. Since they did not view technology as an ‘object-as-such,’ they did not choose between technophilia or technophobia, uncritical acceptance or blanket rejection. Rather than choosing between ‘for’ or ‘against’ it, they paid more attention to specific conditions that can influence their CMC experiences. Their answers often included the phrase ‘depends on …’ followed by things such as: the nature of relationship with their interlocutors or attitudes of the audience. Here, they were conscious of their own bodily engagement in the use of technology and at the same time, they were also aware of how they affect or are affected by others’ experiences with the same technology through CMC, communication in cyberspace. In this sense, they appeared to have become a part of the ‘information ecology’ defined as “a system of people, practices, values, and technologies in a particular local environment” (Nardi & O'Day, 1999a, p. 50), where human activities using technology is the focus.

6.2.3 Language, the biggest barrier in their L2CS

Of the four constructs the participants were asked to think about as affecting their CMC in English, language was said to be the biggest barrier for all participants, except one bilingual Korean-American. Due to the linguistic deficiency assumed by themselves,
they did not show much confidence in their CMC writings in English, which consequently prevented them from expressing their thoughts to their satisfaction. It was during their comments on language when the most emotional outbreaks were noticed as they candidly expressed their frustration, humiliation, pain, or even anger. Although some of the participants said that they preferred CMC to classroom discussion because of higher proficiency in writing than in speaking, the level of proficiency was still felt insufficient for them to actively participate with their native speaker classmates. As hinted here, another aspect of their concerns with their linguistic deficiency is their self-consciousness of being non-native speakers of English or ‘linguistic minorities.’ Their emotional difficulties in relation to language were largely because of the fact that their interlocutors are native speakers of English, who they believe, have more authority in terms of linguistic correctness. To one of the participants, Jiyoung, a doctoral candidate from Korea, the fact that she cannot convey her content knowledge, made her even more frustrated. The word she used to describe her L2CS experience was ‘painful,’ which is a term which captured well her emotional response to CMC in English.

The fact that cyberspace can offer an empowering environment for non-native speakers of English as the combination effect of technology, language, and culture (see 5.6.1 L2CS can be empowering), accords with the results found in several recent studies in foreign and second language education (Belcher, 1999; Chen, 2003; Freiermuth, 2001), where CMC was viewed as less anxiety provoking compared to face-to-face communication. However, the emotional difficulties shared by the participants in this study call to mind the claims often made by foreign and second language educators. At least to the eight Korean females I talked with, CMC was not felt to be an anxiety-free
space, nor did it provide an ‘ideal medium’ for them as some researchers found. (Beauvois, 1992, 1997; B. Smith, 2003). As will be discussed in the next section, more thoughts and considerations are required as CMC is incorporated into classrooms with non-native speakers.

6.2.4 Cultural distance, in addition to language

Through their lived experiences of having attended a U.S. university, the participants have realized that it requires more than linguistic proficiency to properly communicate in a second language. It was the cultural distance between Korean culture and U.S. culture which was realized in a few different ways by the participants. One of the most obvious was the influences of Korean academic culture, which affected their attitudes towards the use of CMC as a course requirement and their CMC behavior. Being accustomed to the heavily competitive, teacher-centered, and grade-centered nature of Korean academic culture, the participants did not seem to benefit from the CMC activities. Unfamiliar with the idea of sharing their thoughts with their classmates, most of them considered CMC postings as yet another course requirement toward grades.

In terms of the cultural awareness of Korean culture (C1) and/or U.S. culture (C2) in their language use, I am referring to the “cultural awareness model” that Jiyoung suggested\(^d\), which correlates linguistic proficiency and cultural awareness. As the language learners become more proficient in the target language (English or L2), they would simultaneously develop cultural awareness to the target culture (U.S. culture or C2). The participants said that their linguistic deficiency prevents them from going

\(^d\) This was discussed in section 5.5.2 How to go about [C1-C2] in addition to [L1-L2].
beyond translating their ideas into English to take cultural norms (either Korean or U.S.) into consideration, which often frustrates them. As a result, they either choose to exercise Korean cultural norm (C1) and become Koreans behaving according to Confucianism (Robinson, 1999; Yum, 1999) or intentionally try to become Americans using their own conception of U.S. cultural norm (C2), being very direct, individualistic, and personal. With improved proficiency in both English language and U.S. culture, however, they expect to become able to choose to write/speak/act according to either cultural norm.

This finding shows that the participants are experiencing the importance of cultural aspect involved in language learning through the realization of the intricate relationship between language and culture (Malinowski, 2000). They might have been considered to be ‘linguistically ready’ to study in the U.S. university when they were admitted to the university. However, they soon realized that they were complete ‘strangers’ in a new environment. In addition to the language barrier, they were faced with totally different classroom culture, which added to their frustration and stress during their first year at the university. After numerous stressful experiences, however, they are/will be slowly becoming more culturally confident and eventually be able to choose to adapt to the target culture. As Kim noted, these “stress-adaptation experiences” will be rewarded with “growth” (Y. Y. Kim, 1988, 1995) in higher cultural competence.

6.2.5 Gender found to matter less than expected in L2CS

For the participants in this study, gender did not matter as much as other constructs did when communicating in cyberspace in a second language. For some of them it was the limited linguistic proficiency in English and for others it was moving into
cyberspace and communicating with invisible others that appeared to free them from the need to conform to the gender norms they are accustomed to. As one participant (Jiyoung) explicitly said, she was no longer a woman when speaking/writing in English. Instead, she becomes a non-native speaker, whose only interest is conveying her thoughts correctly across language border. In addition, the fact that they cannot see their audience alleviates from having to consider themselves as female.

This becomes more evident when their remarks on L2CS and L1RL are compared. As shown in 4.1.1 Looking at each individual pane and four pie charts in Figure 4.1, while the participants were very much aware of gender when speaking in Korean in real life situations (L1RL), their gender awareness showed a drastic decrease in L2CS. When talking to other Koreans in Korean, they were confined by the traditional sex roles and relations, which originated from Confucianism and have long been the indispensable part of Korean mentality. As speculated in 2.1 Korean women: Who are we (they)?, even as women of relatively high position with improved education (students at a U.S. university), they were not free from Confucian influence (J. M. Kim, 1995; Palley, 1994). Crossing the borders of language and communication medium (technology), then, appears to offer them opportunities to ‘escape’ from the Korean gender norms. On the other hand, the fact that linguistic deficiency was a part of the reason for lower awareness of gender in L2CS, might mean that with higher linguistic proficiency, they will become more concerned with gender. Similar to the ‘cultural awareness model’ discussed in the previous section, gender awareness could also increase as language learners improve their linguistic proficiency. As will be mentioned in section 6.4 (Limitations of the study and recommendation for future research), this could be a possible focus of future research.
6.2.6 Moving beyond: from description to theorizing

The findings of this study reported in Chapter 5 were based on results of data analysis through descriptive coding, where I identified themes in the participants’ words in terms of ‘what’ was said. In other words, I have focused on which construct did the participants say mattered or did not matter in their CMC in English. In finishing up writing this dissertation, this study paused here to report the results of data analysis that I have done so far. However, this project is not yet finished because I will continue working with this data to do theoretical coding by asking some ‘why’ questions by tapping on the literature review included in this study.

One such ‘why’ question would be related to the participants’ decreased consciousness of gender in CMC in English. This will involve going back to the readings on gender and language I have included in this study and more readings on that issue, possibly on “gender performativity” that Judith Butler talked about (Butler, 1990). My questions in the process of theorizing gender in the participants’ CMC in English will include: how did they perform their gender differently in different types of communication; and why were the participants not able to perform their gender in their CMC in English.

6.3 Implications of the study

6.3.1 What this study adds to the literature of CMC research

As a researcher coming from two areas of study, foreign and second language education and cultural studies of technology, this study was initiated in an attempt to fill...
the gaps between CMC studies in two fields. In 2.3 Review of CMC studies in the field of foreign and second language education, it was noted that a lot of research on language learners’ CMC focused on the evaluation of changes in language learners’ linguistic output by the function of one or two of the related constructs such as medium (technology), learner characteristics, or in some cases, gender or culture. Mostly using quantitative methodology, the majority being survey or experimental studies, this kind of research holds the rationalistic view of technology as ‘object-as-such,’ and the formative power of technology through human action with the use of technology is often disregarded.

On the other hand, in CMC studies where the social, cultural, or historical meanings of technology are being sought (Barbatsis, Fegan, & Hansen, 1999; M. Chase, Macfadyen, Reeder, & Roche, 2002; Cornelius, 2003; Walther, 1996), CMC by language learners are seldom examined. As a result, these studies lack the linguistic aspect that CMC studies by foreign and second language researchers examine. In this sense, the current study adds insights into the understanding of how non-native speakers of English negotiate their beings, Korean females in this study, cross the borders of language and technology as they communicate in English. Not only did this study try to elicit the meaning of technology in the participants’ engagement in CMC, it also ventured to encompass four constructs -- technology, language, culture, and gender -- to describe how these constructs, separately or in combination with each other, were said to affect the participants’ CMC in English.
6.3.2 Pedagogical implications of the study

The results of this study offer several implications as to the incorporation of CMC into classrooms with students of various linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

In terms of the technical aspect of using CMC as a part of classroom activities, familiarity with specific CMC software seemed to affect the level of participation of the students as a few participants noted. Demonstrating the software for a few initial sessions of the class will be helpful, especially when there are students from different educational settings. The listserv used in the courses in this study might have been familiar to many students, but it was not the case for some of the participants.

In addition to the demonstration of ‘how to use’ the CMC tool, clearly communicating ‘what to expect’ through the CMC activities is important. Some of the participants were uncertain about what to do (write) in listserv and lost interests and enthusiasm in CMC activities. The more specific instructors are about ‘what to expect’ and ‘when to expect,’ the better the students’ postings are both in quantity and quality. As one of the instructors stated, requiring students to post a certain number of messages by the end of the quarter did not seem to motivate students to actively participate in discussion in cyberspace.

The tremendous weight of the linguistic burden reported by the participants in this study calls for the need for increased understanding and possibly tolerance of non-native speakers’ linguistic deficiency by instructors or native speaker students in the class. This is not to suggest lowering expectations of non-native speakers, but rather that instructors reflect upon one’s own experience of learning a foreign/second language to remember the
uneasiness, nervousness, or frustration involved in it. With this kind of self-reflection, one’s attitudes of listening to or reading non-native speakers will become more of an active listener or reader, showing interests in what they have to say/write. Talking or writing to this kind of audience will in turn lower anxiety in non-native speakers as the participants talked about the influence of audience’s attitudes on their CMC performances.

The influences of Korean academic culture in the participants’ attitudes towards CMC and their CMC behavior suggest that Korean students need more motivation or reinforcement to become active in cyberspace. Instructors might emphasize the purpose and value of sharing ideas with their classmates; they can also reassure that commenting on others is a constructive aspect of collaborative discussion and it is not at all regarded as criticizing.

The process of learning U.S. culture, as discussed in 6.2.4, involves a certain level of unlearning Korean cultural norms. As some of the participants admitted, in an effort to adapt to U.S. culture, due to the distance between C1 and C2, they sometimes felt like they were losing some of their C1, or Koreanness as they were using English. The participants’ efforts to exercise C2 in their writing/speaking by becoming more active, assertive, or casual in classrooms or cyberspace were translated into ‘un-Korean’ or ‘un-feminine’ by their audience (instructors or native speaker classmates). While the participants were trying to write/speak/act according to their own understanding of U.S. culture (C2), their interlocutors were using their own understanding of Korean culture or Korean women as they read, listen to, or see the participants.
This is the site of cultural clash, an inevitable aspect of intercultural or cross-cultural communication in the age of increased global communication. This could be resolved through negotiation of each others’ cultural styles. However, when this negotiation fails or does not take place, cross-cultural communication engenders emotional distress on the side of new comers to the target culture, non-native speakers of English, in this study. While expecting better understanding of people of cultural and linguistic difference from the interlocutors of the target culture (native speakers of English), non-native speakers themselves could learn to ‘become intercultural’ (Y. Y. Kim, 2001) by developing ‘intercultural personhood’ through “continual struggle of searching for the authenticity in self and others within and across cultural groups.” (Y. Y. Kim, 1999, p.439)

6.3.3 Methodological implications of the study

The level of complexity of the findings of this study would not have been possible to obtain in quantitative research. Findings such as co-occurrences of multiple constructs (6.2.1) are not readily achievable through quantitative methods. In survey studies, for instance, respondents are usually restricted to multiple choice questionnaires, in which questions asking if technology (or any other constructs) affects their CMC, and if so, how; such questionnaires are typically based on previous research data. But collecting discontinuous answers from respondents, counting (quantifying) numbers of different answers, then analyzing those numbers using statistical analysis tools would not produce the variety and complexity of answers obtained in this study, capturing the emotional entanglement of the participants.
While a lot of educational research on CMC, such as the studies reviewed in 2.3, look at the external effects of technology on learning and examine the size of those effects using quantitative measurements, the stories of research participants in this study shows that the users of technology themselves were experiencing the personal level of actual ‘doing’ with technology. Or, it might have been the case that their experiences have always been personal but those experiences had not surfaced because of the way they were questioned or the way their performances were measured with the use of quantitative methodology. It was when presented with opportunities to talk about their experiences of L2CS, in comparison to other types of communication (L2RL, L1CS, and L1RL) as a whole, that the participants were able to reflect upon the bodily engagement with technology from their CMC experiences. These stories were elicited because they were asked to elaborate, describe, or think about their experiences of CMC, which is the beauty of qualitative methodology and the rationale behind the methodological framework of this study.

6.3.4 Character counting as a way to analyze qualitative data

The results of this study were reported in two separate chapters, Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4 Findings – Overall Picture, results of matrix intersection search provided in QSR NVivo were used to report the shape of the data as a whole, followed by Chapter 5 L2CS in their own words. In 3.5 Data analysis procedures, I reported the processes I had gone through to decide on the use of character counting as a part of data analysis procedures in this study together with rationale and related references (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Gibbs, 2002). The use of character counting as a starting point of data
analysis turned out to be very helpful in terms of anchoring and structuring further analysis and reporting of the data. As the interpretation and discussion of the data based on character counting results accumulated, I chose to use two separate chapters to report the result of the study, first to look at the data as a whole, then to move closer to the actual words of the participants.

For many qualitative researchers overwhelmed by huge sets of complex data to analyze, this study offers a unique way of analyzing and reporting qualitative data. By ‘temporarily’ quantifying the qualitative data, character counting reduced the data into a set of numbers, which was easily visualized in the form of graphs and tables shown throughout Chapter 4. Examining the numbers and graphs, I was able to visualize my data as a whole in terms of which was said more than which. As the amorphous data started to turn into a tangible shape enabling me to get a handle on it, this process suggested where to look and what to look for as I re-read my data for reporting the participants’ words in Chapter 5. Through this process, I gained strength and courage to approach and stay close to the huge, messy and complex data that seemed impossible to analyze, let alone report in any conceivable format. Speaking from my own experience, therefore, I think that character counting using qualitative data analysis software such as QSR NVivo, when used with caution, can become a useful tool for qualitative researchers, especially for novice researchers like myself.

6.4 Limitations of the study and recommendation for future research

A tiny piece of a huge pie or a small piece of brick of an entire building, these are a couple of metaphors for the size of doctoral dissertation research topic I have heard
from somewhere. The message here was that one dissertation research can only offer a solution for a very small problem. Starting with specific objectives, every research project inevitably involves limitations. This section will discuss limitations of this study and propose recommendations for future research as a way to overcome the limitations.

As noted in 5.3.1, the type of CMC in this study was limited to written CMC, such as listserv, WebCT, or textual chatting. Some of the findings reported here, therefore, might not apply to other types of CMC, including less linguistic burden for L2CS compared to L2RL felt by a few participants. Study of audio CMC or video CMC to understand how language and/or technology affect differently from written CMC will add to the CMC literature.

In addition, while this study intentionally limited the participants to Korean female learners of English, performing similar research for different demographic characteristics will be interesting. For example, study of non-native speakers from other countries (Asian or non-Asian) or study of male students might offer insights as to how culture or gender work differently.

A follow-up research of the same participants in this study would be another interesting study. With more time spent in the U.S., more CMC experiences, and possibly higher linguistic proficiency, their responses to how technology, language, culture, and gender affect their CMC might be different from the result of this study and reveal the effect of improved linguistic proficiency on the level of cultural awareness and gender awareness in L2CS. Another issue in this follow-up study would be the question of how their raised consciousness and awareness of technology, language, culture, and gender as
a result of participating in this study affect their subsequent engagement in different types of communication across language and technology.

Under a qualitative methodological framework, this study limited the research participants to eight Korean female participants so as to maintain close distance between the researcher and the participants throughout the study and derive descriptive records of how they thought of the four constructs in their L2CS. While generalization to a larger number of people has never been intended, researchers seeking for it may choose to utilize the results from this study. Using the findings of this study, one could develop questionnaire and conduct a survey study of larger sample size.

6.5 Closing

As I look retrospectively on the whole dissertation process, I think that I have always been reflecting upon my own experiences of different types of communication across borders of language and technology. At the beginning of this research when I first drew the conceptual map (Figure 1.1) in an effort to identity the dissertation topic, I looked into myself to think of the four constructs that mattered in my communication in Korean and English in real life and cyberspace. This self reflection continued throughout the research process: while listening to the eight Korean female participants; while transcribing the interviews; while reading and re-reading the transcripts as a part of data analysis; and even while I was writing up the results of the study.

As I finish up the long journey of dissertation research, I would like to confess that the process of talking with my participants was actually an opportunity to discover and re-discover myself as a Korean female engaged in communication in English both in
real life and in cyberspace. From the moment this study was conceived of, I have
developed a habit of reflecting upon my own communication to see how my being
Korean, non-native speaking, female is represented in my conversation with or e-mails to
others both in Korean and English.
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APPENDIX A

INVITATION FLYER IN ENGLISH AND IN KOREAN
Do you have anything to share about writing in cyberspace?

Here’s a great opportunity waiting for you!

Did you know that about 418 million people worldwide were online as of December 2000? In this world of telecommunication and information technology, it is hard to imagine our life without computers and e-mails.

I mean, how many e-mail messages do you read or write a day? Is checking your e-mail one of the first things you do in the morning?

Do you have any experiences with chat rooms, listservs, or newsgroups either inside or outside of educational settings?

If your answer to the above question is yes, you have more than enough to contribute to this study.

How do you like your words flying in cyberspace when you write to others sitting on the other end of the computer network? As non-native speakers of English, do you sometimes find it hard to communicate your thoughts over the network? What other things do you consider when you write messages in e-mails, chat rooms, listservs, or newsgroups?

By participating in this study, you will have opportunities to share your experiences and thoughts on these variety of issues related to so-called CMC (Computer-mediated communication).

Please join me in a wonderful research experience of exploring the meaning of CMC as a part of our academic and non-academic lives.

Best regards,
Mikyung Baek

Cultural Studies/ Educational Technology
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
E-mail: Baek.7@osu.edu
Office: 614-292-6031 or 4-0418 (campus phone)
가상공간에서 주고 받는 대화에 대해
우리 함께 생각해 보지 않을래요?

요즘처럼 정보통신 기술이 하루가 다르게 발달하는 시대에 컴퓨터나 e-mail 이 없다면
우리 생활은 어떻게 달라질지 상상해 보신 적이 있나요?

이제 혹은 오늘 하루를 지내면서 몇 개의 e-mail 을 주고 받았는지, 또 하루를 시작할 때
가장 먼저 하는 일들 중에 e-mail 체크하는 일이 포함되는지는 않는지 생각해보세요.

한 조사에 따르면 2000 년 12 월 현재 세계 4 억 1800 만명의 사람들이 인터넷을
사용한다고 합니다. 그 중 한국인의 인터넷 사용인구는 지금 이시간에도 계속 늘어나고
있으며 2001 년 6 월 30 일 현재 2 천 2 백여만 명의 한국인이 인터넷을 사용한다는
통계도 나와 있습니다.

이 글을 읽으시는 여러분들도 물론 이 사람들 중 한 분이시라 믿구요, 지금까지 한
번이라도 e-mail, chat room, listserv, newsgroup 중 하나를 써보신 경험이 있다면 제
연구에 초대하고 싶어요.

E-mail 이나 chatting 을 할때, 자신이 쓴 글이 컴퓨터 네트워크 저편에 있는 어떤이를
향해 가상공간 속을 날아가는 그림을 상상한 적은 없나요?
수업의 연장으로 영어로 listserv 에 올려야 할 때 어떤 점이 가장 어려운가요?

이제 우리생활의 일부분으로 자리잡아버린 소위 말하는 “컴퓨터매개통신 (CMC, or
Computer-Mediated Communication)”의 시대를 살아가면서 이런 여러분들
질문들을 자신에게 던져볼 적이 있는지 함께 나눠 보는 귀중한 시간을 통해
컴퓨터매개통신 (CMC)이 우리에게 어떤 의미를 갖는지 함께 생각해볼까요?

자세한 사항을 알고 싶으시면 언제든지 연락주세요.

백 미경
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
(Major: Educational Technology)
E-mail: Baek.7@osu.edu (한국말로 보내셔도 됩니다)
Office: 292-6031 (or 4-0418, campus phone)

참고로 이 연구에서 여러분께 부탁드리는 시간은 한 학기를 통해
총 4-5 시간으로써, 이는 30-40 분 정도의 인터뷰 5-6 회 정도에 소요되는 시간입니다.
물론 여러분의 귀중한 시간에 대한 보답 또한 잊을 수 없겠죠?
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RECRUITMENT LETTER
LETTER OF RECRUITMENT

April 15, 2002

Dear

This letter is an invitation to consider participating in a study (a tentative title: *Computer-mediated communication by Korean female learners of English: Technology, culture, gender, and language*) I am conducting as part of my Ph. D. degree in the School of Educational Policy and Leadership at The Ohio State University under the supervision of Professor Suzanne K. Damarin. I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail.

Living in the age of globalization, our communication often span beyond the geographic or linguistic border. The rapid development in telecommunications and information technology has brought us into a new world community of global economy and the use of computer-mediated communication (CMC) is becoming commonplace both in our everyday lives and work environments. English, being the language of the Internet, non-native speakers of English engaging in CMC inevitably meet the challenge of crossing the border of culture and language. In this regard, not only language learners in educational settings but also virtually everyone in cyberspace whose native language is not English can be regarded as language learners in cyberspace. Although a lot of research has been done on the effects of those technologies in various settings, not many studies have focused on the inner processes that non-native speakers of English go through when engaged in computer-mediated communication in English.

This study, therefore, is intended to achieve three purposes: a) to understand how Korean female learners of English represent themselves in CMC using English and how the combination of technology, culture, gender, and language work together behind it; b) to provide insights about understanding CMC by non-native speakers of English; and c) to provide pedagogical suggestions to educators in ways to use CMC in teaching, especially when non-native speakers of English are involved.

As a non-native speaker of English, your current and previous experiences of CMC in both academic and non-academic settings would become great assets for my study. Therefore, I would like to invite you to be involved in my study where you could share your CMC experiences and valuable thoughts. Participation in this study is voluntary. It will involve:
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- collection of your CMC (e.g. listserv postings or chatting script)
- observation of your classroom (about 3-4 times)
- three to four interviews of approximately thirty to forty minute in length in a mutually agreed upon location

The duration of your participation is expected to be approximately four months (the quarter you are enrolled in the course plus one month afterwards for follow-up interviews). You may decline to answer any of the interview questions if you so wish. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time by advising the researcher. The interview will be tape-recorded or videotaped with your permission, and later transcribed for analysis. Shortly after the interview has been completed, I will send you a copy of the transcript to give you an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of our conversation and to add or clarify any points that you wish. All information you provide is considered completely confidential. Data collected during this study will be retained for the duration of this research in a secure area to which only researchers associated with this project have access. There are no known or anticipated risks to you as a participant in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this study or would like additional information to assist you in reaching a decision about participation, please contact me at (614) 529-1899 or by email at Baek.7@osu.edu. You can also contact my supervisor, Professor Suzanne K. Damarin at (614) 688-5590 or email Damarin.1@osu.edu. This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance from the Office of Research Risks Protection at The Ohio State University. If you have any questions or concerns resulting from your participation in this study, please contact Ms. Jane Kelsey at (614) 292-6950.

I hope that the results of my study bring better understanding of how culture, language, and technology can and do affect/change/reform CMC by language learners and help us better understand ‘others’ we communicate with in cyberspace.

I very much look forward to speaking with you and thank you for your assistance in this project.

Yours Sincerely,

Mikyung Baek
Student Investigator
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CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

I consent to participating in research entitled: Computer-mediated communication by Korean female learners of English: Technology, culture, gender, and language.

Dr. Suzanne Damarin, Principal Investigator, or her authorized representative, Mi-Kyung Baek, has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: _________________________  Signed: _______________________

Signed: _______________________  Signed: _______________________

(Participant)  (Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)  (Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness: _______________________

HS-027E Consent for Participation in Exempt Research
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A SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
1. Describe your previous and current use of CMC (e-mail, chatting, listserv, etc.) in both your personal and academic life. What does CMC mean to you? (including level of confidence with CMC and computer literacy)

2. How would you describe yourself in classroom environment here at OSU? (personality, language behavior, and/or identity)

3. How would you describe yourself when engaged in CMC in English?

4. Are above two different? If yes, how? Is it intended? If yes, why?

5. Are these any different from your personality when engaged in communication in Korean? If yes, how? Is it intended? If yes, why?

6. Describe your CMC experience and/or process (both for personal CMC and CMC in educational settings).

7. When engaged in CMC with your classmates from different countries and cultures, how do you perceive your cultural identity to be? Where do you see yourself in relation to the CMC communities (your classmates)? Does it different from yourself in classroom environment?

8. What are your perceptions of your linguistic proficiency when engaged in communication in English? Do they differ between face-to-face communication and CMC? How?
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9. What are your thoughts on CMC becoming an alternative means of communication? What do you think of doing CMC as a part of course requirement? How does it affect your interaction patterns in terms of enhancing/diminishing your opportunity in representing your ideas?

10. Think of the gender relationship in Korean language and society. Based on your academic experience in the U.S. so far, how do you feel about the gender issues in U.S. academic context (compared to Korean contexts)?

11. Does being a Korean woman make any difference in classroom settings here? (Share such experiences, if any) How about in CMC?

12. In terms of your interaction patterns (both in classrooms and in CMC), do the demographics of your classmates matter (ethnicity, culture, or gender)? How? For example think of the cases where there are non-native speakers of English or other Koreans (females only, males only, or both).
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DISSERTATION TIMELINE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Year 2002</th>
<th>Year 2003</th>
<th>Year 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Selection &amp; Preparatory Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection: Classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection: CMC Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection: Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSR Nvivo Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVivo coding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-reading/coding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Up</td>
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APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW EXCERPTS OMITTED FROM CHAPTER 5
Excerpt #1
(Document: Elena_Interview4)
684: Elena: 이렇게 일단 천나나 이렇게 직접 만나서 얘기할 하면은 더욱더 오랫동안 얘기할 하고, 실제 자기는 뭐 전화 통화를 뭐 한시간 넘게 할 수도 있어요. [웃음] 뭐, 사람 만나는 것도 그렇고. 근데, e-mail 은, I don’t think they are very long.

Excerpt #2
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview1)
245: 근정: 아, 저는, 왜 그걸 안 보냐면요, 그걸 연결을 해야하는데 저는 hanmail 을 더 많이 써요, daum 을. Daum 을 면날 그 mail 채크를 하는데, 그거는 campus 아이 (??) 뭐 그런 거니까 거의 안 들어가게 되죠.
257: 근정: 아이, 근데 이제, 그런 못해서, 못 들어가서 못하는 게 아니구요, 채크는 면날 할 수 있어요. 할 수 있는데, 이제 귀찮아서 안 하는 거죠. ....

Excerpt #3
(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
593: 유선: (Course A listserv) 저 그냥 책상에 앉아서 computer 치면서 해요, 그냥. 바로바로.
598: 미경: 음, 그니까 이, 이거 같은 경우에는 그렇게 했어요?
599: 유선: 음, 그렇게 했어요.
600: 미경: 음, 만약에 선생님한테 e-mail 을 보낸다고면?
601: 유선: (그) 것도 그냥 바로 써요.

Excerpt #4.
(Document: Elena_Interview5)
394: 미경: 그래서 자기는 결과적으로 computer-mediated communication 을 별로 안 좋아하는구나. [웃음]
397: Elena: 일단, 시간이 걸리죠. E-mail 쓰는 게. 시간이 걸리고, 영어로 쓰나 한국 우리말로 쓰나 시간이 걸리죠. ....
399: Elena: 예, 바로 답이 없으니까, follow-up question 을 또 못해요. ....

(Document: Elena_Interview5)
470: Elena: 또 e-mail 쓰는 게 왜, 왜 쉽지가 않나면요, 예를 들자면은 paper에 대해서 e-mail을 쓴다.
471: 미경: paper에 대해서?, 응, 응.
472: Elena: 그니깐 I want to write about this. 그리고는 paper, 그니깐 쓰는 데 이러한 주제에 대해서 뭐 쓰겠는데 I want feedback. 왜냐면은 paper 쓰는 게 쉽지가 않겠어요. 그래서 뭐 교수님의 생각을 듣고 싶은데 그 즉시 feedback가 없으니깐

... 476: Elena: I don't know. [laugh]... Um, there's no, yeah, because there's no feedback, I can't ... ask anything else about my paper. And I have to write 20-page paper and if I just give him topic and he says 'sounds good' then there's nothing to discuss.

Excerpt #5.
(Document: Elena_Interview3)
414: Elena: 직접 만나면은 it's a totally different story,
416: Elena: 왜냐면은 컴퓨터로는 일단 그냥 barrier가 있잖아요. Face-to-face가 아니라면, 일단 barrier가 있고, 그 다음에 처음 만난때는, 처음 사람 만난때는, 그 좋게 보이고 싶잖아요, You want to give a good impression. Um, and, and 그 하는 질문이 계속 똑같잖아요, 뭐 '몇살이냐 '남자냐 여자냐 '뭐 하냐 '학교는 어디서 다니다' 그런거는 답을 쉽게 할잖아요. 근데 쓰는 예를 들자면은 뭐 어,뭐, like, like, 'What was your childhood like?' 그런 질문은 안하니까, [웃음] 그리고 또 그런 질문 나중에 하게 되니까

... 453: Elena: Chatting 방에 들어갈때는 많이는 안된다는데 it IS different. And I think at the beginning, it is very much just superficial ... front ... and superficial in person. And I think that's because number one of the questions that ... that you get asked. ...
Telling your name to a person ... it's not very hard, [laugh] ... telling your age, there is only one answer ...

(Document: Elena Interview#5)
417: Elena: 그렇 친구니까 친구를 잘알잖아요. 그런데 또 e-mail을 쓰면은 잘 모르는 사람하고 e-mail쓰는 느낌이 들어요.

... 427: Elena: 예, 제 친구나 e-mail로 쓰는 뭐 대화가 그렇게 길지 않은 거 같애요.
428: 미경: 그렇 일상적인 거?
429: Elena: 예예.

Excerpt #6.
(Document: Sookie_Interview3)

미경: .

숙희: . 설해도 봤을 때 이라는 것보다 [인종은 표정] 거기서 그린 거는, .

미경: .

숙희: 가까이 있을 때는 되게 좀 민망해할 얘기일 지도 모르는데, 거기서 있을 때는 ‘에 ~~~ ’ 막 이리고 막,

Excerpt #7.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview4)
360: 서영: ... 근데 첫학기 체 어떤 애한테 야, 제가 말씀드렸나요, 이거? 창당한 그 e-mail?

368: 서영: ... 처음에 그걸 봤을 때는 약간 창당하더라구요. ... 나는 빌려달라는 거지, 그날 나한테 아예 달라는 얘기가 아니었는데 그런 반응이 나오니까, 그 다음에 또 생각해 해보니까 또 그게 되게 많이 읽었어요, 그 그 편지를, 또 읽어보니까. 이제 얘기 나돌 되게 ‘아니, 수업시간에 자기는 하나도 안하고 있다가 어디 나라한테 지금 빌려달라는 거야?’ 이런식으로 나한테 편지를 보낸건가 또 그런 생각이 들다가 또 생각해보니까 ‘아니, 얘기 내 말을 잘못 이해했구나...’ 뭐 그러구 그 편지에도 그렇게 썼어요, ‘Good Luck ’

미경: 그러고 e-mail 을 누가 보냈는데 그게 얼마나 자기한테 나무 마음에 안드는 내용이나. ‘이겨 뭐야?’ 뭐 이런 생각이 들어도 reply 를 해야하는 경우에는 그렇게까지는 안한다고 생각했다. 한국말이든, 영어든. 그러니까 그게 왜 그런 거 같애? 왜 cyberspace 로 넘어가서 그런 거 같애? 아니면 증거가 남아서 그런 거 같애?

596: 미경: 그리고 e-mail 을 누가 보냈는데 그런 몇몇 자기한테 나무 마음에 안드는 내용이나. ‘이겨 뭐냐?’ 뭐 이런 생각이 들어도 reply 를 해야하는 경우에는 그렇게까지는 안한다고 생각했다. 한국말이든, 영어든. 그러니까 그게 왜 그런 거 같애? 왜 cyberspace 로 넘어가서 그런 거 같애? 아니면 증거가 남아서 썼어. 그러고 그 편지에도 그렇게 썼어요, ‘Good Luck ’

597: 유선: 증거가 남아서 그런 거도 있었죠?

604: 유선: 그래 전짜 맞다. 전짜 증거가 남아서야. 저, 어떤 남자애가 저한테 심한 소리한 거 다 저장해놨거든요. 증거같아, 증거. 그래서 나중에 저한테 상황이 변할 때가 있었어요. 그러니까, .

Excerpt #8.
(Document: Yuseon_Interview5)

596: 미경: 그러하고 e-mail 을 누가 보냈는데 그런 몇몇 자기한테 나무 마음에 안드는 내용이나. ‘이겨 뭐냐?’ 뭐 이런 생각이 들어도 reply 를 해야하는 경우에는 그렇게까지는 안한다고 생각했다. 한국말이든, 영어든. 그러니까 그게 왜 그런 거 같애? 왜 cyberspace 로 넘어가서 그런 거 같애? 아니면 증거가 남아서 그런 거 같애?

유선: 증거가 남아서 그런 거도 있었죠?

597: 유선: 증거가 남아서 그런 거도 있었죠?

604: 유선: 그래 전짜 맞다. 전짜 증거가 남아서야. 저, 어떤 남자애가 저한테 심한 소리한 거 다 저장해놨거든요. 증거같아, 증거. 그래서 나중에 저한테 상황이 변할 때가 있었어요. 그러니까, .

Excerpt #9.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)

408: 근정: 그리고 솔직히 처음에는 만약에 그걸 처음부터 했다면 이름만 보고 누가 누군지 잘 알순 없는 거잖아요. . . .그러니까 아무래도 더 쉽게 얘기할 수겠죠.

414: 근정: 예. 그럼 수도 있겠죠. 근데 이제 또 모르죠. 그렇게 안보인다는거고 문제에 물론 같은 class 나가 살마 그러진 않겠지만 몇명
안타는 거니가 누군지 아니가, 설마 그렇긴 않았겠지만 혹시라도 누가 나를 정면 무시하는 말을 막 했더니 지 아닐 뭐 되게 나쁜 말을 막 했다든지, discussion 할 때 그랬다면 언제 그건 또 더 상처가 되는거죠. ...
418: 근정: 그리고 또 chatting 같은 경우에는, chatting 이 보통 nickname 을 올리잖아요. 만약에 nickname 이 됐을 경우에 그게 또 더 심해질 수도 있는거죠.

**Excerpt #10.**
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview2)
83: 근정: 그러니까 e-mail 같은 경우에는 사람이 마다 이렇게 얘기들을 들을 수가 없고, 그 느낌을 모르니까 자기가 상상하고 싶은대로 상상을 하는거예요.
...
85: 근정: 그러니까 마다 나쁘게 상상을 할려면 헛없이 나쁘게 상상할 수도 있구, 그냥 '아, 오해했어!' 생각하려면 또 그렇게 생각할 수도 있구, 그냥, 그래서 나중에 개가 '아, 자기 그런 의도 아니었다가' 전화를 하더라구요. 그래서 '아 안나가, 사실은 이해하다구.' [웃음] 그러구 말았어요.

**Excerpt #11.**
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview3)
504: 근정: 음, 아무래도 거절도 좀 더 정중하게 하게 되겠죠? 안보이니까, 모르겠어요. [웃음] 그냥
...
520: 근정: .... E-mail 을 보내서 내가 그걸 읽었어요. 근데 이게 그 사람한테 다시 말 써에는 그 사람의 상태도 바뀌었을 때고, 기분도 바뀌었을 때고, 또, 이걸 이렇게 쓰자지고 그냥 얘기할 하는 것도 아니고, chatting 은 그래도 이렇게 feedback 이 있잖아요. 근데 이건 그것도 아니고 그냥 마다 이렇게 보내버리면, 거절하는 걸 마다 이렇게 보내버리면, 되게 무례하게 느껴질 때가 되게 많은 거 같애요. 그래서 e-mail 을 그런 식으로 안써요. 좋은 일로만 쓰는 거 같애요, e-mail 은.

**Excerpt #12.**
(Document: Sookie_Interview1)
261: 숙희: 근데, 역시 computer 로 하게 되면, 그냥 남의 의도를 먼저 받아들이기 보다는 자기가 먼저, 내 생각을 어떻게 표현하기에 더 바쁘지, 그냥 뭐, 그런 거 같애요.
...
265: 숙희: 예. 내가 그냥 언니랑 이렇게 얘기하는 거랑 완전히 모르는 상태에서 언니랑 그냥 chatting 으로 얘기하는 거하고 빼도, 내가 뭐 모르는 사람이니까 뭐, 이름 밖에 모르는데 뭐, 뭐 이렇게 될 수도 있는데, 이렇게 마주보고 사망하고 얘기하다보면 어, 사람 자체부터 알기 시작해봤구 그 주제까지 이렇게 이렇게 전대가는 말들이, 어, 말하는 방법도 그렇고 그리고 표현하는 것도 그렇고, 다를 거 같애요.
266: 미정: 표현하는 거는 왜, 무슨?
267: 숙희: 그러니까 뭐가 잘 공격적인 수도 있는데 어떻게 보면,
268: 미정: 아, 잘 말을 다한다?
어떻게 생각하든, 나는 기분 내는대로 다 할 수 있고,

**Excerpt #13.**
(Document: Sookie Interview1)
146: 숙희: 그러니까 주제를 한국어로 써도 매장 영어로 써도 됐을 때, 분명히 영어가 직접적으로 되게 숨직해지는 반면에, Chatting을 했을 때 나는 그날 실제로 만났을 때는, __chatting 이 더 숨직해지는 거 같아요. 숨직히 사람 얼굴도 안보이는 거고, 이런 사람일 지라도. chatting 하면 더, 더 되게, 빨리 빨리 되는 거 같아요. 말을 내가 이렇게 내별을 때에는 이렇게 생각할 수지고 내별이 머요. 근데 chatting 을 할 때에는 상대방의 반응에 따라서 내가 직접적으로 반응을 해서 내가 빨리 빨리 치니가, 그래서, __더 숨직해지

[웃음]
147: 미경: 표정을. 안화도 되니까, ...

**Excerpt #14.**
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)
398: 근정: 근데요 cyberspace 에서 만약에 그 내용을 막 주고 chatting 을 하라고 했어요. 그럼 훨씬 더 천천히 할 수 있는 기회가 됐을 수도 있어요. . . . 그게 아니고 이건 그냥 이렇게 올리는 거같아요. 그리고 숨직히 말하면 게세요 제게 열로 안일이었을거예요, response 하는 거 빨고는.
400: 근정: 예, 저도 대체 안알아봤으니까, 근데 저도 한번도 이걸 discussion 이라고 생각하고 올린게 아니고 그냥 숨제라고 생각하고 올려냈어요. 그림기 때문에 이거는 전혀 둘린 거 같아요, 그런거랑은.

**Excerpt #15.**
(Document: Sookie Interview6)
553: 숙희: 음, 그랬나보네, [Sophia 의 listserv postings 을 읽음].
그냥 agree 한다는 토로 얘기한 했다본데요. 이것도 거의 막 몇 개를 써야한다는 그 의무감에. [웃음]

...

**Excerpt #16.**
(Document: Sookie Interview1)

...
235: 숙희: 예. 그냥 자기 의견만 그러지 먼 왜 그렇게 생각하느냐? 이거 생각해봐라. 별로 그냥, 약간 뒤, 되게 막 논리정연하게 ‘누가 어떤 말을 이렇게 해서, 그래서 뭐 이런데 반응할 수 있고, 뭐 이런식한 예제가 있다. 그래서 이상 가능성도 있기 때문에 나는 그게 반대한다’ 이런 아냐고, ...
236: 미경: 그러니까 그렇게 해야될 것 같은데.
Excerpt #17.
(Document: Elena_Interview5)

...
521: Elena: 어, 근데 근데 좋았던 거 같죠. 그 그 reading 에 대해서 느낄하고 생각을 정리할 수 있었던 좋은 기회였던 거 같죠. 수업 때 언니가 수업을 들어보셨는데 그 자주 대화를 잘 안할까봐요.
...
526: Elena: 수업 때 못한 discussion 을 web-ct 통해서 할 수 있으니가 좋았던 거 같겠죠.

Excerpt #18.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)

231: 근정: 어, 뭐, 누가 누가 보겠어요, 나중에, quarter 끝나면 속작히 말해서. [웃음] 누가 보겠어요?
233: 근정: 언니나 보지, 누가 왜요 그걸.
234: 미정: 그래서 그런 데 대한 그런 부담은 별로 없었어?
235: 근정: 별로 없었고, 그리고 생각 지금 처음 생각해봤어요. [웃음]
...
283: 어떤 author 에 대해서 자기가 무슨 strong 한 feeling 이 있다, 그런데 그거에 대해서 Web-CT 에서 알때랑 수업시간에 알때랑 그 강도가 달라지는 거 같아요?
284: 근정: 강도라뇨?
285: 미정: 그러니까 만약에 뭐 `아, 나에 너무 실어.' 내가 `난 이거 아닌 거 같아.' 그런 말을 하고싶다는 그러면 그럴 Web-CT 에서 더 잘? 수 있을까 같아? 아니면 수업시간에 더 잘할 수 있을까 같은 거 같아?
286: 근정: 287: 미정: 그러니까 cyberspace 이기 때문에 더 잘할 수 있는 그런 건 없는 거 같아?
근정: 똑같은 거 같아요.
미경: 거의 비슷한 거 같아?
근정: 예.
미경: 어차피 그걸 얘기할 해야되니까?
근정: 예.

Excerpt #19.
(Document: Eunji_Interview3)
279: 미경: 언어면에서는 어떤 거 같애? Face-to-face로 얘기할 때면 Listserv는 쓰는거같아.
280: 은지: 둘다 힘들지, 얌니. 같은 영언데...
286: 은지: 나는 별로 영어를 그렇게 잘하는 것 같지가 않아서, 쓰는 것도 어렵고 말하는 것도 어려워.

Excerpt #20.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview4)
935: 근정: 응, grammar땜에,
937: 근정: 다 틀려두 근데 진짜 부담을 많이 가지요, grammar 맨에. 해나면

(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)
440: 미경: Gender, language, 하여간 뭐 영어로 하는 거면 cyberspace든 real life든 language가 제일 크다고, 그렇지?
441: 근정: 예.
442: 미경: 그거 때문에 뭐가 다 인제 크게 안되서 상처도 받는거고,
443: 근정: 맞아.

Excerpt #21.
(Document: Sookie_Interview4)
104: 숙희: 그러니까 language 가 너무 크게 작용을 하기때문에, typing하는거랑, 내가 머리속으로 그거를 생각을 해갔고 표현하려는 그 과정이 너무 길기때문에, 한국말에 비해서, 그래서, 그냥, 편하게만, 하는 거 같아요.
106: 숙희: 편하게 표현을 한단구요.. ‘How are you?’ ‘Fine.’ 뭐 이런 것처럼.
109: 미경: Chatting 을 영어로 한다고 그러면, 다른 모든 상황하고 비교해봤을 때,
110: 숙희: 여기가 제일 language 가 큰 거 같아요.

(Document: Sookie_Interview4)
223: 그것도 영어로 비교를 해야되나? 영어로 할 때는 어떻게 하지? 선생님하고 대화를 하거나, 조금 조금 뭐 이렇게 옛날에 영어 선생님 했던 사람, 뭐 옛날에 전에 학교에 있었던 뭐 음악 선생님, 아니면 무슨 Korean American 애들 뭐 이어면은 상 진짜 이 쓰여요. 그러니까 막 가끔 가다 사전도 찾아보구, [웃음] 약간 좀 이렇게 조금 헛리에도 파구선 좀 하는 거 같구,
228: 미경: 한국 사람들하고 하는 건 그냥 leisure 고, 영어로 하는 거는
공부해 공부, 사전도 찾아가면서, 229: 숙희: 예, 가끔 가다 그리는 거 같에도.

(Document: Sookie_Interview1)
279: 숙희: 음, 그런 것 보다는, 내가 이거는 분명 공부량 연관되는 거니까 사용하는 면에서도 그렇고, 또 영어로 해야되니까 그런 것도 나 신경이 쓰이고, 281: 숙희: 그냥 뭐, 그냥 e-mail로 편하게 자기 의견을 그냥 주고 받는 거지만 내, 그냥 얼마나 영어를 내가 잘 grammatically 잘 쓰냐, 어떻게 내가 paper를 쓰는 것 보다는 조금 덜 시간이 많이 걸리겠지만, 어떻게 내 생각을 잘, organize 해놔? 글을 올리냐, 어떤 거 같은거.

Excerpt #22.
(Document: Sunghae_Interview2)
31: 성해: 애들이요, 생각하고 있는 건 나 똑같애요. 근데, 저도 따론 애들이 생각하는 거다 생각을 하고 있는데, 그거를 글로 못썼어요.

Excerpt #23.
(Document: Jiyoung_Interview4)
1036: 지영: 그래요, 맞아요. 맞아. 그러니까 애들 입장에서는 내가 개들하고 달랐을 수도 있어. .... 1040: 지영: 아, 그러니까 문장이 문장 자체가 수준이 떨어지고, 그리고 Sociology 애들이 생각하기에 내가 이, 이 과목을 개설한 과의 애교, 강의를 lecture 하는 lecturer의 (lecturer를 의미) advisee라고, 그러니까 내가 이 adviser의, 그러니까 그 이 교수의 그걸 제일 잘알것이라고 ... guess하고, 따라서할 수도 있고.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview4)

.... 1161: 지영: Input 하고 output하는 데 있어서 그 애가 언어 때문에 또 나갈 때도 언어 때문에 또 가려고하죠. 그런데 만약에 이제 speaking 이었으면 이게 두 개, 세 개 정도 있어서, 이렇게 이렇게 몇 번 걸러서 요약을 나갈건데 전짜 speaking 하면 난 전짜 요약을 밖에 안나가겨mousemove. Writing을 하나가 이렇게 한번만 맛 이렇게 치고 나가서 한번 내지는 두번만 치고 나가니까 조금 더 나은 거지 실제 하고 싶은 거는 더 많았지만 [참 답답하다는 툭] 표현을 어떻게 발변이, 숙어도 생각 안나고, 이놈의 말이 어려, 어떻게 그게 생각이 안나 이게, 말이.
미경: 응, 근데 이제 걔들. 일단 positive하게 comment를 한거잖아, 자기가 한 말에 대해서. 그게에 대해서는 ‘아, 분위기가 그래서 그렇게 하나보다’ 이런식으로만 생각했다고?
지영: 받은 그렇게 생각했고, 받은 내가 지금 바로 point 했구나, 그렇게 생각했고.

Excerpt #24.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview2)
54: 그리구 또, 걔네는 또 e-mail을 보내는데, 전체 다 이렇게 해가지고 e-mail 보내는 거예요. 근데 애네는 또 international 이니까 말을 되게 direct하게 해. 그러면 또 거기에 대해서 또 기분 나쁘니까 또, 막 이렇게 ‘어떻게 그렇게 e-mail을 보낼 수가 있냐? 전화해라’ 막 이런식으로

Excerpt #25.
(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
100: 숙희: 예, 걸러서 얘기하게되고, 101: 미경: 그러니까 걸을 수 밖에 없지. 영어라는 장벽이 있기 때문에, 그러니까, 감정이 일단 숨직해질 수가 없고
102: 숙희: 응,
103: 미경: 그러니까 숨직해지기 실어서 안되는 게 아니라,
104: 숙희: 표현을 못해서,
108: 숙희: 아, 또 보면요, 되게 막 적절치 않고 되게 숨직해졌다고 그렇게, 저 같은 경우에는. 보면은 우리가 아는 단어들이 그니까 표현이 되게 적으니까 되게 막 좀 기분이 나쁘다. 뭐 뭐 이런 뭐 화난다 이런 표현을 뭐 ‘기분이 나쁘다’, 머지 좀 좀 그래 내용 이런식으로 표현할 수 있는 거를 ‘나 기분 나빠, 재한데,’ 막 그런 식으로 표현하게 되고 그니까 되게 표현력도 말리고 어휘력도 말리고, [웃음]

Excerpt #26.
(Document: Jiyoung_Professors)
97: JY-Teacher: . . . . and now is that, that doesn't happen, I mean that, the, the English language is not now a barrier to her in a way that it once was. However, ... um, that said, I think that that's, it's all the more remarkable that she was able to do everything that she was able to do in the first year, including participating in that class, ... which required um, obviously, um, great ... um, use of language. And she ... you know, managed to do it, ... not all the times,

98: Mikyung: You mean, in, in Web-CT?
99: JY-Teacher: Yes, in Web-CT. Right, because it was all content-driven ... not just speaking out loud and not just reading but ... having to write. ... And she accomplished
102: Mikyung: ... even though she could not speak, maybe, or she
... did not want to speak in class, I could see that it ... was the, Web-CT was the place where she could ... yeah, ...

103: JY-Teacher: Yes. She used it (Web-CT) to her advantage.

180: Mikyung: ... So do you see those ... change, dramatic change from class to ... cyberspace when you see her postings in Web-CT?

181: JY-Teacher: Um-hmm.

182: Mikyung: Yeah, because you KNOW that ... as ... language has been struggle for her and ...

183: JY-Teacher: Um-hmm. ... Yes, it’s very very big help for her.

184: Mikyung: Okay, okay. How would you uh ... maybe grade, if you could, I mean, ... her postings, with, compared to other students’ postings in Web-CT?

Excerpt #27.
(Document: Sookie_Interview3)

185: 숙희: 아, chatting 이 더 편한 거 같애요. 솔직히 발음도 그렇고, 그리고,

186: 미경: 생각할 시간이 조금 더 있잖아.

187: 숙희: 예, 예. 영어는 바로바로 내뱉어야되는데, 반면에 이거는 조금 생각을 해서, 좀 ...문법까지 [웃음] 생각해서 좀 그래도 내가 아직 영어를 유창하게 잘 못하니까, 이렇게 쓰여서 쓰고 뒤 이런 거는 잘 못하고, 대신에 말하는 거를 고대로 치는 거 같이 이렇게 나니까, 더 시간이 많이 걸리고,

생각하는 거는, 그것도 더 시간이 많이 걸리는 거 같애요. 그러니까 내가 잘 표현해야겠다 이런 생각 보다는, 문법이나 뒤 어떻게 표현할까 이런 게 더 신경이 많이 쓰이는 거 같애요.

Excerpt #28.
(Document: Sunghae_Interview1)

49: 성혜: 그리고, 근데 거의, 그렇게 어렵, 그렇게 차리라, 그렇게 더 쉬운 거 같애요. 말하는 거보다.

53: 성혜: 영어로 내가 말을 하는 거보다 영어로 내가 쓰서 chatting 을 하는게 훨씬 쉬워요. 왜냐하면, 그냥 얘기할 때, 이렇게 그냥 영어 이렇게 글 쓰는 거같이 그냥 이렇게 쓰는 거라서. 말하면 막 생각해가지구 막 당황해서 막 안나오잖아요, 막 동사 주어 햇갈리고 막. 근데 그거는, 편하아요. 더 편해야.

(Document: Sunghae_Interview4)


661: 성혜: 예, 예예예. 그러니까 말이 더 쓰는게 편하아 그랬잖아요요, 말하는 거보다. ...
미경: 그러면 영어로, 귀가 미국 사람하고 영어로 하는 거랑, 아니 그 Thailand 애같이, ... 만나서 하는 거랑, 그런 cyberspace 에서 하는 거랑 차이는 어때? 느낌이랄까.

성혜: 글쎄, 편하죠. 왜냐하면 제가 보고, 쓰는 거니까. 근데 예약 만나면은 듣고 말하는 거랑, 듣고 말하기랑 읽고 쓰기는 뭐 쓰기가 훨씬 편하잖아요.

(Document: Sunghae_Interview3)

미경: 어, 말이 솔솔 잘 나와서 그렇게 되게 편하다고 했었고, 그 다음에, 그러니까 영어로 그렇게 이게 chatting을 하게 되면은 말하는 거 보다 훨씬 편하기 때문에 영어를 더 접한다.

성혜: 예, 예, 예, 예.

미경: Chatting이 훨씬 편하다. ‘너무 편하죠 --‘라고 얘기.

성혜: 생각하면서 쓰면 되니까. 모르는 단어같은 거 있으면 사전 찾아가면서 할 수도 있고.

미경: 만나서 얘기하게 되면은 생각한 걸 바로 말로 해야되니까 그게 어렵지만 chatting의 경우에는 시간을 바라.

성혜: 또, 듣는 것에 대한 부담도 없어진다. 만나서 말하는 경우, 상대방의 말을 잘 못 알아들거나 해서 힘든 경우가 있는데, chatting의 경우에는 그 사람의 말을 화면상에서 보고 있으면 되니까 훨씬 쉽다.

Excerpt #29.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview5)

미경: 응. 만나서 얘기하는 거보다 e-mail로 얘기하는 게 좀 편하긴해?

지영: 물어볼 거, 가서 말로 물어볼게면 그냥 e-mail로 해.

미경: 응. 만나서 얘기하는 거보다 e-mail로 얘기하는 게 좀 편하긴해?

지영: 물어볼 거, 가서 말로 물어볼게면 그냥 e-mail로 해.

Excerpt #30.

(Document: Gunjeung_Interview3)

근경: 예, 술 때 스트레스를 받아요. 귀가 grammar도 고치야되나, spelling도 전혀 모르니까 고치야되니까, 말할 때는 만약에 내가 혹시 실수를 했다면 그 사람만 이해를 하면 그냥 넘어갈 문제와, 쓰아 indeb니까 그걸 다 이렇게 그 사람이 알아들게, 그리고 또 말할 때는 만약에 그 사람이 뭐 이해를 못하는 표정이면 다시 이렇게 explain을 해주면 되잖아요. 근데 그 chatting,
아니 chatting 이 아니구 e-mail 같은 거를 맡 보내는 거는 그냥 맡 이렇게 던져주는 거기 때문에 아무래도 그 사람이 이해할 만큼의 그 writing 실력은 갖추고 있어야한다고 생각을 해요. 그렇게 때문에 아무래도 좀 더 이해하기 쉽게 맡 써주겠다. 아무래도 말할 때 스트레스는 덜 받아요. 어떻게 뒤 더 잘하고 뒤 그린 거는 어떻게 평가할 수가 없는 거 같아요.

**Excerpt #31.**
(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
111: 유선: 지금 수도 없고, [웃음] 그래서, 그렇게 보면 좀 그런 거 같아요. non-native speaker 가 cyber life 에서, cyber 세상에서 language 를 쓰기는 그냥 real-life 보다 훨씬 어려요. 훨씬. 왜냐하면, 제가 보기에는 language 에 어떤 그런 단계가 있는 거 같거든요. 그러니까 그 단계를 넘어서면, 그, 그, 같이 이렇게 하는데, 제 동생같은 경우에는, 제동생 chatting 하는 거 보면 다 영어로 하거든요. 보면은, 정말 맡이 맡 이렇게 뭐라 그러지? 길이도 왜, ‘No Lecture’ 도 ‘Nor-acture’ (?) 뒤 이렇게 쓰고 뒤 이런식으로, 단어,

112: 미경: 음, 한국 사람들이 하는 것처럼 그렇게 하는구나.
113: 유선: 예, 예, 예, 그렇게, 그 상태방도 그렇게 쓰고, 에도 그렇게 쓰고, 그러니까 그런 걸 우리가 알아야 할, 어느 정도의. 그래서, 제가 보기에는 그렇게. 이건 (L2 in Real-life or L1 in Cyberspace) 당연히 쉬운거고 어리도 (L2 in Cyberspace) 갈리면 정말, 거의 뒤,
114: 미경: 그러니까 실제 생활에서 그런 영어로 하는 거보다, 훨씬 어렵다는 얘기야?
115: 유선: 훨씬 어려죠, 훨씬.
117: 유선: 근데 시간을 두고 생각해도, 우선 구어체를, 구어체를 사용하기가 쉽지 않기 때문에 자기가, 그러니까 생각을 해서 쓰야 그러면 그건데, 그러니까 내가 보기에도 그것은 확실히 무슨 맡 정형화된 essay 라는 거죠. 자유스럽게 말처럼 뒤 ‘나는 이렇게 생각하고, 뒤 이렇게 생각한다’ 이런 식이 아니라.

**Excerpt #32.**
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
530: 미경: 근데 cyberspace 이야기 때문에, 그니까 speaking 이 아니고 writing 이야기 때문에 영어, 그니까 언어적인 측면에서 조금 더 편한 거도 있지?
535: 서영: 더 편하다는 건 제가 이해를 좀 더 일단 잃으면 더 확실, 내가 이해한 거에 대해서 좀더 신화감이 있는 거구, 그러니까 반응이 내 반응이 일단 영 엉 oma, 이상한 소리는 아니더라도 생각을 하는거구. 근데 말을 할 때는, 내가 반응을 하기로 말을 하면서 두 이게 도태해 맞는 상황인지 이게 가끔 혼란할 때가 있는
536: 미경: 음, 그러면 그 output 은 어때? 자기가 말하는 거랑 그 내용이랑, 그리고 쓰는 거랑에 비해서는 일반 speaking 보다는 writing 이 더 나, 나, 낫다고 생각을 하면 크게 좀 더 그런 면에서 좀 더 힘들고, 그니까 언어적으로
힘든 건을 덜하겠네, 그러면? Cyberspace에서는? 확실히가?

541: 서영: 그런 예를 어떤 표현을 하는 게 힘들고 안전하다고 이것 보다는요, 좀 확신을 가지고 반응을 보이는 거나, 그니까 예를 들어서, 또 예를 들어도 되나요?

560: 서영: 그런 면에서는 읽는 게 더 저한테 편한거같에요. 편하다는게 좀 확
561: 미경: 확신을 가지고
562: 서영: 예, 확신을 가지고 반응을 보이는 거나가.

566: 서영: 그리고, 또 쓰는 거랑 말하는 거랑의 차이라면 뭐, 쓰다고 해서 뭐
업정 표현을 유창하게 할 뿐, 몇 아닌 것인지, 그니까 야무레도
문법적인 실수는 좀 덜 하겠죠. 일단 말할때는 막 가끔 be 동사랑 일반동사도
해깔길 때가 있거든요. 근단 쓰기는 그런 실수는 줄어드니까.

571: 미경: 내가 말할 때는 내가 얼마나 확신을 갖고 얘기하는가 그니까
572: 서영: 그건의 일상적인 대화는 상, 별 차이가 없는데, 무슨 주제에 대해서
와기 할 때는 그게 구분이 확실한 거 같에요.
573: 미경: 그렇다. 응.
574: 서영: 내가 들기 반응하는 거랑, 읽고 반응하는 거랑.
575: 미경: ...Okay, 응, 그니까 그런 면에서 language 가 군이
cyberspace 라서 더 어렵다는 거 보다는 확신이 틀린다 크게 중요한 거나?
576: 서영: 그렇네.

580: 서영: 그리고 또 그런 것도 있죠. 말을 하면 말을 할 때는 사건을 편기가
581: 미경: 그렇다. 그만큼 확신도 더 되는거고.
582: 서영: 예.

Excerpt #33.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)

227: 근정: 수업시간에 얘기하는 거는 하기 바로 전까지는 막 긴장이 되지만, 
228: 미경: 그런 게 있죠, 그밖에 집에 가서 
229: 근정: 해야하는 거는 하기 전까지 되게되게 하기 싫구 전지족을 거 같지만, 하구나면 
발할 때보다 좀 실수를 덜었던 거거나, [웃음] 그냥 그렇게 좀 있구 그런 거
같에도.
230: 미경: 실수가 덜 됐겠거나? 아, 
231: 근정: 왜냐하면 한두 번 더 보게 되는 거니까, 이렇게 해크를 하구 고칠
수저 있는거니가.

311: 근정: 별로 없는 거 같에도. Web-CT 가 좀더 쉬울까요? 네 생각을
312: 근정: 시간도 있고, language 때문에 그렇겠죠.
313: 근정: 더 발할 시간을 벌 수 있으니까 그래서 또 이렇게 주장하는 것도
이렇게 순서가 있는 거 같아요. 그렇게 이렇게 차례대로 할 수 있는 거고, 말로 하는 거는 그냥 이렇게 막 빼으면 그만이니까, 아무래도 상대방을 설득시킬 수 있는 시간을 벌 수 있_RCC네.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)
559: 지영: 응, 내가 생각해서, 올리는 거니까, 천천히 이렇게 생각해보고, 말로 이렇게 만들어서 하는 거니까, 이게 편해요.

....
576: 지영: 응, 정 안되면, 표현이 잘 안된다 싶으면 긴게 쓰면 되니까, 이 말로 써보고 저 말로 써보고 여러 말로 써서, 그러면 지가 그 중에 한문장은 이해해겠지.

(Document: Sookie_Interview4)
127: 미경: listserv 나 e-mail 같은 경우에는,
128: 숙희: 시간을 두고 내가 생각하면서 쓸 수 있으니까, 그렇게 한데,

....
132: 숙희: 예. 이거는 그냥 말하자마자 바로 바로 말여지는 거지만 e-mail은 아니니까, 그런 거 같어요.
133: 미경: 응, 좀 더 시간을 두고 자기 생각을 정리하고,
134: 숙희: 예.

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
24: 숙희: 근데 그런거는 생각해보면 되게 말로 하는 거보다 그런 게 더 편했던 거 같아요.

....
28: 숙희: 예, 다 외국인, 아니, 미국인이었던 거 같에요, 이름 보니까. 근데 진짜 생각이 좀 더 정리 해가면서, 내가 이런걸 몇장보고 싶은데, 말로 하게 되면은 벌써 끝난다고, 빨리 저 사람이 말을 들내면은 내도 생각할 틈조차 없이 그냥 빨리 내.lifecycle하는데. 뭐 이런 생각이 있을텐데, chatting 같은 경우에는 쓰다가 또 이거 아닌 거 같아. 그러니까 다시 시작하나 또 다시 쓰고 그리고 정확하게 '나 뭐 궁금하다. 이런 거 몇장보고 싶다.' 그러니까,

Excerpt #34.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview6)
81: 서영: 예, 그리고 일반 자기가 말을 이렇게 시작해서 자기가 끝까지 말을 빠르게하는 데 중간에 이렇게 언제
82: 미경: 누가 꺼
83: 서영: 내, 데님이나가 그냥 가만히 맡히고 있으면 수가 없잖아요. 그러니가 계속 하고 들어오니까 자꾸 있어버려요 자기가 하는 말을.

....
104: 서영: 예, 근데 그때 또 그렇게도 안타깝고요. 왜냐하면 이건 또 속도가 붙으니까, 수업시간에 별로 내가 말 못하고 막 중간에 생각이 안나서 가만히
있으면은 앞에서 누가 치고들어오는 사람은 없어도요. 그래도 다 가만히
105: 미경: (서영이가) 말 하는 중간에
106: 서영: 예, 제가 뭐하나 하고 그냥 다 적다가 보는데 이건 훗 말 막 할리고
하다가 콤판 까고 그 다음 까 치고 있는데 맨 애들이 왜 까구 맨 얘기하고
[웃음]
107: 미경: [웃음] 영어는? 말하는 거보다는 그래도 잘 되지 않나?
108: 서영: 그러니까, 맨 주제가 있으니까, 거기에 대해서 내가 하고싶은 얘기는
더 하기가 힘들,
109: 미경: 혼들어?
110: 서영: 그것도 나름대로 혼들드라구요. 말하는 것두, 말하는 게 재일 힘들
중 알았거든요. 쓰면 좀 덜 힘들 중 알았는데,

Excerpt #35.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
126: 서영: 예, 말을 하, 그러니까 표현하기가 더 편한 거 같았어요. 맨 쓰다가
중간에 끊어두 ‘그래, 집안인…’라고 또 그냥, 끝까지 계속 쓰는 거예요, 맨.
[웃음 싱인] 문장을 쪽 만들어놓고 중간에 끊어가지고 enter 치고 끊어가지고
enter 치고,

135: 서영: 예, 예, 그리고 맨 하나막쳤을 때는 제가 끊었으니까 내가 말을
안하는 것이라 라는, 그, 변명거리같이 혼자 그냥 그렇게 생각하면서 그냥 대충
대충 그냥 끌어바랄 수도 있는거고. 근데 맨 말할때는 맨 언제, 또 애들이
매니가 좋아서 그런건지 아니면 그냥 뭐 애네 스타일이 그런 건지는 모르겠는데,
막 얘기를 하다가 그냥 맨 제가 맨 말이 막heimer요, ‘너 뭐뭐뭐 생각하지?’
이런게 그냥 누가 누군가가 해줬으면 좋겠는데, 분명히 못알아드는 것같은데도
다 눈을 끌어보고 가만히 있는거예요.

(Document: Sookie_Interview4)
294: 숙회: (Chatting 할때는) 말 실수를 벌로 안하는 거 같어요. 말 실수를
하다가도 어떻게 그냥 유머로 그냥 cover 쓰 하거나 그러저. 만약에 listserv
에서 말 실수를 했다 그러니까 이건는 엄청 맨 큰일 난 것 같구 [웃음]
298: 미경: 줄, 그러니까 리스트 listserv 같은 경우에는 Chatting 에 비해서
시간을 더 많이 투자해서도 붙일 수가 없고 그런 게 더, 더, 모르지, Chatting 같은
경우에는 금방금방 그거를 회복을 할 수가 있지만, .. 이건은 보내고나면
끝이니까,
299: 숙회: Chatting 은 그냥, chatting 에서 내가 문법이 떨였어도 내가 친
개 그냥 바로 올라가면 ‘아이 몸값, 그냥 여체 수 없어.’ 그냥 그리고 마는데, listserv 나 뭐 e-mail 은 또 다를가? [웃음] 그런 거 같은 경우에는

(Document: Sookie_Interview6)
299: 숙회: 그러니까 맨 영어, 이렇게 한번 이렇게 맨 뜯고나면 내가 잘못친게 맨
띄고나면 ‘될, 할 수 없지.’ 이렇게 계속 올라가면서 넘어지니까. 근데 E-mail
같은 경우에는 맨 임으면서 그렇게 바로바로 이렇게 될 거 같어요. 잘못된 게,

304: 미경: 그러니까 그렇게 한편으로는 chatting 에서 영어 때문에 부담이 되긴
하지만 실수를 하더라도 벌로 뭐
305: 숙회: 그냥 말로 그랬던 것처럼, 말로 그냥 한번 내뱉고나서 ‘아, 잘못됐다’ 그러면은 ‘아이씨, 대충 이해했었지.’ 이라고 말구. 영어 이렇게

251
문장으로 이렇게 나오게 되면은 ‘아, 이제 이렇게 좀 고칠걸.’ 이런 생각이 들죠.

... 316: 숙희: 아쉬워-- 이러는데, 그냥 chatting 으로 되면 ‘아이구, 할 수

Excerpt #36.
(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
290: 은지: 글쎄. 어렴다라고 점도 사전찾아서 쓰면되고 문법만은 거 퉁크하면서
쓰면되고, 근데 말할 때는 그렇게 안되냐고, 근데 모르겠어, 언니. 무슨 말을
하든지 꼭 말은 더 빨리 될 것 같아, face-to-face 가. 왜나하면, 말이 안되면
제스처되어도 하고 그림까지 그려가고, 위, 따른 예를 많이 들고 그렇게 하지만,
그 문장을 Listserv 에 문장은 한번 이렇게 씩놓고 나면 그만이잖아요. 그리고 난
사람들은 잇을 때 ‘이게 무슨 말이지?’ 그러면 그렇게 끝나는 거 아니. 근데
말하는 경우에는 내가 이런 한 문장을 얘기했다. ‘아, 그렇게 잘 편지
모르겠어요.’ 이러면 ‘아, 그렇게 귀하_TRANSACTION 예를 들어서 말이지, 이렇게 이렇게’
이런게 있잖아요. 그림을 따라서 얘기를 한대든지. 결론에는 이해할 수 있는데,
Listserv 같으면 ‘도대체 무슨 말 쓴건데?’라고 Listserv 로 reply 하기
전까지는 아무도 그사람이 무슨 말인지 모르고 넘어갈 수 있잖아요. ...

Excerpt #37.
(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
323: 미경: [웃음] 그림 얘기, cyberspace 에서 얘기하는 게, 위, 여기,
일상생활에서 얘기하는 거에 비해서, 그 output 을 놓고 봤을 때, 여기서는
말하는 거고 (real life), speaking 이고, 여기서는 (cyberspace)
writing 인데, 그걸 놓고 봤을 때, 뭐라 그러지? 그, quality 라고 그냐?
Linguistic quality 라고 해야 되는가? 그런 거는 그래도 cyberspace 가 조금
높음을까? Grammar 그런 거 때문에? 그런 게 조금 나아서?
324: 유선: 근데 실제로 communication 하기에는 그냥 말하는 게 훨씬 편하죠.
Cyberspace는, 예를 들어서 내가 열심히 내가 생각해해서 말을 써는데
그쪽에서 못 알아들으면, 표절도 모르고 뭐 상황도 모르고 이런식으로 되니까.

330: 미경: 음, 음, 맞어, 실생활에서는 이게 facial
331: 유선: 예를 들어, 대충 표절을 보고, 제가 뭐라는 걸 생각할 품가지, 
내지는 단어 몇 개를 들고, 역량을 보고, 메려잡을 수는 있잖아요. 근데
뭐라 그러지? Cyberspace 는, 내가 열심히 쓴데 못 알아들끔 수도 있잖아요.
가끔, 그, 뭐라 그러지? subscribe 한거 보면 일본에들끼는 또 모를 때도
있어요, 제가.

(Document: Yuseon_Interview4)
205: 미경: [웃음] 그러면 만약에 선생님이 그 독감은 선생님이 자기가 e-mail
보낸 내용이라, 아니면 수업시간에, 그, 수업 마치고 얘기하는 자기 모습이랑
했을 때 어떻게 느낄 거 같아?
206: 유선: 아따 독감이 생각할걸요. 근데 아마 가서 얘기하는 게 더 냉다고
봐요, 표절을 보고 얘기하는 게 더 효과적인거같에.
207: 미경: 웃으니까?
208: 유선: 예. 조금 아까도 Chemistry Lab (점수) 받았는데 내가, 그 인도
여자는 뭐, 여자이하 그런지 몰라도, 열심히 내가 옷으면서 설명하니까 다시
왜주겠다고 그러더라고요. 예를 들어서 mail 로 써보는 경우에는 아마
안그랬을거야. 특히 우리 TA 같은 경우에는 남녀 무심해서 그냥 얼굴을 확실히
얼굴을 뗄때 하고 하는 거는 눈을 보고 말하니까 좀 그렇게 있는 거 같애요.

(Document: Yuseon_Interview5)
541: 미정: 음, 그러면은, 음, 아니, 그리고, 선생님한테 가서 얘기할 때 가서
 얘기하는 게 e-mail 로 하는 거 보다 더 낫겠다고, 표정을 보고 얘기하니까 더
효과적이라고.
542: 유선: 예, 네.
543: 미정: 그러면은 e-mail 이 되면은 그렇게 없어지는 거같아, 표정을 할 수가
없으니까. 그러면은 거기에 대해서 자기가 대처를 어떻게 하는 거 같애?
그리나 내가 실제로 얘기면 이렇게 이렇게 얘기할 수 있을텐데 그걸
못하니까, 뭐 어떻게 뭐 더 긴게 쓰다든지 아니면 더 많이 쓴다면지 어떤
식으로?
544: 유선: 무언 설명을 많이 쓴것조?
545: 미정: 많이 써?
546: 유선: 예.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)
617: 지영: 만약에 chatting 을 하는 경우라면, 금방금방 서로 답을
해야되야만, 그런 경우에는, chatting 이면, 글을 빨리 못 catch 하면, 이
경우에는 (real life) 게 말투나, 이렇게 눈빛을 보거나,
618: 미정: 그렇지, contextual key 같은 게 있잖아.
619: 지영: 이게, 뭐 그러면서, 뭐, 내가 뭐, 뭐 이렇게 하면은, 뭐가 뭐
무슨 단어를 말했는데 내가 맞았어들은 듣면 그런 표정 탁저으면 개개가 이거
 lda라고 이렇게 탁 해줄 수 있는데, 여기선 (cyberspace) 그렇게 없으니까, 들는,
그리나 이해하는 데서는, 이게 별로 도움이 안되겠다.
620: 미정: cyberspace 가?
621: 지영: 음, 근데 표현하는 데서는 이게 도움이 되었네.
622: 미정: 아, 음, 그렇겠네. definitely 그렇다. ...

(Document: Sunghae_Interview3)
301: 일본의 것에 대한 또 다른 예: 진화로 하는 게 아직도 힘든다. 만나서
(face-to-face) 하는 경우에는 눈치같은 걸로 하면 되는데 진화는 그렇게
없어지니까 전짜 힘든다.
302: 물론 이런 눈치같은 걸 cyberspace 에서는 없어지긴 하지만 그래도
chatting 이 더 낫다.

Excerpt #38.
(Document: Sunji_Interview3)
131: 은지: 문법은 누구나 다 들어는건데, 말 잘하는 예는 잘하잖아요, 미루고두도 문법은 들릴 때 있잖아. 그리고 Listserv 는 여차와 문법 신경
안쓰고 다 그냥 쓰고싶은 말 쓰레니까, 편하게 쓰고, 그리고 일단 앞에
안보이잖아요, 사람.
.....
140: 은지: 근데 listserv 는, 일방적으로 내가 올리고 맡아버리면 그만이잖아.
상대방이, 뭐 어떻게 뭐 표정이 보이는 것도 아니고,
141: 미경: 뭐 옛든 말든 상관없어?
142: 은지: 상관 없지.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview5)
49: 미경: 어, 그러먼은 실생활에서 얘기하면 벌써거릴 결 chatting 에서는 좀 정리 할 수 있었으니까, language 에 대한 부담은 좀 적었다, 그러먼은.
50: 숙희: 부담은, 예, 얼굴이 안보이니까 첫제로. 그리고 두번째는 우선, 근데 잘 모르겠어, 어, 얼굴이 안보이는 게 제일 큰 거 같아요. 왜냐하면 내가 말을 이렇게 외국인하고 했을 때, 만악에 무법이 들린다, 단어가 좀 맞지 않는 단어를 쓴다, 뭐 이라면은 되게 맘 죽혀하고 맘 어려워 같은데 그냥 chatting 으로 문장 하나 막 쓰면 그냥 문맥에 맞게 그냥 '그러네' 그냥 나도 그냥 모르고 그냥도 나 모르고 [웃음] 그냥 알려준 거만 그냥 대충 의미만 파악해서 정보 전달만 해주면 되니까

Excerpt #39.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
645: 서영: 그런 점차 너무 싫었어요. 근데 그때는
646: 미경: 음. 왜 그렇게 싫었을까요, 그냥 부담되는 거 때문에? 아니면은
647: 서영: 아, 그렇게 할 것도 많았는데 그것도 해야하는 거구, 너무 반이한
 얘기를 또 해야되니까
653: 서영: 그래서 제가 초반에 좀 막 해버리구 그냥 빼서 끝냈으면 딱
했을텐데 계-속 미루다가 결국은 속أما 해가, 속أما 했어왔으니까

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
210: 미경: [웃음] 그 listserv 에는, 그게 하는 거는 어떻게? 재밌어요?
Posting 하는 거는?
211: 숙희: 그거는, 재미로 하는 건 아니에, 근데 몇, 한 학기에 몇 개
올리아웃다고 그러려구요.

....
223: 미경: 재밌어요?
224: 숙희: 별 재미는 없는 거 [열봐무리듯]

(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
477: 미경: 음, 그, listserv, 자기 그 때 지난번에 posting 한 거 봤더니, 어번 에가 두 명인가, 자기 얘기한 거에 대담한거 봤어? 혹시?

....
480: 유선: 아니, 관심도 없어요.
481: 미경: 그니까 이제 (108.01 listserv), 내가 이번 학기에 안한 이유 중의 하나가,
482: 유선: 예의 관심이 없죠?
483: 미경: 그러니까 너무 그냥 의무감에서 하는 예의가 너무 많기 때문에,
484: 유선: 그러니까 솔직히 의무감이에요. 100 프로. 나는 이걸 즐겨서 한다는 예는 몇 봤어요.

....
487: 미경: listserv 를 한다는 거에 대해서 어떻게 생각을 했어요? 108 에서,
488: 유선: 저는 솔직히 별로 봐주기 같아요. 예의 내용은 다 떠하다리요, 정말.
그러나 한계가 있어요. 그럼기 때문에, 개 idea 나, 내 idea 나, 앞질에 idea
나, 다 비슷한거리 뭐,
492: 미경: 응, 뭐 군이 세상스럽게 또,

(Document: Sunghae_Interview2)
16: 미경: 지난번에는 그런 얘기한적아. 너, 근데 아직 listserv 안 올렸지?
17: 설혜: 뭐요? Final 전까지만 올리면 되, 근데 최소가 몇 개 예요?
여름개란 얘기 들었는데.
18: 미경: 몰라? 3 개 3 갯가?
19: 설혜: 세개요? Course packet 에 at least two 라고 돼있겨요.
20: 미경: [listserv posting requirement 설명] .
21: 설혜: 다 읽어보고 있겨요, 근데, 별씨 애들이 말 다해가지구요, 제가 쓸 말이 없어요.

(Document: Sunghae_Interview5)
322: 미경: 그럼 그, 그냥, 그게 requirement 나가 그냥 한겨내,
323: 설혜: [내 말에 뒤이어서] 한게요.
324: 미경: 아무 생각이 없이 했구만,
325: 설혜: 안했어요, 안했어요.
326: 미경: [웃음] 그림 이걸 누가 보든지 말든지, 그냥,
327: 설혜: 상관없죠.
328: 미경: 그냥 essay 쓴 거 에서 copy, paste 해서,
329: 설혜: 그냥, 일단, 예,
330: 미경: 응,
331: 설혜: 근데 그게 지منذ만이 아니라 모든 아이들이 그래요, 상관을 안하고 그냥, 다 그렇게 올넌어요.

Excerpt #40.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview4)
16: 서영: 아 그리구 마지막에 너무 게우르게. 그거까지 할 시간이 없었어요.
[웃음] 완전 날반이, [웃음]
근대 도저히 거기다가는 그럴 못쓰겠더라구요.

22: 미경: 왜?
23: 서영: 그냥, 뭐 막 틀릴 거 같은, 아니, 여러 사람이 보는 뭐 그런 것도 있고, 충분하게 못받침 못하고 그냥 `난 이렇게 생각해' 하고요만큼만 하면, 보는 사람이, `제, 어떻게?' 막 이런 거 같은 생각도 들고,
24: 미경: 아, 그러니까 paper 는 자기가 그렇게 얘기해놓고도 그럴 support 할 수 있는 걸
25: 서영: 예, 쓸 수 있으니까. 왜냐하면 몇 장을 써야하는 거니까. 그리고 그거는 그만큼 노력을 들일 [웃음] 가지가 있는데 이거는, 근데 송적히 너무 게으르고 하기 싫어가지고 안해요. 했어봤죠, 당연히. 맘 애들도 다 하는데 내가 뭐 잘못된다고...

Excerpt #41.
(Document: Jiyoung Interview3)
522: 미경: [그 부분을 읽으면서] 그냥 자기가 만약에 좀 strong 한 feeling 이 있더라도 우리가 하는
523: 지영: 비관에 대해서 strong 한 feeling 은 말하지 않죠, 잘.
524: 미경: 그러면, 한국 사람들이, 예비들은 critique 하고 criticize 하고를 구분을 하잖아요. criticize 는 좀 나쁜 거지만, critique 은 그냥 발전을 위한, 그렇게 생각하는 하지만 한국문화에서는 그래도 still,
525: 지영: 몰다, 음.
526: 미경: 니가 내 거에 대해서 말하는 거에 대해서는,
527: 지영: 안되죠, 음, 우리나라 밖도 없지.
528: 지영: 찐 찐 아닌 이상에는,
......
533: 지영: 여기는 많이 하잖아요. peer-review, journal 에 꼭 peer-review 가 몇 개씩 들어가는데, 한국에서 누가 그렇게 peer-review 써봐, 난리나지. 씨우고 난리날거야, 그 둘어서, 학회 같은데서, 난리나지.
......
542: 미경: 그냥 그런 거는 한국사람의 입장이 그대로 되는 거네, 그런.
543: 지영: 꼭 그런 거야, 안하죠, 음.
544: 미경: 음, 그런거, 좀 더 하고 싶어도, 그럼 positive comment 만 해? 그러면은, 아니면은 하더라도,
545: 지영: 아니, negative 는 하지만, 원만하면 선은 넘지 않죠.
546: 미경: 음.
547: 지영: Cynthia 처럼 맘 `bullshit 이다' 뭐 이런 맨은 안하지.

Excerpt #42.
(Document: Sookie Interview5)
218: 미경: 그럼 이런 조금 있으면 e-mail 도 자기도 그렇게 쓰게 되었다?
219: 속희: 가끔 그렇게 쓰는 거, 예,
220: 미경: `Hi,’ 이런 거 안하고 그냥, `Have a good weekend’ 이런 거 안하고,
221: 속희: 그냥 예, 뭐 `I’ve got your e-mail.’ 근데 `you said blah blah blah’ 근데 `나는 이렇게 그러다 써 있으면 또 보내라,’ 그냥 되게 좀 전짜로 되게 사무적으로 가는 거 같에요.

256
미경: 응,
숙희: 되게 좋 이기주의적이라면 이기주의적이고,
미경: 그럴 그렇게 직접적으로 써놓은 e-mail 을 자기가 한번씩 보잡아.
숙희: 어, 내가 조금 옛날 하고 틀리네, 라는 생각은 해?
미경: 예, 조금 다른 거 같애요.

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
384: 숙희: 저같은 경우에는 맛에 애들이 그렇게 부른다 교수를 first name으로 부른다 그러먼 e-mail에도 그냥 그렇게 보낼 거 같애요.

(Document: Sookie_Interview6)
150: 숙희: 되게 막 선생님이라는 그런 거 때문에 되게 막 말하는 것도 그렇고 그런데 그거는 거의 문화가 달라서 여기는 그래도 선생님하고 학생들하고 그냥 우리가 배우는 입장이지만 그렇게 꼭 예절을 꼭 지켜야한다고든지 막
미경: 격식이나
숙희: 예, 그렇게 별로 없으니까,
미경: [동시에] 그렇게 없으니까,
숙희: 형식이 별로 없으니까, 그런 거 아닐까? 문화가 달라서 그런 거 아닐까?

Excerpt #43.
(Document: Jiyoung_Interview5)
266: 미경: 응, 근데 그거 말고도 그 이후에도 재는 계속 그런 식으로 나가는데 ...' 그러니까 내가 자기 Jiyoung에 대해서 사람들이 얘기하는 걸 보면, 이렇게 말들이, 이거는 좋은 포인트다 이거 잘 써먹었다 뭐 그런 말들이 많았던 거 같애.
267: 지영: 그러니까 개발하고 나하고 생각하는 게 다르니까,
268: 미경: 응,

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview5)
359: 지영: (it's hard to think of) 애들이 이해할 수 있는 삶의 예.

Excerpt #44.
(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
124: 미경: 응, 그럴 그렇게 똑같은 listserv 들이랑 culture를 share하지 않는다는게 거기서 일단 막히니까 그런 거 같애.
125: 유선: 그렇죠. 그렇죠. 우선 표현 방법이 한계가 있어요. 왜냐하면 똑같은,
은유를 쓰더라도, 한국말로 하는 은유를, 그거를 영어로 번역했을 때의 은유랑은 좀 차이가 있잖아요. 그래도 그런게, 그런게 제일 많이 들어가요. 내가 일단 번역을 한다는 거, 그런게 제일 많이 들어가 거 같아요.

...  
131: 미경: 음, 그러니까 정말 자기 feeling 에, truthful 하지가 않고, 그냥,  

132: 유선: 우선 나는, 번역을 하고보는 거예요. 욕에서 번역이 이미 다 되어서 쓰는게 미국 선생님이 보기에 이건 분명히 무슨 소린지 모르겠다는 거예요. 근데 반역에 다른 한국 사람이 이 글을 읽으면 당연히 자기도 똑같이 번역을 할 거 아니예요. 미리에서. (English) 110 선생님도 (non-native) 내가 보기에는 분명히 이런 미국 선생님이 보면 못 이해할간데 선생님은 그래도 이해할만 말이에요. 비록 점수는 잘 안되기.DO.  

...  
Excerpt #45.  
(Document: Jiyoung Interview5)  
22: > How are you, Professor?  
23: > What day is available to you in order to meet me regarding an independent study?  
24: > Thank you so much.  
25: >  
26: > P.S. The following is my Summer class schedule.  
27: > T 1:30-3:48 - HDFS 862  
28: > W 12:30-3:00 - HDFS 862  
29: > R 12:00-5:00 - WORK  
30: > F 12:00-5:00 - WORK JIYOUNG LIM  

Excerpt #46.  
(Document: Yuseon Interview4)  
116: 유선: 근데 여차대 영어는 좀 다르면 별로 없어서, 그럼말야요.  
121: 미경: 문장말이 별로 없어서 그니까 신경을 별로 안쓰죠?  
122: 유선: 그렇게는 안쓰죠. 예를 들어서 뭐 그. 아주 막 왜 처음에 미국에들 들어 'What's up, man?' 'S'up, man?' (not sure) 뭐 많이 쓰잖아요.  
125: 미경: 그건 아니면 한국말 표현이, 그런 거만 피하면.  
126: 유선: 예, 별로 상관없는 거 같아요.  
127: 미경: 그런가 그러곤한, 한국말로 만약에 교수님한테 e-mail 을 보낸다면 이런건, 일단 그 자세가 [웃음]  
128: 유선: 예, 그렇. '안녕하십니까, 교수님? ... 잘지내십니까? 날씨는 어떻고 ...' 근데 미국에서는 그렇게 알걸까요. 위 날씨가 어떻고, 교수님 반날 보는데, [웃음]  
129: 미경: 음, 그냥그런 게 그러니까 좀 없어지는 거다. 그러지 말가 이렇게 왜사람하고 아랫사람의 그 한국말간 그럴까  
130: 유선: 예, 그런 건 없, 예, 언어차이인 거 같아요.  
131: 미경: 그냥그게 이쪽으로 영어로 넘어오면서 그걸 아예 생각을 안하는 건가, 그러니, 영어 차이에 그게 없기 때문에?  
132: 유선: 없으니까. 예, 사실 한국말로 생각하면서 써두, 교수한테 좀달말한다는 생각은 별로 안해요. 뭐 '그렇습니까?' 이렇게 생각을 안해요.  '그러냐?' [웃음]
미경: 미국 교수한테 쓰 때는,
유선: 예, 군이 존댓말이 아니니까, 영어로. '숙제가 무엇이나?' 생각을
할 때 그렇게 해요.
미경: 어, (알겠다는) 그, 좀, 그러니까, 자세가 그네가 들리거든요.
유선: 예.

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
미경: 음, 그러면 여기서 선생님한테 e-mail 보내는 거에 있어서,
이것도 일반 culture의 문제에, 평급 자기가 계열 얘기했으니까 그런데
그런 게 조금은 줄어드는 거 같에, 그러면요? 미국 culture가 그렇게 많이 뭐

숙희: 예, 더 줄어들죠. 그러니까 내가,
미경: 일단 말에서 차이가 나니까, 한국은 뭐 '하셨어요', 미국말은
그렇지는 않감아.
숙희: 예, 맞아, 그냥 그런 가식적인 거 이렇게 막 사족같은 거 다
필요 없으니까, 그러니까 여기 때는 그렇게 되게 편한 거 같에요.

(Document: Gunjeung_Interview3)
근정: 음, 음, 그러면 그 아까 '영어로 얘기하면 좀 더 직접적이
해야,' 이랬거든. 그랬는데 그럼 그게 한국말로 chatting 알 때랑 영어로
chatting 알 때랑으로 비교하면 어릴까?
근정: 그래, 그래 그전 그, 영어로 얘기하면 좀 더 직접적이된다는 게 그렇게
. 그만 놓고 볼 때, 그게 그러면 여기로 넘어가면은, chatting 을 하게
되면은 영어로 얘기하는 거는 그대로 유지가 돼?
근정: 음, 그대로 유지 해주죠.

(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)
미경: 더 잘하는 거보다 '시간을 벌 수 있으니까'; [웃음] 그 말을
많이 한 거 같에. Culture 하고 gender 는 별 상관 없다 그런지? 일단
영어로 하게 되면은 별, 자기가 그, 거기에 대한 미국사람 그니까 미국
culture에 대한 지식이 없을 뿐더러 그렇게 할 맛, 표현할 만큼, 그게 영어가
그, 구분이 안해서 별로 (상관이) 없다 그런지?
근정: 음. [끄덕끄덕]

Excerpt #47.
(Document: Jiyoung_Professors)
16: JY-Teacher2: Yes, very surprising, ... very surprising. (to see Jiyoung being assertive and correcting other in her first
quarter)
20: JY-Teacher2: Well, just because my previous experience with
Korean ... or Asian ... students in general that ... usually they take
a long time to get ...
... ...
110: Mikyung: ... So were you surprised when she first came here
and talked about, I mean, kind of, criticizing or critiquing
your articles up front?
111: JY-Teacher: Yes. ... For two reasons. ... Um, one, students typically don't do that ... and two, I really felt that culturally ...

123: Mikyung: Um-hmm. So, uh, by ... saying that you’ve been culturally ... kind of shocked when you saw her, I mean, critiquing your articles ... that means ... when you see a student, you ... kind of, I mean, ... how do I say it, um, ... ... put a cultural background around her, or around those people? ... ...

124: JY-Teacher: And I've had the experience of working with other Korean students ...

126: JY-Teacher: ... who have been very reluctant ... um, ... to ... engage ... at that level. So, yes. Um-hmm. And plus, the other thing, too, though, I think that needs to be said is it’s not just um ... it’s not just uh, her nationality, but it’s also the fact that ... from a gender perspective,

129: Mikyung: Um-hmm, um-hmm, ... so when you saw her uh ... doing those things so you could ... just say that it’s ... maybe un-Korean ... un, ...

130: JY-Teacher: un-Korean and un- ...

131: Mikyung: un ... female,

132: JY-Teacher: (un-) feminine, yes.

(Document: Elena_Professor)

77: Mikyung: Okay. [laugh] ... How’s, how’s her performance in Web-CT?

78: Elena-Teacher: ... Oh, fine. She always has ... a lot to say, ... she poses a lot of very good questions, ... uh ... she’s not afraid to state her opinion, ... uh ... you know both the reading and what other people had to say ...

79: Mikyung: Um-hmm, um-hmm, ... when you say she is not afraid to pose her opinion ... do you think it is a, um, ... American thing (?) or ... just normal thing to do in American class or as a abnormal thing ... ...

80: Elena-Teacher: It would be ... a normal thing to do in American class, but ... I think she does it more than the typical American ... student

81: Mikyung: Oh, ... you think so?

82: Elena-Teacher: ... in terms of being ... confrontive about ... the findings or what ... the value of the article ... or what other people said, ... all likely to give her opinion and feel strongly about it. ... So I would say more than the typical American ... 

(Document: Sunghae-Teacher)

19: SH-Teacher: ... The other thing about her which I think is cultural is, I felt a lot of the times she was very impolite. ... She doesn’t make eye contact, I know that. But other times, I will be talking and she will walk away, or ... you know that kind of behavior. Even, even as an ESL teacher, even knowing that she is from a different culture, it still ...

annoying sometimes. Especially her,

20: Mikyung: ... ... I think she is a little bit confused about what the American culture is like, ...
21: SH-Teacher: Right, ... And that’s, there’s no boundaries there, which there need to be. ... You know, never, when I give her paper back, never a thank-you, never, never any kind of, ... you know, “niceities” that go along with. I mean, the other Korean students are very different, I thought. Even ... the couple of the males I had in the class, who were similar to her. They are very weak in class, they weren’t performing. But they were, they were appreciative, they were, they were ... gracious, they were friendly.
25: SH-Teacher: Um, ... because most, most Korean people I know are very polite. But there is something about her I think ... very, ... um, ... very careless, very thoughtless, ... not purposely, not on purpose.
46: SH-Teacher: Because, ... it’s gonna be a recurring problem, you know. Um, ... I think, ... you know I’ve been teaching for 9 years, and, ... most ESL students are, are much more, ... I don’t know how to put it, ... They, they either retain their culture’s, you know, interpersonal norms and they’re, they’re polite, and they’re, you know, very gracious, extra polite, like, Youngmin, for example, he’s still ... you know, bows to me whenever I give him his paper. ... Or, they become,

Excerpt #48.
(Document: Jiyoung_Interview4)
628: 지영: 그런가 그렇게 (JY-Teacher’s reaction to Jiyoung’s critique of his article - different from what he thought Korean students would do) 고정관념 아닌가요? 한국 애들은 Asian 은 어리지 않음인데 ....
632: 지영: 아니지, ... (linguistic skill 도) 떨어지는는데 인체 critique 을 하니까.
633: 미경: 그러니까, 그러니까 그거는 자기네들 생각이야.
634: 지영: 그러니까 critique 을 할려면 어느 정도 language 도 되고, 같은 나라 에라서 문맥을 파악해야 찾아가는데 그런 게 적다고 생각하는데도 불구하고 그렇게 했으니까 선생님들은 생각보다 많이서 다른 애들 보다 많이서 그렇게 받아들이는 거고, 나는, 내 하던 거 보다 줄인거야.

Excerpt #49.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview3)
20: 서영: classroom 에서 보여질 때는, 소극적인 학생이겠죠. [웃음]
24: 서영: 그래서 그것을 따로 e-mail 을 보내서 표현을 하는, [웃음] 근데 전 향상 그런 식이유도, 여기와서. 한국에 있을 때는, 대학 다닐 때도 모르는 게 있어도, 질문하기가 되게 곤란해서 못했거든요. 못한 경우가 많았는데, 여기는, '모르는 게 있으면 언제든지 물어볼 수 있다' 라는 그 편안한 마음이 있거든요.

Excerpt #50.
(Document: Elena_Interview5)
Elena: 그리고 제가 이런 거에 대해서 인종에 대해서 이렇게 얘기할 때 수업 시간 때는 이런 거를 이런 얘기를 못했을 거 같아요.

Elena: Well, that, well ... the issue (racism) is sensitive. But not only that ... but not only that white people don't wanna hear this. ... [laugh] White people don't want to hear ... that ... that there's racism. Because white people don't believe it.

Elena: 예, 네, that, that racism exists. So when I write about okay, so um so when I write my reactions to the reading it's easier for me to just say, It's easier for me to get it out there. But during class I might not be able to.

Elena: 그리고 그 뭐지? Like, the other comments that I make during the Web-CT ... that I make here, ... um ... they sound more legitimate. ... If I make, if I make these comments in class, it sounds like I am complaining. ... For example, um ...

Excerpt #51.

(Electronic: Sookie_Interview4)

숙희: 어, 여, 그리고 이쪽에서는 (L2, Real life) 되게 뭐 culture 나 이런 거를 많이 생각하지, 그냥 뭐 예의나 뭐 이런 거 별로 생각안하고 그냥 말을 어떻게 전달할까 그런 데 focus 가 있는가하면, 이런테는 (L2, cyberspace) 인제 e-mail 이나 그렇게 시간을 두고 할 수 있는 거에서는 더, 어떻게 하면 조금 더 좀 polite 하게 보일까 뭐 이런 것도 좀 더 생각해가게되고, 말 같은 것도 그냥, 여, 영어로 그냥 말했을 때는 그냥 내 생각 전달하기에 따름 반면, 이거에서는 상대방이 나를 어떻게 받아들일까, 뭐 문법이나 이런 것도 다 생각해가게되고 그런 거 같아요.
미경: 음, 상대방이 어떻게 받아들일까 하는 거는 여기 한국말 얘기하는 거랑 마찬가지다, 그지?
숙희: 예.
미경: 음, 예, 예, 그런데 chatting 이나 이런 거에서는 그냥, 그래도 못하고, 그러고 거는 생각 못하고, 그런 것도 약간, 그, 내 생각 표현하는 데만 집중해있는 거 같아요.

숙희: 예, 그런 것처럼 (한국말로 할 때도 그런 것처럼) 어, 영어로 e-mail을 쓸 때도, 내 생각을 조금 더 조리있게 얘기할라고 하고, 조금 더 정리되고, 그리고 조금 더 이렇게 어떻게 보면 조금 더 formal한 거 같, formal 하잖아요, e-mail 두. 그러니까, 그런 거 같아요.

미경: 근데 우리는 뭔가 모름게 e-mail이라도 편지라는 생각을 하고 쓰는 거 같애.
숙희: 예, 언제나 이렇게 형식에 찍 맞춰갔구.

미경: 그냥 바로 질문으로 들어가면 좀 rude한 거 같기도 하고, 그래도 조금은 허전한 거 같기도 하고 멀까.
숙희: 그런 거 생각하는 거같애. 그러니까 한국 사람들 다 그렇게 써. 그렇게 들린 거 같더라고.

미경: 그래도 한국문화는 그런 형식이기 때문에 그런게 좀 있지만 그냥 바로 만나면, 조금 없어진다는 얘기가, 그지?
숙희: [끄덕] 예, 음.

미경: 그러니까 그렇게 한국 거에서 오는 거같애. 한국 culture라 그런 거서 오는 거같애.
숙희: 예, 맞아.

숙희: 예, 나보다 나이 많게 되면으로

Excerpt #52.
(Document: Sookie_Interview5)

숙희: 음, 더 공을 많이 들이죠, listserv를 할 때는. 그 한국사람들도 있고.

숙희: 음, 그리고 내가, 내가 선생님이대로 보내면 선생님이 내가 누구인지 알기 때문에 조금 내 가문법이 조금 틀리도 영어 선생님이나 외국인이 그렇게 가 얘기하고 그냥 내 질문에 대답해줄거를 만약에 listserv에 그러면 그건데 그렇게 왜 한국사람이 글 올리게 되면 그 사람걸 더 막[웃음] 주의 깊게 읽게되고.

미경: 뭐 들었는지 착크해?
많이 해 때

international

listserv

영어로 보는 더 많이 신경을 쓰고 시간도 많이 들이고,

listserv 보는 사람들도 어떻게 볼까 이것도 신경 쓰이지만,

listserv에 있는 한국사람들이 또 나를 어떻게 볼까 [웃음] 그것도 신경이 쓰이는 것 같애요.

영어로보내면 어떻게 볼까 이것도 숭고하네. 

.if 그리고 tentative 참고가지라 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어

영어로도 조금 쓴 나도 거기에다가 한줄은 영어로 써요. 하지만 영어 쓰는 거 [마이크에 다가가서] 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어...

미경: 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어?

미경: 영어로도 조금 쓴 나도 거기에다가 한줄은 영어로 써요. 하지만 영어 쓰는 거 [마이크에 다가가서] 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어...

미경: 자기도 그림 체크해? 한국사람이 영어로 보내면 한번 더 체크해?

미경: 아, 왜요, 한번 더 왜요.

영어로도 조금 쓴 나도 거기에다가 한줄은 영어로 써요. 하지만 영어 쓰는 거 [마이크에 다가가서] 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어...

영어로도 조금 쓴 나도 거기에다가 한줄은 영어로 써요. 하지만 영어 쓰는 거 [마이크에 다가가서] 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어...

영어로도 조금 쓴 나도 거기에다가 한줄은 영어로 써요. 하지만 영어 쓰는 거 [마이크에 다가가서] 싶어해야. 왜냐하면, 틀릴까봐 무서워서, 한국사람한테 영어 쓰는 게 더 실어요. 그래서 주로 안써요. 한국사람한테 휘어 영어...
미경: 그지난번에 listserv posting 할 때, 거기 한국 사람들이 다른 한국사람들이 보았아.

유선: 예.

유선: 은근히 안신경安东경다 그런 거짓말이구요, 은근히 신경은 쓰여요.

미경: 응, 한국사람이라는 거 때문에? 아니면은, 자기를 알 수도 있다는 거 때문에?

유선: 예. 예, 그런거 예를 들어서 훗아, 저 영어 못하는 줄 알아서 영어 잘못하네, 내가 저 영어 잘못하는 줄 알아서 영어 잘못하네 이런식으로 생각할까봐.

미경: 응, 그렇게 한국남자든 여자든 상관없어?

유선: 상관없구요.

미경: 그게 한국 남자든 여자든 상관없어?

유선: 그 신경 안 쓰드래두 하여튼 그래두 잘 써야겠다는 생각을 하면서 하고 있어요.

근정: 예 [끄덕끄덕]

서영: 아, 그랬을 수도 아, 그리고 어쨌든 이거 하면서 아, 이걸 하면서 술작히 108에 그 글 읽리는 거는 그것은 술작히 부담이었거든요. 언니두 일단 본다는 것도 그것도 부담이었고

유선: [웃음] 근데 제가 두개 올렸잖아요, 다섯개 올리야되는데
Excerpt #55.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview5)

214: 서영: Chatting 은 아니구, 반에 Web-CT 가 있어요, discussion 코너가 있는데, 근데 그럴 하는데 지난 학기랑 달라진 점이, 지난 학기는 너무 제미가 없어서라고 했던 신경을 쓰고 되게 막 내 문법이 둔들면 안된다, 막 이런 생각을 하면서 또 돼 그런 누구한테 문법을 물어보면서 그런 간끔해진 거. 그냥 혼자 지혼자 엄청 신경쓰고 들리면서도 그냥 그렇게 했는데 이번에는 이번에 움직여야할 거면, 근데 writing center 에 가서 다 수정해보고 싶었어요.

215: 미정: 아니-

216: 서영: 근데 코년데 스토레스가 쌓이는게 어, 스토레스는 아님데 근데 애견에는 또 미국이들이 왜 제가 지난학기에 말씀드릴 때 미국에들어 보는데는 별로 틀리DoubleClick 달 부담스럽다고 했잖아요, 근데 이번에는 근데 수업이어서 그런지 보르겠는데 막 재해가 잦으면서 '이거 무슨 소리는 하는 거야?', '뭐하러 지는 이런 수업들은지아?' 뭐, 그런 반응이 너무

217: 미정: 그럼까봐?

218: 서영: 예, 싫은겨예요. 그래서 진짜 막 한 다섯 carga 그런 거도 다 아닌 사람한테 해가지고 check 해서 올리고

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)

251: 미정: 예, 예를들어 얘기할 때는 내가 5의 생각을 하더라도 말을 좀 더 완벽하게 하기 위해서 좀 더 단순하게 얘기하는.

252: 서영: 네, 왜냐하면, 재해가 볼 때 재해가 볼 때, 일단 애의
생각은 이렇게_auc된에 서로 다 읽는 건데 17명이 아, 제 무슨, 도대체 이렇게 영어를 쓰면서 [웃음] 어떻게 이 수업에 안되냐니' 라고 생각하면 너무 씁쓸한거같아요.

**Excerpt #56.**
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview6)
71: 서영: 예, 막 내가 enter 누르면 지쪽에서 이미 앵 예기하고있구, 막 어떤 편 내 앵기가 무시 당하구, [웃음] 허튼 소리 막 그려주 또 막 가만 있고,
72: 미경: 뭐 허튼 소리야? 자기가 얘기했는데 앵 무시를 당해?
73: 서영: 아니 뒤 gode치니, 아, 앵들이, 앵들도 그렇다면, 막 조 앵들도 나중에 그러겠다고 그러더라구요.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
160: 미경: 그래 아무 그래 없으니까, 그래 무슨 뜻인지 다른 큐가 없잖아.

**Excerpt #57.**
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview2)
86: 미경: 만약에 그 group member 가 Chinese 나 Japanese 가 아니고 만약에 native 있어. 만약에 그런 e-mail 이 왔다, 그러면은 기분이 더 나빴을까?
87: 근정: 아, 88: 미경: 아, 이거 뭐 나를 무시하는 거야 뭐야? (라든가?) Asian 이라고, 89: 근정: 그렇겠죠. 더 나빴겠죠. Asian 이라고 보다는 얘네는 그림 영어를 어느 정도 잘 하는건데, 그게 자는 다른 사람의 의견을 먼저 물었겠죠. ‘이런 e-mail 을 받았는데 어떻게 생각하냐?’ 만약에 그렇게 진짜 direct 하고 기분 나쁜 e-mail 이라면, 더 화가 난겠죠. ‘애는 뭐 international 이라서 이해를 할 수 있는 것도 아니고, 어떻게 해는 나한테 그런 mail 을 보냈을까?’ 라는 그런 생각을 하면서 더 화를 냈겠죠.

**Excerpt #58.**
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview4)
467: 미경: [웃음] 선생님한테 e-mail 한번씩 보냈다고 했잖아요. . . 선생님이. 외국에 라는 걸 아니라 이해해주겠다고 생각하는 거도 있다고 했잖아요. 그러니까 아는 사람이네 쓰는 내가 한국 사람이 이런거를
전제를 하고 쓰는거네?.
468: 서영: 예.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview2)
93: 미경: 지난번에 그랬잖아요, listserv 에 내면, 한국어들이 보면, grammar 를 봤거 보고 '아, 여거 봤었구나' 봤 그럴까봐 안 올린다고 그랬어요.
94: 서영: 예.
95: 미경: 그럼 instructor 한테 보내는 거는, 별 그런, 서영: 예, 그런 없어요. [웃음]
96: 미경: 어--
97: 서영: 그런 근데 진짜, 예, 그러니까, 제 온연 중에 또 그 생각이 있는 거 같아요. 그냥 내가 외국어니까 이해해주겠지.

(Document: Yuseon_Interview4)
150: 미경: 그럼 여기 있는 선생님들은 그런식으로 보내면은.
151: 유선: 없어요. (한국교수님들처럼 그렇게 반응하는 경우가)
152: 미경: 자세하게 가르쳐, 이렇게 잘 대답을 해주는 편이야?

Excerpt #59.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview4)
825: 미경: 그림면은 Derrick 이상 밝고 뛰 사랑하고 얘기하는 거 하면은 지난번에 영어로 얘기할 때는 gender 는 별 상관 안한다고 그랬잖아요. 상관할게 없다. 그랬잖아요, 자기가 그
826: 근정: 아무래도 chatting 을 하면 실행할보다는 gender 는 좀 멀어지는 거 같애요. 그러니까 좀 더 생각하게 되는 거 같애요.
827: 미경: 음,.. 영어로?
828: 근정: 영어든 한국어든.

(Document: Sookie_Interview3)
156: 미경: 그러면 뭐 여자 이런 것도 별로 신경을 들 쓰겠다.
157: 숙희: 에, 별로 신경을 안쓰는 거 같애요. Chatting 이 나온 거 같애요. 별로 안좋은...

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
42: 숙희: 근데 돈이시면 chatting 했어요.
43: 미경: 어, 그러면 그사람이 남자든 여자든에 대해서는 별로
44: 숙희: 별로 (상관) 없었어요.

(Document: Yuseon_Interview3)
276: 미경: 그러면, 한국말로 chatting 할 때는 그리면, 궁궁거리네 게 그대로, 그대로 가? 그러면은?
279: 유선: 그럼대요, 애들이 맛, 야, 근데, 요즘, ... 야, 최근에 들어서, 제 친구, 남자애랑 chatting 할 하는데, 계속, 야, 말투가 귀여워졌다고, 막 이러는 거예요. 그래서, 야, 아니면, 근데 말투가 진짜 귀여워졌네요.
...
282: 미경: 그러면 뭐, gender 그런 거도 cyberspace 한국말로 할 때는 별 상관 없겠죠? 자기는 gender 는 별 그냥 아예,
283: 유선: 예, 저는 그냥 (gender) 신경을 안씁니다.

(Document: Yuseon_Interview5)
547: 미경: 음,
548: 유선: 그런 거 같네요. 상담할 경우에도 그러던 거 같네요. 뭐 그런 상담은 읽지도 않은 거 같드는.
549: 미경: 읽지도 않은 거 같네요? 그리고 미국 여자 선생님하고 남자 선생님하고 이렇게 뭐 e-mail 보내든지 하여간 얘기하든지 별 상관없다 그랬잖아요.
550: 유선: 예, 네.

(Document: Sunghae_Interview4)
704: 미경: 음, 그 얘기 지난번에 했었던 거 같네요. 자기는 일단 그, gender에 대해서는 별로 신경 안쓴대 그랬어요. 한국말로 하던, 영어는 신경을 쓰지 않어서 못쓴다고 그랬었죠,
705: 성혜: 예,
706: 미경: 그것까지 구분을 할 정도가 없어서 안한다 그랬었죠, 그리고 그 gender라는 게 한국 사람하고 일상 생활에서는 아무 문제가 안되고, cyberspace로 가서도 별로 문제가 안된다고 그랬어요?
707: 성혜: 예. 상관없어요.
708: 미경: 상관 없다고 그랬었죠?
709: 성혜: gender 에 대해서는 전혀 상관이 없어요.

(Document: Eunji_Interview3)
397 은지: 근데 listserv 에서는 언니 그런 남녀 그런게 나는 나타나는게 이혜가 안가.
...왜 그렇게 그렇게 나타나는건지.... 나타나긴 하는건지...
399: 은지: 모르겠어요, listserv 같은 경우에는 언니 슬쩍히 망악에 반구성원들이 다 알아. 그래서 은지 남자고 그는 여자고 그래서 다 알아, listserv 를 읽었을 때 그 이름을 보면 '아, - 은지 누구고 은지 남자고' 이런게 정보가 다 들어와. 그런 경우에는 언니가 말한 그런 뭐, 성, 그런게 나타날 수 있지만, 지금 우리같은 경우에는 몰라.
...
407: 은지: 나는 요변에, 나는 요변에 몰랐어요. 얘기 남자지 여자지...

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview4)
413: 미경: 안맞아?
414: 지영: 별로 신경을, 남자를 남자로 안보기 때문에.
415: 미경: 영어로는?
416: 지영: 영어로도 별로 남자를 남자로 안봐요.
417: 미경: 그러니까 한국, 한국, 한국말은 그대로 남아 있잖아, 그대로. 오히려 더 상세히 수도 있지.
418: 지영: 그니까 미국 남자를 남자로 안한다니가.
   ....
426: 지영: 다르게 생각했다. 남자로서 별로 매력이 안와.
   ....
433: 지영: 그러니까, 그런 잡 모르겠는데, 남자가 남자로 안와당아. 미국
남자인 경우에는.
434: 미경: 근데 여기서 미국 사람 사귀는 사람도 있잖아.
435: 지영: 그러니까 개들은 single 인 경우에 더 이제 민감해질 수 밖에 없는
상황이잖아요. 그런데 나는 상황도 그럴 필요가 없는 상황이고, 사회적인
억압으로 그래서도 안돼고,
   ....
439: 지영: 사회한테 영향을 안받을, 제약이야. 좋아, 여담은 취소다, 제약이야.
   constraint.
   ....
441: 지영: 대개 뭐가 나니깐, 이거는 될 생각 없고, 어디서 따오 수 있나면,
우리가 미국 사람 얼굴은 잘 구별 못해요. 미국 사람이 Asian 을 구별 못하는
처럼. 그러니까 본인이 자주 보지 않고 자주 접하지 않는 것에 대해서는 이렇게
지각적 변화 때문이야 멀어지지. 차이를 몰라.
442: 미경: [들شرو] 웅, 웅, 그러니까, 웅.
443: 지영: 그러니까, 모든 미국 남자가 다 같은 사람으로 보이는 데 그렇게
매력이, 한 특징 남자가 나한테 매력으로 올 수가 없잖아.

Excerpt #60.
(Document: Sookie_Interview3)
100: 숙희: 예, (근데 솔직히 글 쓰 때 여자가 어떻게 이런 거는,) 전혀
상관이 안되고, 그냥 영어로 쓴다 이런 것 보다, 우선 글로 이렇게 옮기니까
생각이 되게 더 정리갔다고 쓰는 거, 있고, 또 뭐가 있을까?
101: 미경: 아, 영어로 face-to-face 로 하는 것 보다?
102: 숙희: 예. 생각이 정리되서 인제 왜 이런 거 있어야요. 앞에 뭐 쓰고
중간에 뭐 쓰고 [웃음] 이런 거 조금 생기고,
   ....
117: 미경: 그러면 뭐 여자/남자 뭐 이런 것도 별로 상관 안하면.
한국사람이고 아니고 그런 것도 별로 상관없겠네?
118: 숙희: 예, 그런 거는, (별로 상관없어요)

(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
77: 숙희: (gender 등) 상관 없는데 진짜 영어가 제일 신경이 많이
쓰여요. 오래 남으니까 e-mail 같은 거는, 글자로 이렇게 맘 보이지니가.
   ....
81: 숙희: Chatting 은 또 이렇게 올라가면서 없어지지않아요. [웃음] 근데
e-mail 은 그냥 맘 한 화면에 계속 남아있으니까.
   ....
84: 미경: 뭐 한참 들어다닐 수도 있다는 거에 뒤게 부담이 된다는 거네?
85: 숙희: 예, 이거 약간 좀 심리학하고 좀 관련이 있는 거 같애,

(Document: Sunghae_Interview3)
244: 미경: 응, 그리고, 아, 찐분, 여, 뒤게 좋은 얘기 많이 했는데.
영어로 하면은 그거 (gender) 별로 생각 안한다는고,
245: 성혜: MSN 이 더 편하다.
246: 미경: 음, MSN 이 빠질 더 편하다. 영어로, 그러니까 잘 쓰진다.
그랬고, 아.

265: 그담에 그, cyberspace 로 chatting 하면은 전혀 상관없이 자기는 medium 만 달라진다는 거 봤어 지의 독 같다고 그랬는데,
266: 상해: 예, 예, 예.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)
484: 지영: cyberspace 에서 gender, 아무 상관 없겠죠.
485: 미경: 그러니까, 여기 인체 real life 에서 gender 보다 더 상관이,
486: 지영: 없겠죠.

....
492: 미경: 상관을 할때야 할 수가 없어.
493: 지영: 음, 상관을 할때야 할 수가 없어요. . . 이제 앞인지 뒷지도 모르겠고 어떻게든 뭐 이러기 때문에, 전혀 상관이 없어요.
494: 미경: 그러니까 last name 인지 first name 인지,

Excerpt #61.
(Document: Seoyoung_Interview5)
363: 서영: 예, 아주 공손하고 내가 감사한다는 걸 아주 100% 보여주고 싶고 그런 식으로 막 표현하고 이렇게 보면 좀 되게 문자로 쓰고, 그랬던 거 같구, 여기서도 여기서도 친찬하진 거 같애요. 여자 instructor 한테 mail 보낼 때는 문법 문법, 물론 미국 사람이 뭐는 당연히 문법에 신경을 쓰지만. . . [웃음] 여자한테 보낼 때는 틀리면 고쳐서 보내주겠지? 이런 식이구, 남자는 '어떻게든 내가 이해를 일단 확실히 사켜야 된다' 뭐 그런 생각이 드는 거
364: 미경: 그러니까 아마 한국에서 남자한테 쓸지 할 때 그 염청나게 신경 쓰는 거랑은 조금 다르지만
365: 서영: 비슷한 거일거 같애요.

Excerpt #62.
(Document: Gunjeung_Interview5)
159: 미경: 음, 그럼 쓰 때, 지난번 같은 경우에는 지난번 같은 경우도 일단 맨 사람이 보는 거잖아. '이 근경' 이렇게 나◯◯가 보는 거고, 이것은 classmate 들이 다 보는거고, 어째면 이게 더 더 많이 알 수도 있겠다, 사람들이, 숫자가 작으니까. listserv 같은 경우는 몇몇인지 모르잖아.
160: 근경: 아, 맞아. 이건 서로 두 누가 썼는지 아니까.

....
미경: listserv에 올리면, 내가 틀리도 맨 애들 뒤 모듈텐데 뭐, 그런 생각은 안들었어요.
서영: 그런 생각은 안드는데, 그니까 나를 알고 모르고 크게 중요한 게 아니고,
미경: pes히 자기가?
서영: 예, 그러니까, 저 사람이 내가 틀린 걸 알아도, '그래, 제는 그렇게, 뭐' 그날 이렇게 생각할 수 있는데, 그렇지 않은 사람이 봤을 때, 그니까 저 혼자 막, 너무 복잡하게 생각하는,
서영: 그런 생각은 안드는데, 그러니까 저를 알고 모르고 그게 중요한 것이 아니고, 저 혼자 막, 너무 복잡하게 생각하는.

미경: 그레도 알고 하더라도 별 그렇게 안된다는 얘긴가, 그러면?
Classmate 들하고 chatting이나 e-mail을 보낸다, Web-CT에 건다, 놔다.

서영: 사람이. 예, 그런 group에서는 상당히 신경이 쓰이겠죠. 일단
서영: 예.
서영: 그러니까, 저 사람일 때, 맞이 막 이렇게 생각할 수 있는데, 그렇지 않은 사람이 봤을 때, 저 혼자 가하고 생각할 수 있는데, 그렇지 않은 사람에 대해, 난 혼자 막, 너무 복잡하게 생각하는,

미경: 했어, 그런 group에서는 상당히 신경이 쓰이겠죠. 일단
서영: 예.
서영: 그러면 저 사람일 때, 맞이 이런 생각이 드니까.

미경: [서영과 동시에] Gender까지는 아니드래도.
서영: 저두, 저두, 막 이런 생각이 드니까.

미경: 그때는 그냥 좀 하긴 했는데 이번 처럼 그렇게 thoroughly하게 잘 안했거든요. So because I was experienced in this, and because I know what he has expected, ... uh ... I was able to do a lot more.

성혜: 근데 그것도 되게 차이나는 게 뭐냐면요, 친구랑, 외국인 친구랑 정말 아, 친하다라고 느껴지만 그게 막 뭐 잘되거든요. 근데, 아, 좀 요즘 틀하나 그게면 확실히 안되요.
성혜: 왜, 김도는 말만 하고, 정말 이렇게 막 즐기지는 못하는 거 같어요,
성혜: 음,
성혜: 똑같은 거 같어요, 한국사람이랑 똑같은 거 같어요.

미경: 음, 음

미경: 똑같은 거 같어요, 한국사람이랑 똑같은 거 같어요.

서영: 그러니까 친하면서 1language에 대한 부담도 조금 줄어드는데, 그지? 친하게 되면은 그 사람이 내가 하는 영어를 어떻게 받아들이건에 대한 생각을
그러니까 그런 선생님이나 이런 사람들하고 할 때는 어느 정도 하는데, chatting 일기연정, 하는데, 친구, 그러니까 완전히 친한 친구면은 영어로 하게 되면 별로 그게 없어진다는 얘기네요.
240: 숙화: 네.

Excerpt #65.
(Document: Sookie_Interview5)
317: 숙화: 말하는 모습을 감추기시 우선은 교수한테는 물어보는 거니까, 전체로 내가 원하는 것만 물어보고 내가 원하는 것만 받아들이다 그런 생각안 반면에 이렇게 연느랑 얘기했을 때나 친구들이랑 있을 때는 응, 내 personality 가 다 다르니 거절이야. 내 얼굴이며, 뭐 말하는 도중에,뭐 행동하는 도중에 그건가 어떻게 보면 더 조심스럽기도 하고.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
244: 서영: 그것도 그게 종류가 여러가지가 있었기 때문이요.해서 공개를 해가지고 애들이 다 보는 거었고, instructor 한테만 보내는 거 있었는데 그건은 철반 편하게 했습니다 거 같아요.
245: 미경: Instructor 한테만 보내는 거는?
246: 서영: 예, 그것은 그냥 제가 저가지구 뒤 한번 몇번 더 익히보긴 했지만 아, 그렇게 맞아, 그때 instructor 한테 쓰는 문법보다는 인체 내가 어떤 생각을 한다 그걸로 거기에 쏘בק을 좀 더 맞췄던 거 같고, 그러니까 말이 안해두 그건가, 아, 맞아. 어떤 때는 (예를들어 예기할 때는) 내가 막 이만큼의 생각을 하는데, level 5의 생각을 하는데도 많이 안해두 그걸 표현하느라고 막 아주 뭉 level 1 정도 되는 표현을 하다보니까, 내 생각하는 걸 다 표현을 할 수 없었던 경우가 많았거든요. 많은데
247: 미경: 그러니까 선생님한테 할 때?
248: 서영: 선생님한테 할 때는, 아니, 선생님한테 할, 따로 보낼 때는 말이 안해 따로 보낼 때는, 그냥 내가 생각하는 거만 어떻게 해서든지 표현을 해볼려고 그렇게 해서 보냈던 거 같고.
249: 미경: 그러니까 자기가 생각하는 level대로 할 수 있, 그러니까 조금 이렇게 language 가 안해더라도 어떻게든 할라고 하는 거고
250: 서영: 예.

(Document: Seoyoung_Interview7)
216: 서영: 아, 근데 또 생각해 보니까 그건은 또 과목 차이도 있는 거 같아요.
[웃음]
223: 서영: 왜두도 이런면 내 단점을 좀 많이 보여서 그런 고치고 싶은 거예요. 예배한 거는 그냥 해가지구 내가 막 일부러 찾아가지구 막 내 나름대로 막 '아, 이게 맞겠지', 해가지구 보내는 거 보다는 차라리 모른다고 하고 막 쓰면 말만 쓰고 그 뒤에다 뭐 '잘 모르겠다', 뭐 이 문장 뭐나 뭐 뭐 그리고 다음에 만났을 때 뭐어분데든가, 그런 식으로 했던 거 같고 남자 instructor는 . . .
227: 서영: 그런 것도 있었어요. 그러니까 맞아요, (남자 instructor는, computer 선생님) 완벽하게 보일, 그러니까, 내, 내가 외국에 이긴 하지만 막.
영어투제가 난 생각하기에 ARIABLE 저런 설명으로 여가와서 공부를 하나'

예를 들어 생각을 들게 하고 실지 않은 것도 있고, 그리고 저 사람이 영어
전쟁념어요 아니니까

미경: 그렇지.

서영: 일단 다른 과목은 영어가 바탕이 돼서 하는 거같아. 근데, 영어도
안된다는 걸 보여주기가 싫었던 것 같기도 하고.

미경: 아니, 굳이 남자 여자를 따서 그렇게 하다보니까 그렇게 왔던
애가?

서영: 아니, 솔직히 남자 여자인 것도 있었어요. 그냥 남자 한테 좀 더
신경을 쓰고 왔던 이유는 뭐 그냥 내가 외국에선 영어를 못하지 않는다. 뭐 그냥
그런 것도 보여주고 싶었고 실수를 덜 보여주고 싶었던 것도 있고, 또 플러스
알파가 있다면, 과목이 영어가 아니었으니까 그냥 내가 못하는 내 영어
설력 이런 거 가지고 지금 이 공부하고 있다라는 걸 보여주고 싶지 않았던 그런
이유도 있던 거 같구.

Excerpt #66.
(Document: Seoyung_Interview7)

149: 미경: 모르는 사람이면 그렇게 여명지는 모르겠지만 다 제가 누가 누군지를
다 아니니까. 그리고 같은 방에서 거의 하는 거같아. 같은 교실에서 하는 거같아.
그러니까 그게는 뭐 없겠다. 옛, 1language 측면에서 그렇게 여겨지? 그러니까
근데 어차피, 옛, 여자남자는 그렇게 상관없다 그랬다? 자기 영어로 할때는?

서영: 아니, 그랬다.

151: 미경: 그런, 그냥 자기도 그냥 뭐 외국 사람으로 왜주는 거 같고 그냥
서영: 그냥 누가 더 잘 들어, 잘 듣느냐 안들느냐 그 차이가 제가
남자여자는

517: 서영: 그때는 그냥 영어 생각만 든 거구 내가 어떻게 표현을 할까, 뭐,
잘 표현할 수 있을까, 상대방이 이해를 할까, 그 생각만 하는 거 같구 그리구
아, 영어 시간에 또 그런 것을 수업 시간에 그런 것도 있다.

522: 서영: 제가 써놓구 혼자 그런 생각을 해요. '아, 누가 읽었을 때는 왜는
분명히 [웃음 섞인] 내말을 좀 이해를 하려고 하니까, 에는 이해를 하겠지.'
그러고 또 영 못알아들든 에들은, '애는 뭐 이렇게 쓰냐도 못알아 들을거야.'
뭐 이런 생각 [웃음]

Excerpt #67.
(Document: Eunji_Interview3)

아는 사람도 있을 거같아.

129: 은지: Listserv 에선 남 신경 안썼어.

207: 미경: [웃음] 그러면 그, 자기가 써서 바로 보내니까 뭐, 이걸 누가 읽든
뭐 그런 거는 별로 없겠네?

208: 은지: 근데 언니 그 listserv 는, 그 listserv 가 어떤 성격을
갖느냐에 따라 틀린 거 같에. 이번 108 같은 경우에는, Grade 에 들어가는
것도 아니었고, 편하게 마음으로 하래써? 만약에 점수에 다 들어가는데고
신경써서 했겠지. Listserv 라서가 아니라 어떤 상황에서 그 listserv 가
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주어지는나에 따라 틀린 거 같애.
210: 미경: 자기 생각하는 거 그냥 쓴고 일방적으로 그냥 내보내는 거지 뭐, 거기에 있는 사람이,
211: 은지: 108 같은 선 그랬어요. 
.
.
218: 미경: . 다른 애들 message 일을 때는 에가 남잔지 여잔지 이런 거 보겠네, 그럼, 애는 사람 같으면?
220: 미경: 너무 많아, 그리고,
221: 은지: . 그거 임을 시간이 어딨어?

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview1)
639: 미경: 그림 그 관계가, class 에서 classmate 들과의 관계가, 그 Web-CT 갈을 때는 어때?
640: 지영: Care 안하는테요, 나는.
641: 미경: 상관없이?
642: 지영: 전혀 상관 없어요.
643: 미경: 그냥 누가 썼는지를 보고 뭐, 그런 거 상관없이?
644: 지영: 웹, 글을 처음에 먼저 읽어보구요, 잘 썼는 글이 있으면 개가 누군가 그 class 가서 찾아본 적은 있어요. 저는 Danielle 글이 좋거든요. Danielle 이 누군가, 그리고 Danielle 이 무슨 말 하는가에 대해서 보고 그래서 했어요.

(Document: Jiyoung_Interview3)
660: 지영: 예, 안해요.
661: 미경: 이렇게 얘기했거든요. 근데 그렇게 흉시, 거기서는 그 message 를 사람하고 연관을 안시키고 그냥 message 자체로만 보기 때문에 인거도 있나?
662: 지영: 그렇죠. 그림죠.